2949. Also, petition of F. E. Morriss, executive secretary and general manager, Texas Retail Dry Goods Association, of Dallas, Tex., favoring House bills 7152 and 7550; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2950. Also, petition of Brazos County Agricultural Association and Lynn Sample, Bryan, Tex., favoring House bill 7577, Flannagan farm-adjustment bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2951. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Denny Cross and 250 other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 4199, known as the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 19, 1937

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Merciful God, our Heavenly Father, as we pause in prayer at Thy mercy seat may we hear Thee in conscience and in the dictates of a higher selfhood. Quicken our souls, for the best influence in all this world is a spiritualized manhood. We pray that by vision and by virtue we may be a voice for the oppressed, the suffering, and the sinning. Give us, we entreat Thee, a truthful knowledge of ourselves for the freshening of our ideals and for the answers of our fevered questions. Help us, we beseech Thee, for we are compounds of weakness and of strength, and the difficult task is to separate the bad from the good, the wise from the unwise. May this day be the beginning of a week of earnest living and earnest doing. Abide with our President, our Speaker, and the Congress, and be in all their counsels. Thine shall be the praise. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 16, 1937, was read and approved.

CAROLINE L. RODGERS

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 280

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Caroline L. Rodgers, wife of Joseph G. Rodgers, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' compensation and an additional amount, not to exceed $250, to defray funeral expenses of the said Joseph G. Rodgers.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include two statements by myself.

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

There was no objection.

SHALL WE SAVE OUR MARKETS FOR AMERICAN FATS AND OILS?

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the trade treaty with Norway.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, the National Grange and other farm organizations are seeking to enlist the cooperation of Congressmen, as well as fellow Grangers, dairymen, and other agricultural producers for the protection of an American industry now threatened by a proposed reciprocal trade agreement with Norway. I am now, and have been for over a quarter of a century, a member of the Grange. For the many years of my public life, as Oregon State senator and Governor, and now in Congress, I have been an uncompromising champion of the dairymen and have, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, interested myself in farm legislation. We have in Washington many kinds of lobbyists, not all of them helpful, but I have found at least two here who are unceasing in their efforts in behalf of American farmers—Fred Brenckman, of the National Grange, and A. M. Loomis, of the Dairy Union.

THE PRESENT EMERGENCY AND THE RECIPROCAL TARIFF ACT

Now, the friends of the farmer in Washington are working together on a matter which affects both producers and consumers of products which are prosaically called "fats and oils." It happens that the State Department is, under the Reciprocal Tariff Act, considering a trade agreement with Norway. Until the Reciprocal Tariff Act was passed, in 1934, all treaties were ratified by the Senate. Under that act, renewed this session, trade treaties or agreements are made by the State Department independently of the Congress. It appears to me that under this system farmers have been sacrificed for the benefit of industry. By this I mean that foreign agricultural products have been given our American markets in exchange for foreign markets for American automobiles and adding machines. Under the most-favored-nation clause of the act, lowering of tariff on any commodity for one nation gives all nations the same privilege. I voted against renewal of this act; now I want to help to overcome its disadvantages.

THE NORWEGIAN TREATY AND WHAT YOU CAN DO ABOUT IT

You will recall that Norway, "land of the midnight sun", sends its sailors forth into the ports of the world, and that its fishermen are famed as the most hardy and successful whalers. They bring home the products of their venturesome journeys at sea and Norwegian people must find a market for the whale oil, which is one of their chief exports. Our friends in Norway seek to have the United States, through a reciprocal-trade agreement, admit to our markets millions of pounds of whale oil to be sold here in competition with the products of the farmers of America. If this treaty goes through, this whale oil can be made into oleomargarine here at a cost of less than 8 cents a pound. As it is now, under a tariff which we have placed for the protection of our American farmers, the whale oil, which is worth around 5 cents on the world market, would have to be sold here raw for 8 cents. The Norwegians have always been large producers of fats and oils; formerly they were used for lamps, lanterns, and grease. Now their whale oil is a substitute for our lard and tallow and it is used for soap, as a butter substitute in oleomargarine, and for many other commercial purposes. This low-tariff wall of 3 cents a pound on certain foreign fats and oils was erected by Congress in 1934 for your protection. Shall we allow those who bargain for us through the State Department to breach that wall for the purpose of the hardy Norwegians if it will work injury to our own farm people who have been so hard-pressed since 1920?

In order to be entirely fair, we must consider several phases of this problem and we must be informed if we are to make an intelligent decision. I am asking the Members of this House to study this matter and to make representation to the State Department, telling them what they think of the proposal to place the American producers outside the protection of this small tax of 3 cents levied on foreign fats and oils. Remember, if the tax is remitted for Norway, it must, under the most-favored-nation clause, be remitted to all who have such products to send us.

WHAT PRODUCERS WILL BE AFFECTED?

If this 3-cent tariff or tax is removed by the State Department, it will lower the income of many types of producers in America, including dairymen, beef-cattle growers, and practically all the livestock industry, cottonseed, corn, and soybean growers. It will actually affect owners and workers on at least four-fifths of all the farms in the country. It is not merely one section of the country which would be affected but practically all sections, because there are so many kinds of animal and vegetable oils and fats produced. This slight tariff wall brought about increased prosperity which the American farmers have enjoyed recently. Because it gave the farmers buying power, it helped the businessmen and industry. Why should we Americans deny

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ourselves this advantage for the benefit of any European country?

This is not a romantic subject, but the figures of the vastness of the world's business in fats and oils are impressive. They constitute a very large percentage of the world's commerce in agricultural products. I was amazed when I learned the magnitude of this business. It has come about very largely through the scientific skill of modern chemists, and the advancement which has followed chemical research. Practically all the fats and oils, vegetable and animal, may be so refined and used that they come into competition with our own farm products raised throughout the whole country—such as butter, lard, tallow, cottonseed oil, soybean oil, and corn oil; also the oil produced through the fisheries. The quantities are so great that we measure them, like the national debt, in "billions." All imported fats and oils come into competition with our own agricultural products. Why should we give any other nation the privilege of flooding our markets with their oils and fats?

SPECIAL BENEFITS OF THE 3-CENT TAX

In 1936, 8,000,000 tons, or 16,000,000,000 pounds, of oil were moved in ships in foreign commerce. That is more than twice the amount of all the fats and oils produced in the United States, which turns out six and one-half billion pounds a year. Most of our domestic fats and oils are consumed within our own borders, as we export only small quantities. We have always been importers of certain oils, which have come in over the 3-cent tax, not intended to be prohibitive, but protective only. The noncompetitive oils are not included in this story, which is limited to those entering into competition with American farm producers. Last year, over this 3-cent wall, which was 4½ cents on some oils, we imported over 1,700,000,000 pounds of oil, or oil-bearing materials. These were subject to the tax and were admitted to our manufacturing industries and our commerce. I wonder if we need to import a billion and a half pounds of oils? Why can we not produce them here? We need new crops of which we have no surplus, and we very specially need crops which could take up the lands now used for our surplus crops, like wheat, corn, and cotton. The disposal and control of these surplus crops is a vexing national problem.

It is my belief that our dairy products today are 25 percent higher than they would be had we not placed this tax on imported ingredients for oleomargarine. The State Department is great and majestic, but, like other departments in Government, it should function for the everyday welfare of our people, and those who milk old Bess are an important part of our population.

The soybean industry, a fairly recent importation from the Asiatic shores, has grown tremendously. When I came to Congress in 1933, soybean oil was produced in this country to the extent of twenty-six and one-half million pounds; in 1936 it was nine times as much, or more than 225,000,000 pounds. Farmers who raised soybeans got 64 cents a bushel in 1933, and in 1935 the price had advanced to $1.02 a bushel, for the tremendous crop of nearly 45,000,000 bushels. This increase in production amounted in shining money to nearly $17,000,000 income for American farmers, and remember, it came from lands which might have been used for our troublesome surplus crops.

Tallow is one of the most important fats in our production. In 1933 it brought 3 cents a pound; today it brings 8½ cents, and the benefits due to this increased price are over $40,000,000. These welcome dollars were paid to stock farmers in better prices for their cattle, and helped dairy farmers because of the higher cost of competing oleomargarine.

What is the story as it relates to the cotton farmers of the South, who find the sale of cotton seed so important? When I first wrote "M. C." after my name, these farmers received $10.35 a ton for their seed. Last year it was $31.33 a ton, and the amount of additional money brought to cotton farmers because of that increased price was over $100,000,000.

This year we look for a 200,000,000-pound production of corn oil, a source of great profit to farmers. Peanut-oil production has increased since 1933 from twelve and one-half million to over 70,000,000 pounds. And so the amazing effects of encouragement of home production have been felt by farmers everywhere in our fair land.

Now, every pound of these oils produced in our country has meant money to American farmers, and the farmers have put that money into circulation for the benefit of industry and business. On the contrary, every pound of the foreign fats and oils landed on our shores benefits a competitor for our production and for our money. Are our farmers in a position to allow that unfair competition to rob them of much-needed income? That 3-cent tax has helped to build up the oil and fat industries of this country. Why not continue to demand that any necessary imports should come over the low protective wall of 3 cents a pound? Modern transportation has made the world so much of a neighborhood that it has been necessary to restudy and recast our trade relations, but every other nation has protected its own people. Unless we in the United States continue this policy of aiding those throughout the country who produce those different oils and fats, a large proportion of the 19,000,000,000 pounds of oils in the world's trade would be brought to American ports.

I am well aware that many of those employed in our industries and factories are made by propaganda to think they are adversely affected when farm prices are increased. They believe it is to their interest to be able to buy cheap food. No one but the greediest of greedy owners could justly take that viewpoint, because the workers, when given higher wages, are willing that the farmers should share their prosperity through higher prices for the products of their labor. Prices of farm products have never gone to the prohibitive point, and people of farm and factory should work together to help each other. All America prospers when the farmer receives a reasonable price for his product. He spends his income for the products of industries. His taxes, which are now harder to pay than they have ever been, help to fill the Public Treasury. Prosperity cannot come to the American farmer nor to the manufacturer if farm products must be sold for less than the cost of production. Are we in a position to lose the advantage in price and public income which we have enjoyed because of the 3-cent tax which has brought increased millions to the producers of this country and extended our farming operations?

PUBLIC REVENUE A FACTOR

Now, this matter of protection of so large and important a section of the American producers is not the only point at issue. Since we placed the tax on foreign fats and oils in 1934 our Government has collected about $69,000,000 from this duty. The collections on Philippine coconut oil must, under our agreement, be returned to that Government, but the net revenue to our Treasury through this 1934 3-cent tax has been more than $26,000,000. This is almost enough to fill the gap made by the 3½-percent farm interest rates which we have recently had such a struggle to retain through congressional action. Now the same sort of group which would require our farmers to pay the highest interest rates on Government money are proposing that those farmers should allow an important part of their markets in this country to be destroyed for the benefit of Norwegian fishermen. We honor the Norwegian people who have settled among us and have the most friendly feeling for their country, but we should not be called upon to make such a sacrifice when we are just coming out of an unprecedented agricultural depression.

We must help the Grange and other farm organizations who are seeking to do justice to American farmers. The State Department must not allow interference with our small protective tax, even in the trade agreement with Norway. The welfare of American farmers should not be sacrificed in the Norwegian reciprocal-trade agreements as they have recently been sacrificed in other trade agreements. Now is the time when we can protect our farm earnings by vigorous action.

This recital of increased prices for certain farm commodities during the past 4 years must impress every listener with the fact that something has been done for the farmer by the group controlling legislation in Washington over this period. The farmer has never had better friends in public life, but he must, of course, express his own opinion in an unmistakable manner.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

REVISION OF AIR-MAIL LAWS

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 4732, to revise the air-mail laws.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PREFERRED EMPLOYMENT OF AMERICAN CITIZENS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3423, to provide for the preferred employment of American citizens by the Government of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That no existing or future appropriation shall be available to pay the compensation of any alien who is compensated out of appropriations made by Congress unless the appointing officer certifies under oath that no qualified American citizen can be found who is available for the office or employment: *Provided,* That no existing or future appropriation shall be available to pay the compensation of any alien who is illegally in the United States or its possessions.

SEC. 2. This act shall become effective 30 days after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That no existing or future appropriation shall be available after December 31, 1937, to pay the compensation of any alien now or hereafter employed within the continental United States in any office or employment who is compensated in whole or in part out of appropriations made by Congress, unless the appointing officer certifies under oath that no qualified American citizen is available for such office or employment. This section shall not apply to persons on the active or retired lists of the armed forces of the United States, commissioned, appointed, enlisted, or enrolled prior to the enactment of this act, nor to instructors in foreign languages at the United States Military, Naval, or Coast Guard Academies. The President may by order prescribe such additional exceptions to the provisions of this section as in his opinion are necessary to the efficiency of the Government service.

"SEC. 2. No existing or future appropriation shall be available after December 31, 1937, to pay the compensation of any alien who is illegally in the United States or any of its possessions."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE HOMESTEADS CORPORATIONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3058, for the relief of former employees of the Federal Subsistence Homesteads Corporations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the case of any person who was employed by any corporation, all of the stock of which was owned by the Federal Subsistence Homesteads Corporation of Delaware, and who was transferred to a position in the Department of the Interior with the same or substantially similar duties but at an increase in his rate of compensation, if there have been heretofore withheld or deducted from any amounts, otherwise payable to such person out of Government funds, any amount on account of any payment of salary to such person, subsequently disallowed or held to have been illegally made under any decision of the Comptroller General that such transfer to such position in the Department of the Interior constituted an administrative promotion within the provisions of section 7, as amended and extended, of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1934, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to such person a sum equal to the amount so withheld or deducted.

SEC. 2. Each person referred to in section 1, and each disbursing officer who made any payments of salary referred to in such section to any such person, is hereby released from any liability to refund or pay to the Government, or otherwise discharge, any amount on account of any such payment of salary to such person, subsequently disallowed or held to have been illegally made under any decision of the Comptroller General that the transfer of such person to such position in the Department of the Interior constituted an administrative promotion within the provisions of section 7, as amended and extended, of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1934, and no deduction shall be made from any amount due or payable out of Government funds to any such person or disbursing officer by reason of any such decision.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES OF THE PAPAGO INDIAN RESERVATION (ARIZONA)

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1806, to extend the boundaries of the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever all privately owned lands except mining claims within the following-described area have been purchased and acquired as hereinafter authorized, the boundary of the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona shall be extended to include the west half of section 4; west half of section 9, township 17 south, range 8 east; all of township 18 south, range 2 west, all of fractional township 19 south, range 2 west; and all of fractional townships 18 and 19 south, range 3 west, except sections 6, 7, 18, 19, 30, and 31 in township 18 south, range 3 west, Gila and Salt River meridian. This extension shall not affect any valid rights initiated prior to the approval hereof nor the reservation of a strip of land 60 feet wide along the United States-Mexico boundary made by proclamation of the President dated May 27, 1907 (35 Stat. 2136). The lands herein described when added to the Papago Indian Reservation as provided in this act shall become a part of said reservation in all respects and upon all the same terms as if said lands had been included in the Executive order issued by the President on February 1, 1917: *Provided,* That lands acquired hereunder shall remain tribal lands and shall not be subject to allotment to individual Indians.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to purchase for the use and benefit of the Papago Indians with any available funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated pursuant to authority contained in section 5 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), all privately owned lands, water rights, and reservoir site reserves within townships 18 and 19 south, ranges 2 and 3 west, together with all grazing privileges and including improvements upon public lands appurtenant to the so-called Menager Dam property, at the appraised value of $40,016.37.

SEC. 3. The State of Arizona may relinquish in favor of the Papago Indians such tracts within the townships referred to in section 1 of this act as it may see fit and shall have the right to select other unreserved and nonmineral public lands within the State of Arizona equal in area to those relinquished, said lieu selections to be made in the same manner as is provided for in the enabling act of June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 558), or in the discretion of the State of Arizona under the provisions of section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended and supplemented by the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 842). The payment of fees or commissions is hereby waived in all lieu selections made pursuant to this section.

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.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 3 OF THE ACT OF JUNE 18, 1934 (48 STAT. 984–988) RELATING TO INDIAN LANDS IN ARIZONA

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2188, to amend section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984–988), relating to Indian lands in Arizona.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984–988), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, if he shall find it to be in the public interest, is hereby authorized to restore to tribal ownership the remaining surplus lands of any Indian reservation heretofore opened, or authorized to be opened, to sale, or any other form of disposal by Presidential proclamation, or by any of the public-land laws of the United States: *Provided, however,* That valid rights or claims of any persons to any lands so withdrawn existing on the date of the withdrawal shall not be affected by this act: *Provided further,* That this section shall not apply to lands within any reclamation project heretofore authorized in any Indian reservation: *Provided further,* That this section shall not apply to the lands ceded and excluded from the San Carlos Indian Reservation in Arizona by the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896 (29 Stat. 358).

"(b)(1) The order of the Department of the Interior signed, dated, and approved by Hon. Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior, on October 28, 1932, temporarily withdrawing lands of the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona from all forms of mineral

entry or claim under the public-land mining laws, is hereby revoked and rescinded, and the lands of the said Papago Indian Reservation are hereby restored to exploration and location, under the existing mining laws of the United States, in accordance with the express terms and provisions declared and set forth in the Executive orders establishing said Papago Indian Reservation: *Provided*, That damages shall be paid to the superintendent or other officer in charge of the reservation for the credit of the owner thereof, for loss of any improvements on any land located for mining in such a sum as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be the fair and reasonable value of such improvements: *Provided further*, That a yearly rental not to exceed 5 cents per acre shall be paid to the superintendent or other officer in charge of the reservation for deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Papago Tribe for loss of the use or occupancy of any land withdrawn by the requirements of mining operations.

"(2) In the event any person or persons, partnership, corporation, or association desires a mineral patent, according to the mining laws of the United States, he or they shall first pay to the superintendent or other officer in charge of the reservation, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Papago Tribe, the sum of $1 per acre in lieu of annual rental, as hereinbefore provided, to compensate for the loss of the use or occupancy of the lands withdrawn by the requirements of mining operations; but the sum thus deposited, except for a deduction of rental at the annual rate hereinbefore provided, shall be refunded to the applicant in the event that patent is not acquired: *Provided*, That an applicant for patent shall also pay to the superintendent or other officer in charge of the said reservation, for the credit of the owner thereof, damages for the loss of improvements not theretofore paid, in such a sum as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be the fair value thereof.

"(3) Water reservoirs, charcos, water holes, springs, wells, or any other form of water development by the United States or the Papago Indians shall not be used for mining purposes under the terms of this act, except under permit from the Secretary of the Interior approved by the Papago Indian Council: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as interfering with or affecting the validity of the water rights of the Indians of this reservation: *Provided further*, That the appropriation of living water heretofore or hereafter affected by the Papago Indians is hereby recognized and validated subject to all the laws applicable thereto.

"(4) Nothing herein contained shall restrict the granting or use of permits for easements or rights-of-way; or ingress or egress over the lands for all proper and lawful purposes; and nothing contained herein, except as expressly provided, shall be construed as authority for the Secretary of the Interior, or any other person, to issue or promulgate a rule or regulation in conflict with the Executive order of February 1, 1917, creating the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona or the act of February 21, 1931 (46 Stat. 1202)."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "reservation", strike out the remainder of line 5 and all of lines 6, 7, 8, and 9.

The committee 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 was laid on the table.

ADMISSION TO CITIZENSHIP OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6785, for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to February 5, 1917.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

Mr. LANZETTA. Will the gentleman withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. LANZETTA. I believe the gentleman understands what this bill purports to do. It purports to give citizenship to people who have been here for 20, 30, and 40 years or more and who have been unable to become American citizens because of their inability to comply with the educational requirements of our naturalization law. This is a humane piece of legislation, and in view of the laws which are being passed by Congress barring aliens from employment on Government work and depriving them of W. P. A. positions, I think our Government owes it to these people who have been in this country a great number of years to admit them to citizenship. In most countries persons are admitted to citizenship on the basis of length of residence in the country.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. In most countries they cannot become citizens at all.

Mr. LANZETTA. I do not think that is true.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. This is the most liberal country in the world in that respect.

Mr. LANZETTA. I received information from various countries that citizenship is granted after a certain period of residence. My bill takes care of persons who in the main have American families.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If the gentleman will not object to my request to pass this bill over without prejudice, I will be glad to look into the matter until the calendar is called the next time; otherwise I shall have to object.

Mr. LANZETTA. If the gentleman wishes to further study the bill, I shall not object.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIEN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4291, to extend further time for naturalization to alien veterans of the World War under the act approved May 25, 1932 (47 Stat. 165), to extend the same privileges to certain veterans of countries allied with the United States during the World War, and for other purposes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the author of the bill if this covers simply an extension of time granted in bills we have heretofore passed?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this bill is similar to the bill, H. R. 2739, passed in the Seventy-fourth Congress, but strikes out the words "having been denied entry into the military and naval forces of the United States." Many of these aliens joined the armies in France prior to our entry into the war, so they cannot prove they were denied service in this Army.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Does the gentleman state this bill is similar to bills we have heretofore passed?

Mr. LESINSKI. This is the same bill, except for the wording.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I want to know about the difference. Will the gentleman please state the difference again?

Mr. LESINSKI. The difference is that line 10 in the old bill is struck out, reading as follows:

Having been denied entry into the military and naval forces of the United States.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. To whom does the gentleman refer when he uses the phrase "having been denied"?

Mr. LESINSKI. The aliens who went across prior to our entering the war.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman states "having been denied."

Mr. LESINSKI. They left the country, so they could not be denied.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is this the only class? The gentleman is not including anybody who has made application here but could not get in?

Mr. LESINSKI. No one at all, except the aliens who left the country before we were in the war.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Heretofore we have been very liberal, and I think justly so. I have always favored this kind of a bill letting in all of these veterans. However, we have extended the time several times. Is this going to open the door in any way so that we are going to give citizenship to some fellow who has complicated the situation by getting into some other country, and if we give him citizenship now it will complicate our relationship with some other country?

Mr. LESINSKI. No; it does not include such a man at all. The reason for introducing this bill is that some of the judges claimed they would not grant citizenship to these veterans on account of certain words in the Connally-Cannon bill, which have been struck out in my bill.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois if he has anything to offer.

Mr. MASON. This bill applies only to veterans of the World War who were aliens and joined the other armies before we got in.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision (a) of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to further amend the naturalization laws, and for other purposes", approved May 25, 1932 (47 Stat. 165; U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 8, sec. 392b (a)), shall, as herein amended, continue in force and effect to include petitions for citizenship filed prior to May 25, 1938, with any court having naturalization jurisdiction: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this act clause (1) of subdivision (a) of section 1 of the aforesaid act of May 25, 1932, is amended by striking out the words "all such period" and in lieu thereof inserting the words "the 5 years immediately preceding the filing of his petition."

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 1 of this act are hereby extended to include any alien lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence who departed therefrom between August 1914 and April 5, 1917, or who departed therefrom subsequent to April 5, 1917, for the purpose of serving, and actually served prior to November 11, 1918, in the military or naval forces of any of the countries allied with the United States in the World War and was discharged from such service under honorable circumstances: *Provided*, That before any applicant for citizenship under this section is admitted to citizenship, the court shall be satisfied by competent proof that he is entitled to and has complied in all respects with the provisions of this act; and that he was and had been a bona fide lawfully admitted resident in the United States for 2 years before the passage of this act.

SEC. 3. The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECORDS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Clerk called House Resolution 222, authorizing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transfer certain records not necessary in current business to the Archivist of the United States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL PLAN FOR FLOOD CONTROL

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 175, to authorize the submission to Congress of a comprehensive national plan for the prevention and control of floods of all the major rivers of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Would the gentleman object to having the joint resolution passed over without prejudice? The author of the resolution is not here at the moment.

Mr. DONDERO. Not at all.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will submit that request, I will be very much obliged to him.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SALE OF DORMITORY PROPERTIES OF THE CHICKASAW TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7409, providing for the sale of the two dormitory properties belonging to the Chickasaw Nation or Tribe of Indians in the vicinity of the Murray State School of Agriculture at Tishomingo, Okla.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR HOLDING COURT AT SHAWNEE, OKLA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4605, relating to the accommodations for holding court at Shawnee, Okla.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a term of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma at Shawnee, Okla.", approved May 13, 1936 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. II, title 28, sec. 182), is amended by striking out ": *Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Shawnee are furnished without expense to the United States."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "out", strike out the remainder of line 7 and down to and including line 10 and insert the following: "the period at the end of the proviso and adding the following: 'until, subject to the recommendation of the Attorney General of the United States with reference to providing such rooms and accommodations for holding court at Shawnee, a public building shall have been erected or other Federal space provided for court purposes in said city.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIPPEWA INDIANS IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4540, authorizing the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota to file suit in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4539, authorizing a per-capita payment of $25 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MEMORIAL TO WILL ROGERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6482, providing for cooperation with the State of Oklahoma in constructing a permanent memorial to Will Rogers.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CREATION OF UNITED STATES BOARD OF AWARDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 171, to create a United States Board of Awards and to provide for the presentation of certain medals.

Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. WOLCOTT asked unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INAUGURATION OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 366, providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington as first President of the United States and authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate therein.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS OF THE SHOSHONE OR WIND RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6914, to authorize the acquisition by the United States of certain tribally owned lands of the Indians of the Shoshone or Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyo., for the Wind River irrigation project.

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 acquire on behalf of the United States for the use and benefit of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Shoshone Indian Reservation, Wyo., at the appraised value thereof, the E½SE¼ sec. 8; the E½NE¼ and NW¼SE¼ sec. 17; the N½N½NE¼ sec. 20; and the N½NW¼NW¼ sec. 21, all in T. 1 S., R. 2 W., Wind River meridian, Wyoming, and not to exceed $650 of the allotment made by the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works to the Indian Service for Federal project 266–Indian, may be used for this purpose. The amount herein authorized shall be deposited to the credit of the Indians of the Shoshone Reservation as proceeds of labor, Shoshone and Arapahoe Indians, Wyoming, and shall be subject to expenditure pursuant to the provisions of existing laws: *Provided*, That such deposits of funds shall operate as a full, complete, and perfect extinguishment of all right, title, and interest the Indians may possess in and to the land herein described.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIMS OF THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4407, authorizing the Five Civilized Tribes, in suits heretofore filed under their original Jurisdictional Acts, to present claims to the United States Court of Claims by amended petitions to conform to the evidence; and authorizing said court to adjudicate such claims upon their merits as though filed within the time limitation fixed in said original Jurisdictional Acts.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS WITHIN THE GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5472, to authorize the exchange of certain lands within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park for lands within the Cherokee Indian Reservation, N. C., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, under such terms and conditions as he may deem proper, to exchange a tract of land of approximately 1,202 acres, near Smokemont, N. C., known as the Towstring tract and forming a part of the Cherokee Indian Reservation, for three tracts of land, totaling approximately 1,547 acres, in the vicinity of Ravensford, N. C., known as the Boundary Tree, Ravensford, and Tight Run tracts and forming a part of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, conditioned upon the consent of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians to the acquisition by the State of North Carolina of a right-of-way, which shall vary in width between 200 feet and 800 feet, for the Blue Ridge Parkway across the said reservation, and further conditioned upon payment to the said Cherokee Indians by the said State of North Carolina of such compensation as shall have been determined by the said Secretary as just and reasonable for the said right-of-way. When the foregoing conditions have been complied with, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby further authorized to grant to the State of North Carolina a right-of-way as hereinbefore provided for.

SEC. 2. The consent of the said Cherokee Indians to any proposed exchange and the acquisition of a right-of-way by the State of North Carolina as provided for herein shall be considered as expressed in the event the tribal council has, by the majority vote, agreed thereto within 60 days after the passage of this act, or in the event the said Cherokee Indians have, in a general election held thereafter and in which a majority vote in favor thereof, agreed thereto.

SEC. 3. No exchange shall be consummated pursuant to the provisions of this act unless and until the consent of the State of North Carolina is first had and obtained thereto as indicated by an act of its legislature.

SEC. 4. Upon the consummation of the exchange made pursuant to the provisions of this act, the lands transferred to the Indians shall be held in trust by the United States for the said Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians and shall be nontaxable and nonalienable the same as the balance of said lands and the lands transferred to the National Park Service shall become and be a part of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and shall be subject to the provisions of the act of Congress approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended: *Provided*, That should any of the exchanged area or parkway right-of-way herein dealt with cease to be used for park purposes, the title thereto shall revert to its status prior to the exchange.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "to", insert "this exchange and to."

Page 2, section 2, strike out all of lines 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "be expressed by secret ballot in a general election, in which a majority vote in favor thereof. Such election to be arranged and supervised by the tribal council within 60 days after the passage of this act, and the results of such election shall be final."

Page 3, line 7, strike out the word "said" and insert in lieu thereof "the Indian."

Page 3, line 8, after the first word of the line and before the comma, insert "of the aforesaid reservation."

Page 3, line 8, strike out the words "National Park Service" and insert in lieu thereof "United States for park purposes."

Page 3, line 14, after the word "park", insert "or parkway."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN LANDS APPROPRIATED BY THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4399, authorizing payment for certain lands appropriated by the United States, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make this explanation: H. R. 4399 is an appropriation bill to pay for certain coal lands taken from the Indians of my State for Government purposes several years ago. Congress paid for all of the land—1,010,000 acres, mostly grazing land—with the exception of 36,000 acres of coal land. The Congress instructed the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the value of the coal land and report back to the Congress, which was done. I introduced a bill for the appropriation of money to pay for it, which bill was killed in the last session of Congress. I anticipated there would be objection to this appropriation bill, so at the same time I introduced it I also introduced a companion bill, H. R. 3162, giving these Indians the right to go into the Court of Claims and establish the value of the coal lands and present any and all other claims they had against the Government. While I do not find any fault with the objection to the appropriation bill, I do hope that the next bill, H. R. 3162, which is merely a jurisdictional bill, will be allowed to pass at this time. If this Congress is unwilling, as directed by a former Congress, to assume the payment of this just claim, then the least we can do is to pass this jurisdictional bill and let the Indians involved present their claim to the Court of Claims. To do less is to deny justice to them, to ignore a solemn, just claim predicated upon a treaty, and to shut our ears and eyes to the facts.

Some gentlemen of this house, regardless of the merit of pending bills, object to their consideration on the ground of economy, but justice should not be denied or delayed on the principle of economy or any other principle. The premise of economy in delaying a meritorious claim is false and only forestalls the day of reckoning and at the same time overlooks the piling up of interest which, under our Supreme Court decisions, attaches from the inception of the claim and runs until it is ultimately paid. It is a simple thing to object to a bill which, by reason of its merit, will eventually pass, but such a course usually proves to be false economy. This jurisdictional bill should pass on its merit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION UPON THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS TO EXAMINE CLAIMS OF VARIOUS INDIAN TRIBES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3162, conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims which the Uncompahgre (Tabegauche), Uintah (Uinta), and White River (Yampa and Grand River) Bands of the Ute Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice. I have asked for a report on it and I have not yet received it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND ACT OF MARCH 26, 1934

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7512, to amend the act approved March 26, 1934.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved March 26, 1934, to authorize annual appropriations to meet losses sustained by officers and employees of the United States in foreign countries due to appreciation of foreign currencies in their relation to the American dollar, be, and is hereby, amended by substitution of the date "July 1, 1933", for "July 15, 1933", as the date from which officers and employees of the United States in service in foreign countries may be reimbursed for losses sustained due to the appreciation of foreign currencies in their relation to the American dollar, and reimbursement of losses sustained for such additional period is authorized to be paid from any unexpended balance of funds appropriated for exchange relief remaining in the Treasury which are otherwise unencumbered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUNTING ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE RESERVATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4642, to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the county of Beaufort, S. C., of the Hunting Island Lighthouse Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the condition hereinafter specified, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to convey to the county of Beaufort, S. C., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the two parcels of land (together with all improvements thereon) constituting the Hunting Island Lighthouse Reservation, situated on the island known as Hunting Island, in the county of Beaufort, S. C. Such conveyance shall contain the express condition that if the county of Beaufort, S. C., shall at any time cease to use the property as a public park for public recreation or as a game sanctuary, or both, or shall alienate or attempt to alienate such property in any manner other than that authorized by section 1 of the joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, approved June 2, 1936, authorizing the development of Hunting Island, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Secretary of Commerce" and insert "Director of Procurement, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATANO REAR RANGE LIGHT RESERVATION, P. R.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6045, authorizing and directing the Secretary of Commerce to transfer to the Government of Puerto Rico a portion of land within the Catano Rear Range Light Reservation, P. R., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transfer to the Government of Puerto Rico a portion of land within the Catano Rear Range Light Reservation, Puerto Rico, as shown on the map filed in the Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C., described more particularly as follows:

Beginning at a point lettered "A′" in the easterly line of the Catano Rear Range Light Reservation on the north side of the present municipal road, Catano Palo Seco Road, as shown on the chart no. 2306 of the Department of Commerce, located at a distance of 2.16 feet from point lettered "A" on above-mentioned chart no. 2306; thence, from said initial point lettered "A′", by metes and bounds, the following courses:

South 28°23′ W. 28.84 feet to a point lettered "B"; south 61°37′ E. 100 feet to a point lettered "C"; north 28°23′ E. 6.14 feet to a point lettered "D"; north 61°37′ W. 59.93 feet to a point lettered "E′"; north 30°47′ W. 17.68 feet to a point lettered "F"; north 25°51′ W. 28.77 feet to the starting point "A′."

Contains an area of 110.95 square yards.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the words "Puerto Rico", insert "for roadway purposes."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Rear Range Light" and insert "Range Rear Lighthouse."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "map" and insert "drawing numbered 2309."

Page 2, beginning in line 1, strike out all down to and including line 22 and insert the following:

"From a point lettered A, Ninth Lighthouse District Drawing No. 2309, which is the initial point of the metes and bounds of lighthouse reservation at Catano Range Rear Light as per survey dated October 27, 1904, this point being located north 89°16′ W. 56.30 feet from center of original wooden tower now removed and south 85°52′ W. and 57.90 feet from center of present steel rear range tower, thence by metes and bounds as follows: South 62°5′ E. 100 feet along south boundary of lighthouse reservation to a point lettered B; thence north 27°55′ E. 18 feet along east boundary of said reservation to a point lettered C; thence north 62°5′ W. 59.93 feet to a point lettered D; thence north 31°15′ W. 17.68 feet to a point lettered E; thence north 26°9′ W. 30.31 feet to a point lettered F on west boundary of said reservation; thence along this boundary south 27°55′ W. 45 feet to point of beginning; enclosing an area of 249.50 square yards.

"All bearings given are true, calculated from magnetic bearings from survey of October 27, 1904, corrected by 1°46′ W. variation.

"SEC. 2. The deed of conveyance shall contain a provision that should the government of Puerto Rico cease to use the property for the purpose for which it is conveyed title thereto shall revert to the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of Commerce to transfer to the government of Puerto Rico a portion of land within the Catano Range Rear Lighthouse Reservation, P. R., and for other purposes."

SAFETY OF RAILROAD OPERATION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 29, to promote the safety of employees and travelers on railroads by requiring common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to install, inspect, test, repair, and maintain block-signal systems, interlocking, automatic train-stop, train-control, cab-signal devices, and other appliances, methods, and systems intended to promote the safety of railroad operation.

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

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. HARLAN. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. In view of the fact that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], author of the bill, is not present this morning on account of a death in his family, would the gentleman mind asking leave that the bill go over without prejudice?

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, instead of objecting to the present consideration of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. I did not know the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] was not present.

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

There was no objection.

SALE BY SECRETARY OF WAR OF SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT TO PROSPECTIVE MANUFACTURERS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1972, to authorize the Secretary of War to sell, loan, or give samples of supplies and equipment to prospective manufacturers.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it would seem to me there is no limitation here concerning the amount of property that the Secretary of War could give away. There is a strong inference in the bill that the property is given to contractors in anticipation of their bids, in order that they may have a better understanding of the needs of the departments.

Should there not be some restriction in the bill that would authorize the Secretary of War to give this property only for that purpose; and should not the words "in anticipation of a bid", or something of that nature, be inserted in the bill? I have every faith and confidence in the Secretary of War, of course, not to violate this, but some future Secretary of War might violate the confidence that we are reposing in him.

Mr. FADDIS. I may say to the gentleman that the committee took that into consideration during the hearings on the bill. We were assured that it was not necessary, that every safeguard was taken.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then, may it be recorded that the intention of Congress is that the Secretary of War shall give this property to the contractors only in anticipation of a bid?

Mr. FADDIS. Surely. I am glad the gentleman brought that point out, because the point was brought out in the committee hearings also.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And the amount that is necessary is only that amount which will give the bidder a clear understanding of the needs of the Department.

Mr. FADDIS. Yes. I am glad the gentleman brought that point out.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, in his discretion and under rules, regulations, and limitations to be prescribed by him, to sell, loan, or give to contractors and private firms which are or may likely be manufacturers or furnishers of supplies and equipment for the use of the War Department or of the Army, under approved production plans, such drawings, manufacturing and other information, and samples of supplies and equipment to be manufactured or furnished, as he may consider will best promote the interests of national defense.

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.

ADDITIONAL NUMBER OF CADETS AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2295, to amend the act approved June 7, 1935 (Public, No. 116, 74th Cong.; 49 Stat. 332), to provide for an additional number of cadets at the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of the act approved June 7, 1935 (Public, No. 116, 74th Cong.; 49 Stat. 332), to provide for an additional number of cadets at the United States Military Academy, which reads as follows: "one to be selected by the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, from among the sons of civilians of the Panama Canal Zone and the Panama Railroad, resident on the zone", is amended to read as follows: "one cadet to be selected by the Governor of the Panama Canal from among the sons of civilians residing in the Canal Zone and the sons of civilian personnel of the United States Government and the Panama Railroad Co. residing in the Republic of Panama."

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.

PORT OF NORFOLK, VA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7614, to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes", approved March 4, 1911.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes", approved March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1353; U. S. C., title 34, secs. 1121–1123), is amended by adding at the end of the first section the following paragraph:

"The port of Norfolk specified in the preceding paragraph shall be construed as embracing Norfolk, or Portsmouth, or Newport News, or any other city, town, municipality, or locality within the territorial limits of the customs-collection district having its headquarters at Norfolk, Va."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUNISHMENT FOR REPEATED VIOLATIONS OF NARCOTIC LAWS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6283, to increase the punishment of second, third, and subsequent offenders against the narcotic laws.

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

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COLUMBIA NATIONAL FOREST, STATE OF WASHINGTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3866, to add certain lands to the Columbia National Forest in the State of Washington.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to any valid existing claim or entry, all lands of the United States within the areas hereinafter described be, and the same are hereby, added to and made parts of the Columbia National Forest, in the State of Washington, to be hereinafter administered under the laws and regulations relating to the national forests; and the provisions of the act approved March 20, 1922 (U. S. C., title 16, secs. 486, 487), as amended, are hereby extended and made applicable to all other lands within the said described area.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, and 11 and 12, township 2 north, range 4 east; sections 1 to 3, inclusive, 6 to 8, inclusive, and 10 to 36, inclusive, township 3 north, range 4 east; sections 1 to 28, inclusive, 34 to 36, inclusive, township 4 north, range 4 east; all of township 5 north, range 4 east; sections 1, 2, 11 to 15, inclusive, 22 to 27, inclusive, and 33 to 36, inclusive, township 6 north, range 5 east; sections 4 to 9, inclusive, 16 to 21, inclusive, 28 to 33, inclusive, township 6 north, range 5 east, all in the State of Washington, Willamette meridian.

With the following committee amendment:

Pame 2, line 8, strike out the figure "5" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "4."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF SCOTLAND COUNTY TO THE MIDDLE JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7092, to provide for the transfer of Scotland County to the middle judicial district of North Carolina.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 98 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. II, title 28, sec. 179), is amended by striking out "Scotland," in the second paragraph thereof and by inserting "Scotland", immediately after the comma following the word "Rowan" in the fourth paragraph.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, at the end of the line, strike out the word "by"; strike out all of lines 5, 6, and 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The State of North Carolina is divided into three districts to be known as the eastern, the middle, and the western districts of North Carolina.

"The eastern district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of January 1926, in the counties of Beaufort, Bertie, Bladen, Brunswick, Camden, Carteret, Chowan, Columbus, Craven, Cumberland, Currituck, Dare, Duplin, Edgecombe, Franklin, Gates, Granville, Greene, Halifax, Harnett, Hertford, Hyde, Johnston, Jones, Lenoir, Martin, Nash, New Hanover, Northampton, Onslow,

Pamlico, Pasquotank, Pender, Perquimans, Pitt, Robeson, Sampson, Tyrrell, Vance, Wake, Washington, Warren, Wayne, and Wilson.

"The terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina shall be held at Raleigh, a 1-week civil term, on the second Mondays in September and March; and at the following places on each succeeding Mondays thereafter: Fayetteville, Elizabeth City, Washington, New Bern, Wilson, Wilmington, and Raleigh, the term at Raleigh being a criminal term only. The clerk of the court for the eastern district shall maintain an office in charge of himself or deputy at Raleigh, at Wilmington, at New Bern, at Elizabeth City, at Washington, at Fayetteville, and at Wilson which shall be kept open at all times for the transaction of the business of the court.

"The middle district shall include the territory embraced on the first day of January 1926, in the counties of Alamance, Alleghany, Ashe, Cabarrus, Caswell, Chatham, Davidson, Davie, Durham, Forsyth, Guilford, Lee, Hoke, Montgomery, Moore, Orange, Person, Randolph, Richmond, Rockingham, Rowan, Scotland, Stanly, Stokes, Surry, Watauga, Wilkes, and Yadkin.

"The terms of the district court for the middle district shall be held at Rockingham on the first Mondays in March and September; at Salisbury on the third Mondays in April and October; at Winston-Salem on the first Mondays in May and November; at Greensboro on the first Mondays in June and December; at Wilkesboro on the third Mondays in May and November; and at Durham on the first Monday in February and the fourth Monday in September: *Provided*, That the cities of Winston-Salem, Rockingham, and Durham shall each provide and furnish at its own expense a suitable and convenient place for holding the district court until Federal buildings containing quarters for the court are erected at such places.

"The western district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of January 1926, in the counties of Alexander, Anson, Avery, Buncombe, Burke, Caldwell, Catawba, Cherokee, Clay, Cleveland, Gaston, Graham, Haywood, Henderson, Iredell, Jackson, Lincoln, Madison, Macon, McDowell, Mecklenburg, Mitchell, Polk, Rutherford, Swain, Transylvania, Union, and Yancey.

"Terms of the district court for the western district shall be held in Charlotte on the first Mondays in April and October, at Shelby on the fourth Monday in September and the third Monday in March, at Statesville on the fourth Mondays in April and October, at Asheville on the second Mondays in May and November, and at Bryson City on the fourth Mondays in May and November: *Provided*, That the cities of Shelby and Bryson City shall each provide and furnish at their own expense suitable and convenient places for holding the court at Shelby and Bryson City. The clerk of the court for the western district shall maintain an office, in charge of himself or a deputy, at Charlotte, at Asheville, at Statesville, at Shelby, and at Bryson City, which shall be kept open at all times for the transaction of the business of the court.

"There shall be a judge appointed for the said middle district in the manner now provided by law who shall receive the salary provided by law for the judges of the eastern and western districts, and a district attorney, marshal, clerk, and other officers in the manner and at the salary now provided by law.

"All causes in the said middle district in equity, bankruptcy, or admiralty, in which orders and decrees have already been made and which are now in process of trial, shall continue and remain subject to the jurisdiction of the judge of that district by whom the same shall have been made and before whom the same shall have been partially tried and determined."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, OGDENSBURG, N. Y.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7514, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.

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

There being no objection, 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 St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y., authorized to be built by the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and its successors and assigns, by an act of Congress approved June 14, 1933, and heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved June 8, 1934, May 28, 1935, and April 11, 1936, are hereby extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from the date of approval of this act.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAINE-NEW HAMPSHIRE INTERSTATE BRIDGE AUTHORITY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7542, granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Maine and New Hampshire for the creation of the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2661, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to an interstate compact for the creation of the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority, executed on the 14th day of April 1937 by the representatives of the States of Maine and New Hampshire, which compact has been deposited in the Department of State of the United States and reads as follows:

"INTERSTATE BRIDGE AUTHORITY FOR THE PORTSMOUTH-KITTERY BRIDGE AND APPROACHES THERETO

"COMPACT BETWEEN THE STATE OF MAINE AND THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

"Whereas the single highway bridge serving as the sole facility for vehicular traffic over and across the Piscataqua River between the State of New Hampshire and the State of Maine is wholly inadequate to care for and accommodate such traffic over said river between the said two States and therefore causes such traffic congestion in and upon the streets and highways of the city of Portsmouth, N. H., and the town of Kittery, Maine, that the lives and property of the citizens of said communities and the travelers on said streets and highways are constantly endangered; and

"Whereas the antiquated and obsolete wooden pile bridge serving as the sole facility for railroad traffic over and across the Piscataqua River between the State of New Hampshire and State of Maine is wholly inadequate to care for and accommodate the railroad traffic between the said two States; and

"Whereas the narrow drawspan of said wooden pile railroad bridge, the sole facility permitting passage of water traffic up and down said river, is wholly inadequate to permit the passage of steamers and vessels of broad beam from the sea inland to serve the large industrial plants now situate on the banks of said river and therefore constitutes an obstacle to further enlargement of these industries and the development of numerous other industrial sites located so that passage through said bridge is absolutely necessary; and

"Whereas the only remedy for the conditions now existing is the construction of a bridge across said river which by coordinating the facilities required by vehicular and railroad traffic will remove the obstacle to water traffic; and

"Whereas the solution of this problem will result in great economy and benefit not only to the States of Maine and New Hampshire but to the Nation and will require the cordial cooperation of the States of New Hampshire and Maine in the encouragement of the investment of capital as well as the formulation and execution of the necessary plans and such result can best be accomplished through the joining of the two States of Maine and New Hampshire by and through a common agency.

"Now, therefore, the said States of New Hampshire and Maine do hereby agree and pledge each to the other as follows:

"ARTICLE I

"Said States agree to and pledge, each to the other, faithful cooperation in the planning, execution, and construction of a suitable vehicular and railroad bridge with suitable highway approaches thereto and drawspan therein; holding the same in high trust for the benefit of the Nation and of the said two States.

"ARTICLE II

"There is hereby created 'The Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority', which shall be a body corporate and politic having the powers and jurisdiction hereinafter enumerated and such other and additional powers as shall be conferred upon it by the legislature of either State, concurred in by the legislature of the other State, or by act or acts of Congress as hereinafter provided.

"ARTICLE III

"The Authority shall consist of six members, three residents of the State of New Hampshire and three residents of the State of Maine. The New Hampshire members to be chosen by the State of New Hampshire and the Maine members to be chosen by the State of Maine in the manner and for the term fixed and determined from time to time by the legislatures of either State, respectively. Any member may be removed or suspended from office as provided by the law of the State from which he shall be appointed.

"ARTICLE IV

"The members of the Authority shall, for the purpose of doing business, constitute a board and may adopt suitable rules and regulations for its management.

"ARTICLE V

"The Authority shall constitute a body both corporate and politic with full power and authority (1) to sue and be sued; (2) to have a seal and alter the same at pleasure; (3) to adopt from time to time and amend bylaws covering its procedure, rules and regulations governing use of the bridge, and any of the other services

made available in connection with said bridge, to publish the same, if such publication is necessary or advisable, and to cause records of its proceedings to be kept; (4) to construct, maintain, reconstruct, and operate an interstate toll bridge over the Piscataqua River between the city of Portsmouth in New Hampshire and the town of Kittery in Maine and for this purpose; (5) to acquire, hold, and dispose of personal property for its purposes; (6) to acquire in the name of the Authority by purchase, condemnation, lease, or otherwise, any real property and rights or easements therein deemed by it necessary or desirable for its purposes, and to use such property; (7) to acquire any such real property by the exercise of the power of condemnation in the manner provided by laws and statutes of the said two States, or otherwise; (8) to charge and collect fees, fares, and tolls for the use of said bridge and other services made available in connection with the said bridge; (9) to make contracts with the United States, the State of New Hampshire, the State of Maine, public corporations, or bodies existing therein, and private corporations and individuals; (10) to accept grants and the cooperation of the United States or any agency thereof in the construction, maintenance, reconstruction, operation, and financing of the bridge and its highway approaches and to do any and all things necessary in order to avail itself of such aid and cooperation; (11) to employ such assistants, agents, and servants as it shall deem necessary or desirable for its purposes; (12) to exercise any of its powers in the public domain of the United States unless the exercise of such powers is not permitted by the laws of the United States; (13) to borrow money, make and issue negotiable notes, bonds, and other evidences of indebtedness or obligations of the Authority and to secure the payment of such obligations, or any part thereof, by pledge of any part of the revenue of the bridge; and (14) to do all other lawful things necessary and incidental to the foregoing powers. All property of the Authority and all property held in the name of either State pursuant to the provisions hereof shall be exempt from levy and sale by virtue of any execution and no execution or other judicial process shall issue against the same. No judgment against the Authority shall be lien upon its property held in the name of either State pursuant to the provisions hereof. No property now or hereafter vested in or held by either State by any county, city, town, village, district, township, or other municipality thereof shall be taken by the Authority without the authority and consent of the State, county, town, village, district, or township, or other municipality in which it is located; nor shall anything impair or invalidate any bond, indebtedness of either State, any county, city, town, village, district, or township, or other municipality, nor impair the provisions of law to regulate the payment into sinking funds of revenue derived from municipal property or dedicate the revenues derived from any municipal property to a specific purpose.

"ARTICLE VI

"The Authority shall have such additional powers and duties as may hereafter be delegated to and imposed upon it from time to time by the action of the legislature of either State concurred in by the legislature of the other. Unless and until otherwise provided, it shall make a biennial report to the legislatures of both States, setting forth in detail the operations and transactions conducted by it pursuant to this agreement and any legislation thereunder. The Authority shall not pledge the credit of either State except by and with the expressed authority of the legislature thereof.

"ARTICLE VII

"Nothing in this agreement or compact is intended or shall be construed to affect the laws now existing which vest jurisdiction over or control of railroads in the public service commission of the State of New Hampshire, or the public utilities commission of the State of Maine, or the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States or any agency of either State or the United States.

"ARTICLE VIII

"The Authority shall elect from its members a chairman, vice chairman, clerk, and treasurer, and may appoint such officers and employees as it may require for the performance of its duties and shall fix and determine by resolution their qualifications and duties.

"ARTICLE IX

"Expenses incurred by the Authority in the interim between execution of this agreement or compact and the date money received from grants, bonds, or revenues shall be available shall be borne by the said two States in equal shares and shall be raised as each State shall determine.

"ARTICLE X

"Unless and until otherwise determined by the action of the legislatures of the two States, no action of the Authority shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which at least two members from each State are present and unless four votes are cast therefor, two from each State. Each State reserves the right hereafter to provide by law for the exercise of a veto power by the governor thereof over any action of any commissioner appointed therefrom.

"ARTICLE XI

"Unless and until otherwise determined by the legislatures of the two States, the Bridge Authority shall not incur any obligations for salaries, office or other administrative expenses, within the provisions of article IX, prior to the making of appropriations adequate to meet the same.

"ARTICLE XII

"The Bridge Authority is hereby authorized to make suitable rules and regulations not inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States or of either State, which shall be binding and effective on all persons and corporations affected thereby.

"ARTICLE XIII

"The two States shall provide penalties for violations of any order, rule, or regulation of the Bridge Authority, and for the manner of enforcing same.

"ARTICLE XIV

"Definitions: 'Transportation facility' shall include railroads, steam or electric, motor truck or other street or highway vehicles, bridges, highways, and every kind of transportation facility now in use or hereafter designed for use for the transportation or carriage of persons or property. 'Facility' shall include all works, buildings, structures, stations, appliances, and appurtenances necessary and convenient for the proper construction, equipment, maintenance and operation of such facility or facilities or any one or more of them. 'Real property' shall include land under water, as well as uplands, and all property either now commonly or legally defined as real property or which may hereafter be so defined. 'Personal property' shall include choses in action and all other property now commonly or legally defined as personal property or which may hereafter be so defined. 'To lease' shall include to rent or to hire. 'Rule or regulation' shall include charges, rates, rentals, or tolls fixed or established by the Bridge Authority. Wherever action by the legislature of either State is herein referred to, it shall mean an act of the legislature duly adopted in accordance with the provisions of the constitution of the State. Plural or singular. The singular wherever used herein shall include the plural. Consent, approval, or recommendation of municipality, how given. Wherever herein the consent, approval, or recommendation of a 'municipality' is required, the word 'municipality' shall be taken to include any city, town, or village district. Such consent, approval or recommendation whenever required in the case of the city of Portsmouth shall be deemed to have been given whenever the city council of the city of Portsmouth or any body hereafter succeeding to its duties shall by majority vote pass a resolution expressing such consent, approval, or recommendation; and in the case of the town deemed to have been given whenever at a regular town meeting, or special meeting called for that purpose shall by majority of votes of persons present and voting therefor; and in all other cases whenever the body authorized to grant consent to the use of the streets or highways of such municipality shall by a majority vote pass such a resolution.

"In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands and seals under chapter 18 of the Private and Special Laws of 1937 of the State of Maine and chapter 4 of the Laws of the Special Session of 1936 of the State of New Hampshire this 14th day of April 1937.

"In the presence of:

"Helen D. Ayers [Seal] PAUL C. THURSTON,
"Lucius D. Barrows [Seal] HOLLIS B. COLE,
"Helen D. Ayers [Seal] WILLIAM H. HINMAN,
"Commissioners for Maine.
"Sanford L. Fogg [Seal] FRANZ U. BURKETT,
"Attorney General of Maine.
"Daniel H. Dickinson [Seal] FREDERIC E. EVERETT,
"Daniel H. Dickinson [Seal] JAMES J. POWERS,
"Daniel H. Dickinson [Seal] FRANK E. BROOKS,
"Commissioners for New Hampshire.
"Harry E. Trapp [Seal] THOMAS P. CHENEY,
"Attorney General of New Hampshire."

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of the first section of 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 and a House bill (H. R. 7542) were laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE PISCATAQUA RIVER, PORTSMOUTH, N. H.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7543, authorizing the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Piscataqua River at or near Portsmouth, State of New Hampshire.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2662, be substituted for the House bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority (hereinafter referred to as the authority) is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Piscataqua River, from a point at or near Portsmouth, State of New Hampshire, to a point at or near Kittery, State of Maine, suitable to the interests of navigation, 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 the authority 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, maintenance, and operation 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 pulbic purposes in such State.

SEC. 3: The authority is 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. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same 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 cost of such 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 45 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization and for the maintenance of said bridge and the approaches thereto 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 cost of the bridge and its approaches; the 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. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a House bill (H. R. 7543) were laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND IN BRECKINRIDGE COUNTY, KY., TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4705, to authorize the transfer of a certain piece of land in Breckinridge County, Ky., to the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Kentucky for State road purposes, without expense to the United States, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain piece of land in Breckinridge County, Ky., described as follows:

Beginning at a stone, in the southeast corner of the United States reservation at Lock and Dam No. 45, Ohio River, which point is north 23°8′ W. 37 feet from a point formerly marked by a stone in Minor's line (now line between L. D. Addison heirs and Burks heirs) at south edge of right-of-way of old road; thence running along the north side of the Stephensport-Cloverport Road south 82°37′ W. 255.1 feet to a stone; thence north 89°42′ W. 54.85 feet to a stake at the intersection of United States property line and the northern limits of right-of-way of proposed Stephensport-Cloverport highway; thence running 30 feet from and parallel with the center line of proposed right-of-way on 1°15′ curve 313.96 feet to a stake in the property line between the United States reservation and Pearl Burks; thence running with the said property line south 11°18′ W. 13.56 feet to a stone, the point of beginning, containing approximately 0.08 acre.

Such conveyance shall contain the express condition that if the Commonwealth of Kentucky shall at any time cease to use said land for road or highway purposes, or shall alienate or attempt to alienate such land, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPORTATION OF ARTICLES FOR EXHIBITION AT THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, 1939

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 288, to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the New York World's Fair, 1939, New York City, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the international exposition to be held at New York City, N. Y., beginning in April 1939 by the New York World's Fair 1939, Inc., or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign buildings or exhibits at the said exposition, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during and/or within 3 months after the close of the said exposition, to sell within the area of the exposition any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles, which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling, or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles, which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond, and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said exposition under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the New York World's Fair 1939, Inc., shall be deemed, for customs purposes only to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, after line 15, insert: "and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officer and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the New York World's Fair 1939, Inc., to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIOLATIONS OF NARCOTIC LAWS

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill H. R. 6283, No. 337 on the Consent Calendar. I was confused with another bill similar to this and objected to its consideration in the belief it was the other bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of H. R. 6283 in order that the bill may be presented to the House again for consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a person who, after having been convicted of selling, importing, or exporting, or conspiring to sell, import, or export, opium, coca leaves, cocaine, or any salt, derivative, or preparation of opium, coca leaves, or cocaine, again sells, imports, or exports, or conspires to sell, import, or export, any of the said narcotic drugs, in violation of the laws of the United States, shall, upon conviction of such second offense, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned in a Federal penitentiary for not more than 10 years, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 2. A person who, after having been two times convicted of selling, importing, or exporting, or conspiring to sell, import, or export, opium, coca leaves, cocaine, or any salt, derivative, or preparation of opium, coca leaves, or cocaine, again sells, imports, or exports, or conspires to sell, import, or export, any of the said narcotic drugs, in violation of the laws of the United States, shall, upon conviction of such third or subsequent offense, be fined not

more than $10,000 or imprisoned in a Federal penitentiary for not more than 20 years, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 3. Whenever it shall appear, after conviction and before or after sentence, that a person convicted of unlawfully selling, importing, or exporting, or conspiring unlawfully to sell, import, or export, any of the narcotic drugs enumerated in this act, has previously been convicted of unlawfully selling, importing, or exporting, or conspiring unlawfully to sell, import, or export, any of said narcotic drugs, in violation of the laws of the United States, it shall be the duty of the United States district attorney for the district in which such subsequent conviction was had to file an information alleging that the defendant has previously been so convicted, and further alleging the number of such previous convictions. The court in which the defendant was convicted shall cause the said defendant, whether confined in prison or otherwise, to appear before it and shall apprise him of the allegations of the information and of his right to a trial by jury as to the truth thereof. The court shall require the defendant to state definitely whether he is the person who it is alleged has previously been convicted. If the defendant claims he is not such person, or if he refuses to answer or remains silent, his plea, or, if none, the statement that no plea was made, shall be made a matter of record, and a jury shall be empaneled to determine whether the defendant is the person alleged in the information to have previously been convicted and the number of such previous convictions. If after a trial on the sole issue of the truth of such allegations the jury determines that the defendant is in fact the person previously convicted as charged in the information, or if he acknowledges in open court, after being duly cautioned as to his rights, that he is such person, he shall be punished as prescribed in sections 1 or 2 of this act, as the case may be, and the previous sentence of this court, if any, shall be vacated, and there shall be deducted from the new sentence the amount of time actually served under the sentence so vacated.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "court", insert "whenever the fact of such previous conviction is established in the manner prescribed in section 3 of this act."

Page 2, line 11, strike out "or subsequent" and after the word "offense", insert "or any offense subsequent thereto."

Page 2, line 14, after the word "court", insert "whenever the fact of such previous convictions is established in the manner prescribed in section 3 of this act."

Page 3, line 9, strike out "require" and insert "inquire"; and after the word "defendant" strike out the remainder of the line.

Page 3, line 10, strike out "it is alleged."

Page 3, line 11, after the word "convicted", strike out the remainder of line 11, all of lines 12 and 13 and 14 and insert "if the defendant states he is not such person or if he refuses to answer or remains silent, a plea of not guilty shall be entered by the court."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF TWO DORMITORIES BELONGING TO THE CHICKASAW NATION OR TRIBE OF INDIANS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill (H. R. 7409) providing for the sale of the two dormitory properties belonging to the Chickasaw Nation or Tribe of Indians, in the vicinity of the Murray State School of Agriculture at Tishomingo, Okla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar bill, S. 2587, for the House bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior shall take possession of, and appraise and sell, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by him, the two dormitories, together with the lands upon which they are located and the furniture, therein, belonging to the Chickasaw Nation or Tribe of Indians, in the vicinity of the Murray State School of Agriculture at Tishomingo, Okla., which lands were acquired and which dormitories were erected and equipped, under the acts of Congress of March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. L. 983), and May 25, 1918 (40 Stat. L. 584), and he shall deposit the proceeds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Chickasaw Nation, less expenses incident to the appraisement and sale of such properties, including reasonable compensation to special attorneys for services rendered in connection with such sale acting under the direction of the Governor of the Chickasaw Nation, such compensation to be fixed and paid by the Secretary of the Interior; and immediately after such sale, patents conveying such properties shall be made and delivered in the same manner as now provided by law for the conveyance of other tribal properties: *Provided*, That preference right shall be given the State of Oklahoma to purchase said dormitory properties at a price to be agreed upon between the Secretary of the Interior and the board of regents of the Murray State School of Agriculture, in accordance with the senate concurrent resolution passed by the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma.

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.

ERECTION OF THE "SHENANDOAH" MEMORIAL IN OR NEAR AVA, OHIO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7564, to permit the erection of the *Shenandoah* Memorial in or near Ava, Ohio.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the cost of this memorial?

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, the bill authorizing the memorial has already been passed. This is merely an amendment to the original bill determining the exact spot where the memorial is to be located.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section of the act entitled "An act authorizing the erection of a memorial to those who met their death in the wreck of the dirigible *Shenandoah*", approved May 22, 1936, is hereby amended to read as follows: "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to erect in or near Ava, Ohio, a suitable tablet or marker to commemorate the heroic services rendered by Commander Landsdowne and other members of the crew who died when the Navy dirigible *Shenandoah* was destroyed."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE NAVY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4676, to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian employees of the Navy for the value of personal effects destroyed in a fire at the Naval Air Station, Hampton Roads, Va., May 15, 1936.

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 $1,101.20, or such portion as may be necessary, to pay claims of civilian employees of the United States Navy for the value of personal effects destroyed as the result of a fire at the Naval Air Station, Hampton Roads, Va., May 15, 1936: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall determine the amount to be paid hereunder to each claimant: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent 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 claims. 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 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claims, 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 engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSIGNMENT OF OFFICERS OF THE NAVY FOR DUTY UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7216, to provide for the assignment of officers of the Navy for duty under the Department of Commerce and appointment to positions therein.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

OSAGE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 670, authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COAST GUARD STATION, FORT MYERS, FLA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6048, to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station in the vicinity of Fort Myers, Fla.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to establish a Coast Guard station in the vicinity of Fort Myers, Fla., at such point as the Commandant of the Coast Guard may recommend.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAST GUARD STATION, DAUPHIN ISLAND, ALA.,

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6976, to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Alabama at or near Dauphin Island, Ala.

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 establish a Coast Guard station on the coast of Alabama, at or near Dauphin Island, Ala.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAST GUARD OFFICERS ON THE RETIRED LIST

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7611, to adjust the pay of certain Coast Guard officers on the retired list who were retired because of physical disability originating in line of duty in time of war.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 1, as amended, of the act of June 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 793, ch. 563), any officer of the Coast Guard who has been retired since September 3, 1921, but prior to March 4, 1925, by reason of physical disability which originated in line of duty at any time between April 6, 1917, and March 3, 1921, inclusive, while holding higher temporary rank in the Coast Guard, shall receive from the date of the approval of this act the pay of the rank he holds on the retired list.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEN. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON BEADLE

The Clerk called the next business, S. Con. Res. 10, accepting the statue of Gen. William Henry Harrison Beadle, to be placed in Statuary Hall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of Gen. William Henry Harrison Beadle, presented by the State of South Dakota, to be placed in Statuary Hall, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of the Congress be tendered said State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his valor as a soldier and his distinguished service as an educator; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of South Dakota.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANT LANDS IN OREGON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7618, relating to the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands situated in the State of Oregon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provisions in the acts of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218), and February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1179), as amended, such portions of the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands as are or may hereafter come under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, which have heretofore or may hereafter be classified as timberlands, and power-site lands valuable for timber, shall be managed, except as provided in section 3 hereof, for permanent forest production, and the timber thereon shall be sold, cut, and removed in conformity with the principle of sustained yield for the purpose of providing a permanent source of timber supply, protecting watersheds, regulating stream flow, and contributing to the economic stability of local communities and industries, and providing recreational facilities: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to interfere with the use and development of power sites as may be authorized by law.

The annual productive capacity for such lands shall be determined and declared as promptly as possible after the passage of this act, but until such determination and declaration are made the average annual cut therefrom shall not exceed one-half billion feet board measure: *Provided*, That timber from said lands in an amount not less than one-half billion feet board measure, or not less than the annual sustained yield capacity when the same has been determined and declared, shall be sold annually, or so much thereof as can be sold at reasonable prices on a normal market.

If the Secretary of the Interior determines that such action will facilitate sustained-yield management, he may subdivide such revested lands into sustained-yield forest units, the boundary lines of which shall be so established that a forest unit will provide, insofar as practicable, a permanent source of raw materials for the support of dependent communities and local industries of the region; but until such subdivision is made the land shall be treated as a single unit in applying the principle of sustained yield: *Provided*, That before the boundary lines of such forest units are established, the Department, after published notice thereof, shall hold a hearing thereon in the vicinity of such lands open to the attendance of State and local officers, representatives of dependent industries, residents, and other persons interested in the use of such lands. Due consideration shall be given to established lumbering operations in subdividing such lands when necessary to protect the economic stability of dependent communities. Timber sales from a forest unit shall be limited to the productive capacity of such unit and the Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, to reject any bids which may interfere with the sustained-yield management plan of any unit.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to make cooperative agreements with other Federal or State forest administrative agencies or with private forest owners or operators for the coordinated administration, with respect to time, rate, method of cutting, and sustained yield, of forest units comprising parts of revested or reconveyed lands, together with lands in private ownership or under the administration of other public agencies, when by such agreements he may be aided in accomplishing the purposes hereinbefore mentioned.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to classify, either on application or otherwise, and restore to homestead entry, or purchase under the provisions of section 14 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), any of such revested or reconveyed land which, in his judgment, is more suitable for agricultural use than for afforestation, reforestation, stream-flow protection, recreation, or other public purposes.

Any of said lands heretofore classified as agricultural may be reclassified as timberlands, if found, upon examination, to be more suitable for the production of trees than agricultural use, such reclassified timberlands to be managed for permanent forest production as herein provided.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to lease for grazing any of said revested or reconveyed lands which may be so used without interfering with the production of timber or other purposes of this act as stated in section 1: *Provided*, That all the moneys received on account of grazing leases shall be covered either into the "Oregon & California land-grant fund" or the "Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund" in the Treasury as the location of the leased lands shall determine, and be subject to distribution as other moneys in such funds: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is also authorized to formulate rules and regulations for the use, protection, improvement, and rehabilitation of such grazing lands.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect. The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized, in formulating forest-practice rules and regulations, to consult with the Oregon State Board of Forestry, representatives of timber owners and operators on or contiguous to said revested and reconveyed lands, and other persons or agencies interested in the use of such lands.

In formulating regulations for the protection of such timberlands against fire, the Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, to consult and advise with Federal, State, and county agencies engaged in forest-fire-protection work, and to make agreements with such agencies for the cooperative administration of fire regulations therein: *Provided*, That rules and regulations for the protection of the revested lands from fire shall conform with the requirements and practices of the State of Oregon insofar as the same are consistent with the interests of the United States.

TITLE II

That on and after March 1, 1938, all moneys deposited in the Treasury of the United States in the special fund designated the "Oregon & California land-grant fund" shall be distributed annually as follows:

(a) Fifty percent to the counties in which the lands revested under the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218), are situated, to be payable on or after June 30, 1938, and each year thereafter to each of said counties in the proportion that the total assessed value of the Oregon & California grant lands in each of said counties for the year 1915 bears to the total assessed value of all of said lands in the State of Oregon for said year, such moneys to be used as other county funds.

(b) Twenty-five percent to said counties as money in lieu of taxes accrued or which shall accrue to them prior to March 1, 1938, under the provisions of the act of July 13, 1926 (44 Stat. 915), and which taxes are unpaid on said date, such moneys to be paid to said counties severally by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, upon certification by the Secretary of the Interior, until such tax indebtedness as shall have accrued prior to March 1, 1938, is extinguished.

From and after payment of the above accrued taxes said 25 percent shall be accredited annually to the general fund in the Treasury of the United States until all reimbursable charges against the Oregon & California land-grant fund owing to the general fund in the Treasury have been paid: *Provided*, That if for any year after the extinguishment of the tax indebtedness accruing to the counties prior to March 1, 1938, under the provisions of Forty-fourth Statutes, page 915, the total amount payable under subsection (a) of this title is less than 78 percent of the aggregate amount of tax claims which accrued to said counties under said act for the year 1934, there shall be additionally payable for such year such portion of said 25 percent (but not in excess of three-fifths of said 25 percent), as may be necessary to make up the deficiency. When the general fund in the Treasury has been fully reimbursed for the expenditures which were made charges against the Oregon & California land-grant fund said 25 percent shall be paid annually, on or after June 30, to the several counties in the manner provided in subsection (a) hereof.

(c) Twenty-five percent to be available for the administration of this act, in such annual amounts as the Congress shall from time to time determine. Any part of such percent not used for administrative purposes shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That moneys covered into the Treasury in such manner shall be used to satisfy the reimbursable charges against the Oregon & California land-grant fund mentioned in subsection (b) so long as any such charges shall exist.

All acts or parts of acts in conflict with this act are hereby repealed to the extent necessary to give full force and effect to this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the House has just passed a bill entitled "A bill relating to the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay wagon road grant lands situated in the State of Oregon."

Of course, the title means very little to a Member unless he has read the bill and report very carefully. A few weeks ago when the bill providing for the purchase of additional land, known as the Sugar Pine Forests, which adjoins the Yosemite National Park, was pending, I objected to an amendment which would have provided that the Government would have been required to pay taxes to the counties where the land is located. I told the House at the time that this was a most unusual procedure and that we should not embark upon the general policy of the Government paying taxes to States and subdivisions of States on Government-owned land. I am pleased to say that the House defeated that amendment, and the bill as it became a law did not contain that provision.

During the debate on that bill I called attention to the fact that there was one case where the Government was paying nearly $300,000 a year to counties in Oregon in connection with some lands which were originally granted to the Oregon & California R. R. Co. and the Coos Bay Wagon Road Co., title to the lands being revested to the United States in 1916 and 1919 because the grantees violated the covenants contained in the granting acts. My statement might not have been entirely correct at the time when I said it was costing the Government that amount in taxes because some will claim that this money in part was paid out of the Federal Treasury as cost of administration. The real fact is that the taxes have been taken out of the receipts from the sale of lumber and it matters not whether or not the Government's share went directly for taxes or administration, because the receipts did not equal the necessary costs of administration and taxes. Nevertheless, it has been costing the Government that amount.

The bill that the House just passed corrects this situation, and further than that, it provides that $8,500,000 which was advanced to the Oregon and California land-grant fund, and which never has been repaid to the Treasury, will be repaid under this legislation, and still further, the cost of administration, taxes, and so forth, is to come out of the receipts from the sale of timber and not out of the Treasury of the United States.

If the Senate passes this bill and it is signed by the President in its present form, the taxpayers are going to be saved not only the amount that is being taken annually out of the Treasury at the present time, but further than that, the Treasury will be reimbursed for the $8,500,000 which was advanced under the terms of the act of June 9, 1916.

This is a meritorious piece of legislation and I am pleased to see the House take favorable action thereon.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DEROUEN], chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, and his associates on the committee, for bringing in this bill. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] presented the report and it was so complete and so easily understood that not one single objection was advanced. Mr. DEMPSEY deserves the thanks of the taxpayers for his work in this respect. I hope the Senate will pass the bill without delay.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1284, to change the name of the Chemical Warfare Service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chemical Warfare Service, created by the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 768), shall hereafter be known as the Chemical Service.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "service" and insert the word "corps."

The committee 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 was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2147, to amend provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will some member of the committee explain this bill? If not, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SAN CARLOS APACHE INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1231, authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896, and reopening such lands to mineral entry.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF CANCELED CHECK TO THE GOVERNOR OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5809, authorizing the transfer of canceled check to the Governor of Alaska.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A ONE-HOUSE LEGISLATURE IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6651, to provide for a referendum in the Territory of Alaska as to the establishment of a one-house legislature, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That at the general election held in the Territory of Alaska, in the year 1938, for the election of a Delegate to Congress from Alaska, members of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, and such other officials of the Territory as may be by law then elective, each of the qualified electors of the Territory shall be afforded an opportunity to vote upon the question as to whether a one-house legislature shall be provided for the Territory of Alaska, such vote to be taken by furnishing to each of such electors a ballot, separate and apart from the ballot which embraces the names of the candidates for office to be voted upon at said election, having printed thereon the following:

"SPECIAL REFERENDUM BALLOT

"(Place an (X) in square before your preference)

"(Vote for one only)

"☐ I favor a one-house legislature for Alaska.

"☐ I do not favor a one-house legislature for Alaska."

SEC. 2. Such ballots shall be prepared, printed, numbered, and distributed, so far as may be practicable, in the same form and manner as the ballots containing the names of candidates for office to be voted upon at said election; and the special referendum ballots so cast at said election shall be counted, tallied, canvassed, and returns thereon made in substantially the same manner as in the case of ballots containing the names of candidates.

SEC. 3. The expense of preparing, printing, distributing, counting, tallying, and canvassing such special referendum ballots, and all other additional expenses incurred in said election by reason thereof, shall be paid in the same manner as the other costs and expenses of said election.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK IN FLORIDA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2014, to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Everglades National Park in the State of Florida, and for other purposes", approved May 30, 1934.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ADMISSION OF CITIZENSHIP OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. LANZETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 286, the bill (H. R. 6785) for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to February 5, 1917.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall have no objection if the gentleman will agree to an amendment which I shall propose.

Mr. LANZETTA. I shall agree to the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CARTER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN NATIONAL PARK, KY.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4070, to change the designations of the Abraham Lincoln National Park, in the State of Kentucky, and the Fort McHenry National Park, in the State of Maryland.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN STATE-OWNED LAND IN UTAH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4186, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept from the State of Utah title to a certain State-owned section of land and to patent other land to the State in lieu thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF HOMESTEAD LAWS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5592, to amend an act entitled "An act extending the homestead laws and providing for right-of-way for railroads in the District of Alaska, and for other purposes", approved May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. 409, 414).

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL MONUMENT AT CAMP MERRITT, N. J.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 71, to provide for the establishment of a national monument on the site of Camp Merritt, N. J.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK, KY.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5594, to make available for national-park purposes certain lands within the area of the proposed Mammoth Cave National Park, Ky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all lands purchased from funds heretofore allocated and made available by Executive order, or otherwise, or which hereafter may be allocated and made available for the acquisition of lands for conservation or forestation purposes within the maximum boundaries of the Mammoth Cave National Park as authorized by the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635), be, and the same are hereby, made a part of the said park as fully as if originally acquired for that purpose and the proviso at the end of section 1 of said act of May 25, 1926, shall not be construed so as to prohibit the acquisition of lands in said area under funds made available as aforesaid.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to exclude the Great Onyx Cave and the Crystal Cave, or either of them, from the maximum boundaries of the said park, and the area required for general development of the said park by section 1 of the act of May 14, 1934 (48 Stat. 775), is hereby modified accordingly.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROGUE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST, OREG.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 199, to add certain lands to the Rogue River National Forest in the State of Oregon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill (S. 1762) may be considered in lieu of the House bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of forest management, watershed protection, and recreational use the north half northwest quarter section 3, the south half northwest quarter section 23, and the west half northeast quarter northeast quarter and the east half northwest quarter northeast quarter section 27, township 37 south, range 3 east, Willamette meridian, of revested Oregon & California land-grant lands are hereby added to and made a part of the Rogue River National Forest in the State of Oregon, subject to all laws and regulations governing national forests: *Provided*, That the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture shall jointly appraise and agree on the value of said Oregon & California land-grant lands and shall certify the same to the Secretary of the Treasury. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized, upon notice of the appraisal by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, to transfer an equal amount of money from the national-forest receipts and credit the same to the Oregon & California land-grant funds, subject to all laws and regulations governing the disposal of money received from the Oregon & California land-grant lands.

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.

A similar House bill (H. R. 199) was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO SETTLERS OF HOMESTEAD LANDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2888, granting a leave of absence to settlers of homestead lands during the year 1937.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me we should stop this somewhere. We have been extending this privilege from year to year throughout the depression. I do not think it is fair to those who

want to take up legitimate claims to continue this privilege year after year without some showing that the economic condition is such that it is necessitated, and for this reason I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. MOTT. I object, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I object, Mr. Speaker.

FORT DONELSON NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5593) to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Fort Donelson National Military Park in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described tracts or parcels of land, lying and being within the Seventh Civil District of Stewart County, Tenn., be, and are hereby, transferred from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior as additions to the Fort Donelson National Military Park, and shall hereafter be subject to all laws and rules and regulations applicable to said park:

Tract no. 1, a right-of-way, 50 feet wide, lying 25 feet on each side of a center line, beginning at a point in the southerly boundary line of lock D reservation, 734.8 feet from the southwest corner of this reservation; thence south 31°5′ W. 77.1 feet; thence south 86°21′ W. 479.9 feet; thence south 63°53′ W. 262.3 feet; thence south 39°36′ W. 186.7 feet; thence south 0°40′ E. 194 feet; thence south 30°58′ E. 314.5 feet; thence south 28°15′ E. 85 feet; thence south 28°37′ E. 250.5 feet; thence south 4°6′ E. 261.7 feet; thence south 36°27′ E. 282.3 feet; thence south 23°45′ E. 178.3 feet, to center line of county road; reserving, however, to the War Department the right to the continued use of the road over this tract as a means of access to lock D.

Tract no. 2, beginning at a point in the southern boundary line of lock D reservation, 753.5 feet from the southwest corner of this reservation; thence north 74°28′ E. 191.98 feet; thence south 85°12′ E. 52.9 feet; thence south 51°36′ E. 32.9 feet; thence south 9°33′ E. 117.02 feet; thence south 31°3′ W. 69.82 feet; thence north 58°57′ W. 288.08 feet to beginning.

Tract no. 3, beginning at a point in the southern boundary line of lock D reservation, 590 feet from the southwest corner of this reservation, this point being marked by an iron fence post; thence north 58°57′ W. 590 feet along the southern boundary line of lock D reservation; thence north 31°3′ E. 488 feet along the western boundary line of lock D reservation to low-water mark on bank of Cumberland River; thence along low-water line of Cumberland River in a southeasterly direction 335 feet; thence south 34°5′ W. 123 feet to an iron pin; thence south 55°55′ E. 307.5 feet to an iron pin; thence south 40°5′ west 310.5 feet to beginning.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept donations of land, interests in land or buildings, structures, and other property within a distance of 1 mile from the boundaries of said Fort Donelson National Military Park, as hereby extended, and donations of funds for the purchase or maintenance thereof, the title and evidence of title to lands acquired to be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That he may acquire on behalf of the United States out of any donated funds, by purchase at prices deemed by him reasonable, or by condemnation under the provisions of the act of August 1, 1888, such tracts of land within a distance of but 1 mile from the boundaries of the said national military park as may be necessary for the completion thereof. Upon the acquisition of such land, the same shall become a part of the Fort Donelson National Military Park and shall be subject to the laws and rules and regulations applicable to said park.

SEC. 3. The administration, protection, and development of the lands hereby authorized to be added to the Fort Donelson National Military 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 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ANGELES NATIONAL FOREST

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5685) to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating upon lands within the exterior boundaries of the Angeles National Forest, in the State of California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission established by section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (U. S. C., title 16, sec. 513), is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase any lands within the boundaries of the Angeles National Forest in the State of California which, in his judgment, should become the property of the United States in order that they may be so managed with other lands of the United States as to minimize soil erosion and flood damage, and to pay for said lands from the entire receipts from the sale of natural resources or occupancy of publicly owned lands within the said national forest, which receipts are hereby authorized to be appropriated for that purpose until said lands have been acquired.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "resources", insert "other than mineral."

The committee amendment was agreed to; and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

SAN JUAN NATIONAL MONUMENT, P. R.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7487) to establish the San Juan National Monument, P. R., and for other purposes.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

ASSIGNMENT OF OFFICERS OF THE LINE, MARINE CORPS, TO STAFF DUTY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2521) to authorize the assignment of officers of the line of the Marine Corps to staff duty only as assistant quartermasters and assistant paymasters, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That officers of the line of the Marine Corps of the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel may, upon application, and with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, be assigned to staff duty only as assistant quartermasters and assistant paymasters: *Provided*, That when so assigned they shall retain the lineal position and precedence which they now hold or may later attain and shall be promoted, retired, and discharged in like manner and with the same relative conditions in all respects as are now or may hereafter be provided for officers of the line of the Marine Corps, except as herein otherwise provided: *Provided further*, That the recommendation of selection boards in the cases of officers assigned to staff duty only shall be based upon their comparative fitness to perform the duties prescribed for them: *Provided further*, That officers of the grades of major and lieutenant colonel assigned to staff duty only in accordance with this act shall, on promotion up to and including the grade of colonel, be carried as additional numbers in grade: *And provided further*, That the number of officers assigned to staff duty only in accordance with this act in any 1 year shall be in accordance with the requirements of the service as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "to", strike out "staff duty only as assistant quartermasters and assistant paymasters" and insert "assistant quartermaster and assistant paymaster duty only."

Page 2, line 3, after the word "for", insert the word "other."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "staff duty only" and insert "such duty."

Page 2, line 10, strike out the word "staff" and insert "assistant quartermaster and assistant paymaster."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "assigned to staff duty only" and insert "so assigned."

The committee amendments were 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 the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to authorize the assignment of officers of the line of the Marine Corps to assistant quartermaster and assistant paymaster duty only, and for other purposes."

AMENDING PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE ACT OF 1934

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7561) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes", approved March 24, 1934.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Contrary to what the bill might appear to be, I understand that it is a further limitation on immigration

and I wish the gentleman from Hawaii would explain briefly what the bill is about.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. When the Philippine Independence Act was passed it permitted, under certain conditions, the immigration of Philippine labor into the Territory of Hawaii. This repeals that condition and makes it impossible for any further immigration of that sort. I may say to the gentleman that the provision of the Independence Act was never invoked, and this repeal makes it no longer possible to invoke it in the future.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 8 (a) (1) of said act which reads as follows: "This paragraph shall not apply to a person coming or seeking to come to the Territory of Hawaii who does not apply for and secure an immigration or passport visa, but such immigration shall be determined by the Department of the Interior on the basis of the needs of industries in the Territory of Hawaii", is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

AMENDING LIQUOR ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1936

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7508) to amend the Liquor Enforcement Act of 1936.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This bill apparently indicates that it is of minor importance, but as I read the bill I am very confident that from the standpoint of enforcement the Government of the United States is going back to the old prohibition days, provided the law is actually enforced. If this bill becomes a law, and it is enforced, there is absolutely no doubt but that it is going to require an army of enforcement agents to carry out its purposes. This bill indicates by its wording it would merely require the Federal Government to protect States which permit the manufacture of only beer and wine, regardless of the alcoholic content, from the importation of distilled spirits. The bill in effect would require the Government to protect all States, whether wet or dry, against the importation of distilled spirits in violation of their laws.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the bill is in the exact language of the second section of the twenty-first amendment. If the Congress meant what it said, specifically and impliedly, when it submitted the twenty-first amendment, then the importation or transportation of intoxicating liquors into States for sale or use in violation of their laws should not only be prohibited, but some penalty should be provided for the violation of that provision of the twenty-first amendment.

The creation of a new enforcement agency is not contemplated by this bill. This act, if passed, would be exactly like many other Federal statutes, subject to enforcement by the Department of Justice, just as many other Federal statutes are enforced. There is no ground for the gentleman's apprehension that any great body of enforcement officials will be created. There is no purpose that any such body should be created. This is merely an act of good conscience. This is merely saying that the thing prohibited by the second section of the twenty-first amendment shall be made criminal and a means provided for enforcement of that provision of the Constitution by providing that its violation shall be punished as for a misdemeanor. I cannot conceive of any reason why any Member should object to such a provision. Without it we have the constitutional prohibition against the importation of intoxicating liquors into States for use or sale in violation of their laws without any penalty for its violation.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. This bill carries out the promises that the gentleman from Missouri and all others made——

Mr. COCHRAN. I did not yield for a speech. What does the bill do, in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. MICHENER. I am telling the gentleman. This carries out the promise that the gentleman from Missouri, and all others who favored resubmission of the eighteenth amendment, made in Congress, made on the floor, at the time of the submission. I was one of those who voted to resubmit the eighteenth amendment. I did it, as the gentleman did, on the promise and with the understanding that dry States, States desiring to be dry, would be protected against importation from wet States. Every Member of Congress understood that. That was a specific promise.

Mr. COCHRAN. Why not amend the bill, then, to include only the dry States?

Mr. MICHENER. The Committee on the Judiciary, regardless of how they feel today on the wet and dry question, have reported this bill unanimously for the purpose of carrying out the terms of the twenty-first amendment to the Constitution, and for the express purpose of keeping the word of those who believed in resubmitting the eighteenth amendment. I hope the gentleman, because of lack of information, will not object to this bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman that I do not have any lack of information. I made an inquiry about this bill. I am just looking at it from the standpoint of common sense. We do not want another army of prohibition agents. If you want to protect the dry States, why not amend your bill so as to limit it to the dry States? Why do you say any State?

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. COCHRAN. Not right now, as I have asked the gentleman from Michigan a question. Why do you say any State?

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman will read the bill——

Mr. COCHRAN. I have the bill in front of me. I asked the gentleman the question, Why do you say any State, when you want to protect only the dry States? As far as protecting the dry States is concerned, I am with the gentleman. Where is there any report from the Attorney General? Where is there any report from the Federal Alcohol Administration? Where is there any report from the Treasury Department on this bill?

Mr. MICHENER. Where is there any report from a country constable? You might go on down the line.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

Mr. MICHENER. If you are going to require reports from everybody, why not go all the way?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I can see nothing that can be accomplished by the bill going over without prejudice. If the gentleman is opposed to the bill, let him object. I object.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the bill today. They can call it up on the next Consent Calendar date, and in the meantime perhaps I can get a report.

PENSION BENEFITS TO PEACETIME VETERANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7531, to afford protection of pension benefits to peacetime veterans placed on the pension rolls after March 19, 1933, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say I am not going to object, but I am merely asking for information. Why is it necessary for the Congress of the United States to repeal an Executive order? Under the authority which we gave to the President to issue Executive orders, at the time the economy bill was enacted, one of which this seeks to abrogate or repeal, did we not give him authority to countermand his own Executive orders? Is there not anybody on the majority side who can explain why it takes an act of Congress to repeal an Execu-

tive order, and whether this is the usual thing or whether this is the exception to the general rule?

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. I do not claim to have any special knowledge about the matter, but my recollection is that when the Economy Act was passed we provided that any regulations or Executive orders that were in effect 2 years after date would become law. That is my impression. Some member of the committee may have a different recollection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think, as a matter of precedent, we should decide whether it is necessary for the Congress to repeal Executive orders, and whether we retain to ourselves authority to amend Executive orders in the same authorization.

Is not somebody here from the Committee on Pensions who can explain why this bill is necessary, and why another Executive order repealing Executive Order 6098 is not all that is required?

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. Does not the gentleman recall that that provision was in the act? I am not positive, but that is my recollection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not recall whether it was in the act or not. That might be the reason for it, but surely somebody should know whether it is the reason for it or not. Apparently I am not going to get the information, but I have no objection to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph X of Executive Order No. 6098, dated March 31, 1933 (Veterans' Regulation No. 10 (38 U. S. C., ch. 12, appendix)), as amended by paragraph 1, Executive Order No. 6568, dated January 19, 1934 (Veterans' Regulation No. 10 (c). is hereby canceled as of the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN WAR PENSIONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5787, granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the first day of the next month after the approval of this act, the rate of pension to surviving soldiers of the various Indian wars and campaigns who are now on the pension rolls or who may hereafter be placed thereon under the provisions of the acts of July 27, 1892; June 27, 1902, and May 30, 1908, as amended by the act of February 1, 1913; or under the act of March 4, 1917, or the act of March 3, 1927, shall be $65 per month: *Provided*, That any such survivor who is now or hereafter may become, on account of age or physical or mental disability, helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, shall be paid the rate of $72 per month: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to reduce any pension under any law, public or private, and that hereafter pensions granted under this act or acts referred to in this section shall commence from the date of filing of application therefor in the Veterans' Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That from and after the first day of the next month after the enactment of this act, all surviving soldiers of the various Indian wars and campaigns who are now on the pension rolls or who may hereafter be placed thereon under the provisions of the acts of July 27, 1892, June 27, 1902, and May 30, 1908, as amended by the act of February 19, 1913, or under the act of March 4, 1917, or the act of March 3, 1927, shall be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding $55 per month and not less than $20 per month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support as determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and in determining such inability each and every infirmity shall be duly considered, and the aggregate of the disabilities shown be rated: *Provided*, That any such person who has reached the age of 62 years shall be entitled to receive a pension of $25 a month; in case such person has reached the age of 68 years, $35 a month; in case such person has reached the age of 72 years, $45 a month; and in case such person has reached the age of 75 years, $55 a month: *Provided further*, That any such person who is now or hereafter may become, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, shall be paid the rate of $72 a month: *And provided further*, That no one while an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any National or State soldiers' home shall be paid more than $50 per month under this act.

"SEC. 2. That the increased rates of pension herein provided shall be effective from and after the first day of the month following the enactment of this act as to those then in receipt of Indian war service pension, and as to those with claims then pending who are shown to be entitled to pension under one of the acts enumerated herein, and as to all other cases where entitlement under this act is shown, such pension shall commence from the date of filing application therefor in the Veterans' Administration on and after the enactment of this act, and in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs: *Provided*, That pension of $72 per month granted under this act on the basis of requiring the regular aid and attendance of another person shall commence from the date of receipt in the Veterans' Administration of the evidence showing the requisite condition or the date of filing application therefor on and after the enactment of this act, whichever is the later date, but such pension of $72 per month shall not be awarded to any person for any period during which he is maintained in an institution by the United States Government or a political subdivision thereof and is being furnished with nursing or attendant service: *Provided further*, That in no event shall the rates of pension provided in this act be effective prior to the first day of the month following the enactment thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OIL WORLD EXPOSITION, HOUSTON, TEX.

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 385, authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Oil World Exposition at Houston, Tex., to be held October 11 to 16, 1937, inclusive.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice there are two resolutions providing for oil expositions. Will not some Member on the majority side explain this resolution?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I shall be pleased to explain it. In the first place, this bill will not cost the Government 5 cents expense. The expense will be borne by the city of Houston and the State authorities.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There will be no expense to the Federal Government?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. None whatever.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And there is no intention on the part of the sponsors to come back at any future time to try to secure a Federal contribution?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Absolutely none.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to invite by proclamation, or in such other manner as he may deem proper, the States of the Union and all foreign countries to participate in the proposed Oil World Exposition, to be held at Houston, Tex., from October 11 to 16, 1937, inclusive, for the purpose of exhibiting samples of fabricated and raw products of all countries produced by the petroleum industry; and the exhibiting of the tools and equipment used by the industry; and bringing together buyers and sellers for promotion of trade and commerce in such products.

SEC. 2. All articles that shall be imported from foreign countries for the sole purpose of exhibition at the Oil World Exposition upon which there shall be a tariff or customs duty shall be admitted free of the payment of duty, customs, fees, or charges, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall

prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during the exhibition to sell any goods or property imported for and actually on exhibition, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles when sold or withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States shall be subject to the duty, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling and necessary exposure, the duty, if paid, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal for consumption or use, and the penalties prescribed by law shall be enforced against any person guilty of any illegal sale, use, or withdrawal.

SEC. 3. That the Government of the United States is not by this resolution obligated to any expense in connection with the holding of such exposition.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out section 2 and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Oil World Exposition to be held at Houston, Tex., from October 11 to 16, 1937, inclusive, by the Oil World Exposition, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign buildings or exhibits at the said exposition, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the said exposition to sell within the area of the exposition any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouse under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said exposition under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the Oil World Exposition shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the Oil World Exposition to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid in the manner provided for in section 524 of the Tariff Act of 1930."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM EXPOSITION, TULSA, OKLA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7127, authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to be held May 14 to May 21, 1938.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the same questions concerning this exposition.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, the same replies fit this situation as those given by the gentleman from Texas to the last situation. No money is being asked of the Federal Government. The only thing sought from the Federal Government by this bill is the usual provision regarding the handling of property brought in, so far as the draw-back of customs duties is concerned. If the property is sold here, they pay duty, of course.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The sponsors of this project will not come back later to ask for any money from the Federal Government?

Mr. DISNEY. Oh, no.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to invite by proclamation, or in such other manner as he may deem proper, the States of the Union and all foreign countries to participate in the proposed International Petroleum Exposition, to be held at Tulsa, Okla., from May 14, 1938, to May 21, 1938, inclusive, for the purpose of exhibiting samples of fabricated and raw products of all countries used in the petroleum industry and bringing together buyers and sellers for promotion of trade and commerce in such products.

SEC. 2. All articles that shall be imported from foreign countries for the sole purpose of exhibition at the International Petroleum Exposition upon which there shall be a tariff or customs duty shall be admitted free of the payment of duty, customs, fees, or charges, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during the exhibition to sell any goods or property imported for and actually on exhibition, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles, which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law, and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond, and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said exposition under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the International Petroleum Exposition shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the International Petroleum Exposition to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930.

SEC. 3. That the Government of the United States is not by this act obligated to any expense in connection with the holding of such exposition and is not hereafter to be obligated other than for suitable representation thereat.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AT MILITARY POSTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7645, to authorize appropriations for construction and rehabilitation at military posts, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $21,460,688, to be expended for the construction, rehabilitation, and installation at military posts of such buildings and utilities and appurtenances thereto as may be necessary, as follows:

Station	Description of construction	Amount
Army and Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs, Ark.	Quarters	$34,000
	Telephone	1,000
Total		35,000
Air Corps Technical School, Denver, Colo.	Barracks	935,000
	Hospital headquarters and administration building.	200,000
	School building	540,000
	Runways	300,000
	Grading and improving landing field	300,000
Total		2,275,000
Fort Barrancas, Fla	Quarters (noncommissioned officers, 10)	85,000
	Telephone construction	2,000
Total		87,000
Fort Benning, Ga	Water system, improvements to pumping and filtration plants; reservoir storage.	180,000
Fort Bliss, Tex	Barracks	275,000
	Quarters (warrant officers and noncommissioned officers, 20).	170,000
	Radio station, including towers (Biggs Field).	17,000
	Telephone construction	1,000
Total		463,000
Fort Bragg, N. C	Barracks	412,500
	Telephone construction	1,000
Total		413,500
Carlisle Barracks, Pa	Quarters	229,000
	Telephone construction	3,000
	Quarters	348,000
	Sterilizing plant, etc	35,000
	Barracks (125 men)	137,500
Total		761,500
Chanute Field, Ill	Barracks, including mess facilities	1,035,000
	Quarters, noncommissioned officers	505,000
	Hospital	300,000
	Central heating plant, beginning	500,000
	School building	540,000
Total		2,880,000
Fort Crook, Nebr	Barracks (additon to)	55,000
	Barracks	137,500
	Telephone construction	500
Total		193,000
Fort Douglas, Utah	Medical detachment barracks	42,000
Fort Du Pont, Del	Barracks	412,500
	Telephone construction	1,000
Total		413,500
Fort Ethan Allen, Vt	Quarters (30 noncommissioned officers)	255,000
	Telephone	2,500
Total		257,500
Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colo.	Hospital	1,750,000
	Telephone construction	20,000
Total		1,770,000
Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa.	Office building	225,000
	Extension building no. 127, acoustic laboratory.	23,000
	Extension of annealing room building no. 215	7,000
Total		255,000
Fort Sam Houston, Tex	Hospital (addition)	235,000
	Basement in transmitter building	4,000
	Barracks	550,000
	Telephone construction	4,000
Total		793,000
Fort Humphreys, D. C	Reproduction plant	74,880
	Telephone construction	3,500
Total		78,380
Jefferson Barracks, Mo	Barracks (medical and other detachment)	$82,500
	Mess and kitchen addition to barracks	60,000
	Nurses quarters	63,000
Total		205,500
Fort Knox, Ky	Hospital	200,000
Fort Leavenworth, Kans	Auditorium and production plant	600,000
Madison Barracks, N. Y	Barracks	137,500
	Quarters, noncommissioned officers	136,000
	Telephone construction	1,000
	Water supply	85,000
Total		359,500
Fort McArthur, Calif	Barracks and utilities	137,500
	Telephone construction	1,000
Total		138,500
Fort McPherson, Ga	Radio station	23,000
	Dental clinic	85,000
Total		108,000
Fort Monmouth, N. J	Barracks	137,500
	Signal Corps laboratory	220,000
	Telephone construction	20,000
Total		377,500
Fort Monroe, Va	Barracks, quartermaster detachment	110,000
	Barracks (addition to)	225,000
	Enlisted specialists' school	69,500
	Telephone construction	12,000
Total		416,500
Fort Myer, Va	Hospital addition	9,000
	Barracks building no. 104	55,000
	Barracks (addition to)	220,000
	Telephone construction	500
Total		284,500
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.	Barracks	137,500
	Quarters (noncommissioned officers), telephone construction and utilities.	38,870
Total		176,370
Fort Riley, Kans	Academic building	400,000
	Telephone construction	5,000
Total		405,000
Fort D. A. Russell, Tex	Motor shop, truck, and gun shed	77,818
Fort Sill, Okla	Barracks	330,000
	Telephone construction	1,000
Total		331,000
Fort Thomas, Ky	Barracks	412,500
	Telephone construction	2,500
Total		415,000
Fort Washington, Md	Quarters (officers' double)	30,000
Fort Wayne, Mich	Quarters (8 noncommissioned officers)	68,000
Total for the United States.		15,090,588
HAWAII		
Schofield Barracks	Barracks, Eleventh Field Artillery	1,256,200
	Barracks, detachments	498,300
	Telephone construction	11,000
	Barracks, detachments	283,800
Total		2,049,300
Fort Shafter	Barracks	825,000
	Telephone construction	2,500
Total		827,500
Department headquarters, Fort Shafter.	Quarters	246,500
Tripler General Hospital	Barracks, medical detachment	176,000
	Telephone construction	3,000
Total		179,000
Total, Hawaii		3,302,300
PANAMA		
Fort Clayton	Barracks	825,000
	Telephone	3,000
	Barracks	687,500
	Telephone construction	2,000
Total		1,517,500

Station	Description of construction	Amount
PANAMA—continued		
Corozal general depot	Barracks	$454,300
	Telephone construction	5,000
Total		459,300
Fort Davis	Barracks	550,000
	Telephone construction	3,000
Total		553,000
Fort de Lesseps	Barracks	120,000
Fort Kobbe	do	55,000
	Warehouse and shops	20,000
	Special project	7,000
	Water tank	8,000
Total		90,000
Panama Canal Zone	Rehabilitation	328,000
Total, Panama		3,067,800
Grand total		21,460,688

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to establish in or near Denver, Colo., an extension to the Air Corps Technical School and to accept on behalf of the United States, free from encumbrance or conditions and without cost to the United States, for use as a site for the extension to such school, the title in fee simple to 960 acres of land, more or less, within and without the city limits of the city of Denver, Colo., including the property known as the "Agnes (Phipps) Memorial Sanitarium", together with existing buildings and equipment located thereon; and, also, a tract of land, within the State of Colorado, suitable for use as an aerial gunnery and bombing range by the Army Air Corps: *Provided*, That in the event a donor is unable to perfect title to any land tendered as a donation, condemnation of such land is authorized in the name of the United States, and payment of any and all awards for title to such land as is condemned, together with the cost of suit, shall be made by the donor.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 437, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a commission for the settlement of the special claims comprehended within the terms of the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States concluded April 24, 1934", approved April 10, 1935, and to redefine the jurisdiction of the Special Mexican Claims Commission in certain particulars.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the act entitled "An act to establish a commission for the settlement of the special claims comprehended within the terms of the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States concluded April 24, 1934", approved April 10, 1935 (49 Stat. 149), provides for the establishment of the Special Mexican Claims Commission and confers upon that Commission jurisdiction to hear and determine all claims against the Republic of Mexico, notices of which were filed with the Special Claims Commission, United States and Mexico, established by a convention of September 10, 1923, in which the said Commission failed to award compensation, except such claims as may be found by the committee provided for in the Special Claims Convention of April 24, 1934, to be general claims and recognized as such by the General Claims Commission; and

Whereas the said Special Claims Convention of April 24, 1934, provides that the jurisdiction in and validity of the claims found by the said committee to be general claims shall be determined in each case when examined and adjudicated by the commissioners or umpire in accordance with the provisions of the General Claims Convention of September 8, 1923, and the protocol of April 24, 1934, or the Special Claims Convention of September 10, 1923, and the protocol of June 18, 1932, in the event it shall be found by the commissioners or umpire to have been improperly eliminated from the special claims settlement; and

Whereas certain claims filed with the said Special Claims Commission, United States and Mexico, established by the said convention of September 10, 1923, were found by the said committee to be general claims, but have not yet been the subject of any determination by the said General Claims Commission; and

Whereas the said Special Mexican Claims Commission, established in pursuance of the said act approved April 10, 1935, expires by the terms of the said act on August 31, 1937; and

Whereas, by the terms of the protocol of April 24, 1934, between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, the said General Claims Commission expires on October 24, 1937, and the two Governments have undertaken, upon the basis of the joint report of the members of the said Commission, to conclude a convention for the final disposition of the claims pending before the said Commission, the said convention to take either the form of an agreement for an en-bloc settlement of the said claims or the form of an agreement for the disposition of the claims upon their individual merits by reference to an umpire; and

Whereas the committee provided for in the Special Claims Convention of April 24, 1934, found that the amount to be paid by the Government of Mexico in settlement of the special claims comprehended in that convention was $5,448,020.14, it being understood that the sum thus determined was susceptible of increase after express decision of the General Claims Commission in case the said Commission might decide to be within the jurisdiction of the Special Commission any one or more of the claims which the said committee found to be general claims; and

Whereas the said Special Mexican Claims Commission, in the event that the total amount of the awards made by it upon all claims is greater than the amount which the Government of Mexico has agreed to pay to the Government of the United States in satisfaction of the claims, is required by the said act approved April 10, 1935, to reduce the awards on a percentage basis to such amount; and

Whereas in the circumstances set forth, it is not now possible to ascertain which, if any, of the claims found by the said committee to be general claims will be found by the said General Claims Commission to be special claims, nor what will be the amount of the total en-bloc settlement provided for in the said Special Claims Convention of April 24, 1934; and

Whereas payments on awards of the said Special Mexican Claims Commission from funds paid to the Government of the United States by the Government of Mexico under the Special Claims Convention of April 24, 1934, should not, in justice to the beneficiaries, be deferred until the question of the jurisdiction of the claims now pending before the General Claims Commission, by virtue of the classification of such claims as general claims by the joint committee, shall have been finally determined in the manner provided for in the said convention of April 24, 1934, or in the said protocol of the same date: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the jurisdiction of the Special Mexican Claims Commission established in pursuance of the act approved April 10, 1935 (49 Stat. 149), shall not be deemed to include any of the claims found by the committee provided for in the Special Claims Convention of April 24, 1934, to be general claims.

SEC. 2. That for the purposes of the reduction of awards on a percentage basis as provided for in section 4 of the act approved April 10, 1935 (49 Stat. 149), the amount which the Government of Mexico has agreed to pay to the Government of the United States in satisfaction of the claims shall, subject to the provision in section 3 hereof, be deemed to be the sum of $5,448,020.14, set forth in the report of the said committee provided for in the said convention of April 24, 1934.

SEC. 3. That in the event of the reclassification as special claims of any of the claims found by the said committee to be general claims, the claims so reclassified shall be passed upon by a commission to be established in conformity with the said act of April 10, 1935, and the total amount payable by the Government of Mexico to the Government of the United States on account of the claims so reclassified, together with interest on all deferred payments under the Special Claims Convention of April 24, 1934, shall be added to the sum of $5,448,020.14 set forth in the report of the said committee. The total amount awarded by the commission so established upon the claims so reclassified shall be added to the total amount of the original awards made by the Special Mexican Claims Commission, and any necessary readjustment of the awards of the Special Mexican Claims Commission and those that may be made by the commission to be established pursuant to this section shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis prescribed by section 4 of the act approved April 10, 1935.

SEC. 4. Upon the certification to the Secretary of the Treasury of the awards of the Special Mexican Claims Commission, he shall proceed to make payments as provided for in section 9 of the act approved April 10, 1935; and upon the certification to the Secretary of the Treasury of awards upon any claims reclassified as special claims he shall after making the readjustments provided for in section 3 of this resolution, accord priority of payment on such awards until the beneficiaries thereof shall have been placed upon an equal percentage basis as to payments with the beneficiaries of awards of the Special Mexican Claims Commission.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "Joint resolution relative to determination and payment of certain claims against the Government of Mexico."

CANADIAN PASSENGER VESSELS ON LAKE ONTARIO AND ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 413, to permit the transportation of passengers by Canadian passenger vessels between ports or places in the United States on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, until such time as passenger service shall be established by vessels of the United States between ports or places in the United States on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River, Canadian passenger vessels shall be permitted to transport passengers between any such ports or places; such Canadian vessels not to be subject to the provisions of section 8 of the act of June 19, 1886, as amended by section 2 of the act of February 17, 1898 (46 U. S. C., sec. 289).

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That for the months of July, August, and September 1937 Canadian passenger vessels operating in former years between the port of Rochester, N. Y., and the port of Alexandria Bay, N. Y., shall be permitted to transport passengers between these ports; such Canadian vessels are not to be subject to the provisions of section 8 of the act of June 19, 1886, as amended by section 2 of the act of February 17, 1898 (46 U. S. C., sec. 289)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7402, to provide more effectively for the marking of wrecked and sunken craft for the protection of navigation, to improve the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4676 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4676. Whenever the owner of any sunken vessel, boat, watercraft, raft, or other similar obstruction existing on any river, lake, harbor, sound, bay, or canal, or other navigable waters of the United States has failed to mark, or in the judgment of the Commissioner of Lighthouses has failed suitably to mark, the same in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the act of March 3, 1899 (ch. 425, 30 Stat. 1152), the Commissioner of Lighthouses is authorized to suitably mark the same for the protection of navigation. Until such time as abandonment of any such obstruction has been established in accordance with the provisions of section 19 of the act of March 3, 1899 (ch. 425, 30 Stat. 1154), the owner thereof shall pay to the Commissioner of Lighthouses the cost of such marking. As soon as abandonment of any such obstruction has been so established, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to keep the same so marked pending removal thereof in accordance with the provisions of section 19 of the act of March 3, 1899 (ch. 425, 30 Stat. 1154), but the Commissioner of Lighthouses may at the request of the Department of War continue the suitable marking of any such obstruction for and on behalf of that Department. The cost of continuing any such marking shall be borne by the Department of War. All moneys received by the Commissioner of Lighthouses from the owners of obstructions, in accordance with the provisions of this section, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. No provision of this section shall be construed so as to relieve the owner of any such obstruction from the duty and responsibility suitably to mark the same in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the act of March 3, 1899 (ch. 425, 30 Stat. 1152)."

SEC. 2. The Lighthouse Service is authorized, whenever an aid to navigation or other property belonging to that Service is damaged or destroyed by a private person, and such private person or his agent shall pay to the satisfaction of the proper official of the Lighthouse Service for the cost of repair or replacement of such property, to accept and deposit such payments, through proper officers of the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, in special deposit accounts in the Treasury, for payment therefrom to the person or persons repairing or replacing the damaged property and refundment of amounts collected in excess of the cost of the repairs or replacements concerned.

SEC. 3. The Commissioner of Lighthouses, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, is authorized in his discretion hereafter to establish and maintain aids to navigation to mark rivers, waterways, or channels, connected by navigable waters with the sea or the Great Lakes, which have been improved for navigation by the United States under proper authority, and appropriations made for the support of the Lighthouse Service are made available for the expenses of establishing and maintaining such aids to navigation.

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the act of Congress approved June 17, 1910 (ch. 301, 36 Stat. 537; U. S. C., title 33, secs. 711, 721), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. There shall be in the Department of Commerce a Bureau of Lighthouses and a Commissioner of Lighthouses, who shall be the head of said Bureau, to be appointed by the President. There shall also be in the Bureau a Deputy Commissioner, to be appointed by the President, and a Chief Clerk, who shall perform the duties of Chief Clerk and such other duties as may be assigned to him by the Secretary of Commerce or by the Commissioner. There shall also be in the Bureau such inspectors, clerical assistants, and other employees as may from time to time be authorized by Congress. The Commissioner of Lighthouses shall make an annual report to the Secretary of Commerce, who shall transmit the same to Congress at the beginning of each regular session thereof. The Commissioner of Lighthouses, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine all claims for damages, where the amount of the claim does not exceed the sum of $500, occasioned by collisions, for which collisions vessels of the Lighthouse Service shall be found to be responsible, and report the amounts so ascertained and determined to be due to the claimants to Congress at each session thereof through the Treasury Department for payment as legal claims out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor."

SEC. 5. That so much of section 20 of the act approved May 28, 1935 (Public, No. 81, 74th Cong.), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of certain lighthouse reservations, and for other purposes", as reads "to convey to the town of Southold, State of New York" is hereby amended to read "to convey to the Southold Park District in the town of Southold, State of New York."

SEC. 6. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to convey to the State of Florida for public-roadway purposes an additional portion of the Crooked River Range Lighthouse Reservation, Fla., 34 feet in width and approximately 500 feet in length adjoining the strip of land conveyed pursuant to section 4 of the act approved May 28, 1935 (Public, No. 81, 74th Cong.), to provide for a roadway 100 feet in width across the reservation. The deed of conveyance shall describe by metes and bounds the portion of the reservation transferred and the conditions imposed by section 36 of the act of May 28, 1935 (Public, No. 81, 74th Cong.).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCEPTION OF YACHTS, TUGS, TOWBOATS, AND UNRIGGED VESSELS FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE ACT OF JUNE 25, 1936

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7158, to except yachts, tugs, towboats, and unrigged vessels from certain provisions of the act of June 25, 1936, as amended.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF LAWS RELATING TO ENLISTMENTS IN THE COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6916, to amend the laws relating to enlistments in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of May 26, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 200; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 14, sec. 35), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(a) That all persons composing the enlisted force of the Coast Guard shall be enlisted for a term not to exceed 3 years, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall prepare regulations governing such enlistments and for the general government of the service: *Provided*, That an enlistment in the Coast Guard shall not be regarded as complete until the enlisted man concerned shall have served any time, in excess of 1 day, lost on account of unauthorized absence from duty, or injury, sickness, or disease, resulting from his own intemperate use of drugs or alcoholic liquors, or other misconduct, or while in confinement under sentence, or while awaiting trial and disposition of his case if the trial results in conviction.

"(b) The term of enlistment of any enlisted man in the Coast Guard may, by his voluntary written agreement, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, be extended for a period of 1, 2, or 3 full years from the date of expiration of the then-existing term of enlistment, and subsequent to said date an enlisted man who extends his term of enlistment as herein authorized shall be entitled to and shall receive the same pay and allowances in all respects as though regularly discharged and reenlisted immediately upon expiration of his term of enlistment. No such extension shall operate to deprive the enlisted man concerned, upon discharge at the termination thereof, of any right, privilege, or benefit to which he would have been entitled if his term of enlistment had not been so extended.

"(c) The commanding officer of any vessel of the Coast Guard is authorized, in his discretion, to detain an enlisted man beyond the term of his enlistment until the first arrival of the vessel at its permanent station, or at a port in a State of the United States or in the District of Columbia, unless, in his opinion, the detention of such person for a further period is essential to the public interest, in which case he may detain him for a further period, not exceeding 30 days, after arrival at such station or port. Any person so detained shall be subject in all respects to the laws and

regulations for the government of the Coast Guard until his discharge therefrom."

SEC. 2. The act entitled "An act extending the benefits of the marine hospitals to the keepers and crews of life-saving stations", approved August 4, 1894, as amended (28 Stat. 229; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 24, sec. 8), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(a) Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the President, upon the recommendation of the Surgeon General with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, all commissioned officers, chief warrant officers, warrant officers, cadets, and enlisted men of the Coast Guard, including those on shore duty and those on detached duty, whether on active duty or retired, shall be entitled to medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization by the Public Health Service; and the dependent members of families of officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard shall be furnished medical advice and out-patient treatment by the Public Health Service at its first-, second-, and third-class relief stations, and such dependent members of families shall be furnished hospitalization at marine hospitals, if suitable accommodations are available, at a per-diem cost to the officer or enlisted man concerned equivalent to the uniform per-diem reimbursement rate for Government hospitals as approved by the President for each fiscal year. Collections of the Public Health Service for the hospitalization of such dependent members of families shall be credited to the applicable appropriation for the operation of marine hospitals and relief stations.

"(b) The act entitled 'An act to extend medical and hospital relief to retired officers and retired enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard', approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 603; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 14, sec. 179), is hereby repealed."

SEC. 3. Subdivision "Seventh" of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, and to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States", approved June 29, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 598; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 8, sec. 388), is hereby further amended by inserting in line 4 thereof, after the words "Naval Auxiliary Service", the words "or the Coast Guard."

SEC. 4. Section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 789; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 10, sec. 1429), is hereby amended by inserting in line 8 thereof, after the words "United States Navy", the words "or with the United States Coast Guard."

SEC. 5. Section 2 of the act of June 23, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 452; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 14, sec. 15), is hereby further amended by inserting the following sentence at the end thereof: "A cadet, upon admission to the Coast Guard Academy, shall be credited with the sum of $250 to cover the cost of his initial clothing and equipment issued, to be deducted subsequently from his pay in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury."

SEC. 6. Section 2 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act, approved July 31, 1894, as amended (28 Stat. 205; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, sec. 62), is hereby further amended by inserting in line 12 thereof, following the word "Navy", the words "or the Coast Guard."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF LIGHTHOUSE SITES, PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7823, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to exchange with the people of Puerto Rico the Guanica Lighthouse Reservation for two adjacent plots of insular forest land under the jurisdiction of the commissioner, department of agriculture and commerce, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to convey to the people of Puerto Rico the parcel of land and certain improvements comprising the Guanica Lighthouse Reservation in exchange by deeds of conveyance of two adjacent plots of land required for establishing the Guanica Light at a higher elevation to provide greater visibility, and to provide for necessary roadway and wharf facilities. The deeds of conveyance shall describe by metes and bounds the lands involved in the exchange, and acceptable titles free of all encumbrances are required to be furnished the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMISSION TO CITIZENSHIP OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of bill H. R. 6785, for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to February 5, 1917, No. 286 on the Consent Calendar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall object unless the gentleman agrees to an amendment to which we agreed a while ago.

Mr. KRAMER. I agree to the amendment the gentleman proposes to offer.

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

There was no objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a new subdivision is hereby added to section 4 of the Naturalization Act of June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. 596), as amended, to read as follows:

"Fifteenth. Any alien eligible for citizenship who is 50 years of age or more, who prior to the enactment of this act has made a declaration of intention or filed a petition for naturalization, and who was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence prior to February 5, 1917, may be naturalized upon full and complete compliance with all requirements of the naturalization laws, with the following exceptions: Petition for naturalization may be filed without regard for the 7-year limitation on the declaration of intention, and the applicant shall not be required to sign his petition in his own handwriting or to speak the English language and he shall be exempt from all educational requirements. Nothing herein shall be held to waive or in anywise relax the requirement for good moral character."

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: Page 1, line 11, after "1917", add the following: "and has ever since said lawful entry maintained a bona-fide residence in 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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO SETTLERS OF HOMESTEAD LANDS DURING YEAR 1937

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of the bill H. R. 2888, granting a leave of absence to homestead settlers during the year 1937, No. 371 on the Consent Calendar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if this differs in any way from another bill which we considered earlier in the session concerning these rights and, second, may I ask him, what is the economic necessity for continuing from year to year the prohibition against these people exercising their rights under the homestead laws in order to acquire title?

Mr. MOTT. In answer to the first question, I may say that the bill presently under consideration differs from the former one in that it does not contain the Indian provision. As to the second question, the economic reason, there are a great many homesteaders throughout the United States who during the past 2 or 3 years have found it impossible to stay upon their land and to comply with the laws and the regulations and at the same time make a living. This bill simply permits them to go off of the land temporarily, after they have made a showing that they are not able to make a living by staying on the land and after that showing has been supported by the affidavits of two disinterested parties.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the bill purports to accomplish?

Mr. MOTT. The bill provides that a homestead entryman having taken up a homestead and who finds it impossible on account of economic conditions during the present year

to stay on his land and make a living, and who is required to go off his land during that period in order to make a living, may be permitted to go off the land during the present year if he makes a sufficient showing and if that showing is supported by the affidavits of two disinterested parties who are familiar with the situation. The bill further provides an entryman receiving permission to go off his land will not have that time included within the time under which he is required to take up his homestead.

However, his time will be extended during the period he is off the land. It is a very interesting bill and affects homesteaders in all the Western States.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOTT. Certainly.

Mr. COSTELLO. I notice in the committee report a letter from the Department of the Interior in which the suggestion is made that two amendments be added to the bill. The one on page 2 would insert, in line 20, the words "or purchaser of", so that the line would read "any entryman or purchaser of ceded Indian lands", which would include the purchaser along with the entryman. However, I notice the committee did not add that amendment.

Mr. MOTT. My recollection is that the committee had no objection to the amendment. I have no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. There is another amendment at quite some length which the Department recommended in its report, and this amendment is known as section 5.

Mr. MOTT. I have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. COSTELLO. Is the gentleman planning to offer section 5 as an amendment to the bill?

Mr. MOTT. I was not planning to, but I would have no objection to such an amendment being offered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any homestead settler or entryman who, during the calendar year 1937 should find it necessary, because of economic conditions, to leave his homestead to seek employment in order to obtain the necessaries of life for himself or family or to provide for the education of his children, may, upon filing with the register of the district his affidavit, supported by corroborating affidavits of two disinterested persons, showing the necessity of such absence, be excused from compliance with the requirements of the homestead laws as to residence, cultivation, improvement, expenditures, or payment of purchase money, as the case may be, during all or any part of the calendar year 1937, and said entries shall not be open to contest or protest because of failure to comply with such requirements during such absence; except that the time of such absence shall not be deducted from the actual residence required by law, but a period equal to such absence shall be added to the statutory life of the entry: *Provided*, That any entrymen holding an unperfected entry on ceded Indian lands may be excused from the requirements of residence upon the conditions provided herein, but shall not be entitled to extension of time for the payment of any installment of the purchase price of the land except upon payment of interest, in advance, at the rate of 4 percent per annum on the principal of any unpaid purchase price from the date when such payment or payments became due to and inclusive of the date of the expiration of the period of relief granted hereunder.

SEC. 2. Any homestead settler or entryman, including any entryman on ceded Indian lands, who is unable to make the payments due on the purchase price of his land on account of economic conditions, shall be excused from making any such payment during the calendar year 1937 upon payment of interest, in advance, at the rate of 4 percent per annum on the principal of any unpaid purchase price from the date when such payment or payments became due to and inclusive of the date of the expiration of the period of relief granted hereunder.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: Page 2, line 20, after the word "entryman", strike out the word "on" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or purchaser of."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further amendment, to add a new section to the bill at the end, to be known as section 3.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: After line 3, on page 3, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. Any homestead entryman or purchaser of ceded Indian land who is delinquent in the payment of the purchase money or interest, or both, due on the land embraced in his entry, entries, purchase, or purchases, and who is unable to make payment thereof in accordance with existing laws, shall be accorded the privilege of relinquishing any subdivision, or subdivisions, as shown on the approved plat, of his entry, entries, purchase, or purchases, so that the purchase money paid on the whole of such entry, entries, purchase, or purchases, will be sufficient to complete payment on the lands retained, which retained lands shall be in reasonably compact form. Relinquishments heretofore made may be accepted under the provisions of this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF THE LIQUOR ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1936

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago I objected to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7508) to amend the Liquor Enforcement Act of 1936.

I now ask unanimous consent to return to that bill and consider it. I realize the bill can be passed by suspension, so I do not want to take up the time of the House, although I feel my objection was sound.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to return to the consideration of the bill H. R. 7508. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of an act approved June 25, 1936, known as the Liquor Enforcement Act of 1936 (U. S. Stat. L., vol. 49, ch. 815, p. 1928), be, and the same is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Whosoever shall import, bring, or transport any intoxicating liquor into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein in violation of the laws of said State, Territory, or possession of the United States, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAN CARLOS APACHE INDIANS

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of the bill (S. 1231) authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896, and reopening such lands to mineral entry.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe I shall ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice for the purpose of securing a report on it. I think the bill should be considered on the next day the Consent Calendar is called. I had a memorandum in reference to this bill which warranted me in taking the action I did. I, therefore, object, Mr. Speaker.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN AUXILIARY VESSELS FOR THE NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2193) to authorize the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the Navy, with House amendments, insist on the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. VINSON of Georgia, Mr. DREWRY of Virginia, and Mr. MILLARD.

CONSENT CALENDAR

TRANSFER OF CANCELED CHECK TO THE GOVERNOR OF ALASKA

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5809) authorizing the transfer of canceled check to the Governor of Alaska. This bill was passed over without prejudice.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, at the time this bill was first called I asked unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice, with

the thought that it might be better to have this check preserved in the Nation's Capital as an object of interest to the many visitors who come to the Capital from all over the country. However, I have been informed by the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] that the check is not on display in the Capital but is simply stored in a vault, and that the check might become an object of public interest if it were transferred to Alaska and made available there for sightseers to observe. For this reason I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida to return to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to deliver to the Governor of the Territory of Alaska for transfer into the custody and retention by the Territorial Historical Library and Museum of said Territory at Juneau, Alaska, the original check and warrant issued for the purchase of Alaska from Russia by the United States, for the sum of $7,200,000, pursuant to the Treaty of Cession of March 30, 1867

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEVEES, FLOOD WALLS, AND DRAINAGE STRUCTURES IN OHIO RIVER BASIN

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7646) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control and for other purposes", approved June 22, 1936, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved June 22, 1936, is hereby amended by adding a third paragraph reading as follows under the heading "Ohio River Basin" in section 5:

"Levees, floodwalls, and drainage structures: Construction of levees, floodwalls, and drainage structures for the protection of cities and towns in the Ohio River Basin, the projects to be selected by the Chief of Engineers with the approval of the Secretary of War, in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers in House Committee on Flood Control Document No. 1, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, at a cost not to exceed $24,877,000 for construction which is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose: *Provided*, That the protection for Pittsburgh, Pa., is to be interpreted as applying to the metropolitan district of Pittsburgh: *Provided further*, That the local cooperation required by section 3 is complied with: *Provided further*, That any funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1938 to carry out the provisions of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, may be used for plant, material, supervisory, and skilled services necessary in the execution of the projects authorized herein, with relief labor furnished under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to approve the expenditure of not to exceed $300,000 per year, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, in removing accumulated snags and other debris and clearing of channels in navigable streams and tributaries thereof when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of flood control: *Provided*, That not more than $25,000 shall be expended for this purpose on any single stream in any one year.

SEC. 3. That, in order to further the declaration of policy and principles declared in sections 1 and 2 of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, and to supplement the preliminary examinations and surveys which the Secretary of War has heretofore been authorized and directed to make of waterways with a view to the control of their floods, the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys to be made for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on the watersheds of said waterways, the costs thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes.

SEC. 4. That section 3 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved June 22, 1936, is hereby amended by adding the following subsection (d):

"As a condition to the extending of any benefits, in prosecuting measures for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention authorized by act of Congress pursuant to the policy declared in this act, to any lands not owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, the Secretary of Agriculture may, insofar as he may deem necessary for the purposes of such acts, require—

"(1) The enactment and reasonable safeguards for the enforcement of State and local laws imposing suitable permanent restrictions on the use of such lands and otherwise providing for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention;

"(2) Agreements or covenants as to the permanent use of such lands; and

"(3) Contributions in money, services, materials, or otherwise to any operations conferring such benefits."

SEC. 5. That section 6 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved June 22, 1936, is hereby amended by adding to the list of localities at which preliminary examinations and surveys are authorized to be made the following names:

"Santa Ana River and tributaries, California.
"South Fabius River in northeast Missouri.
"Willow Creek, Oreg.
"Cherry Creek and its tributaries, Colorado.
"Zumbro River and the Whitewater River in southeastern Minnesota.
"Saline River, Ark.
"Alameda and San Lorenzo Creeks and their tributaries, California.
"Arkansas River in Sequoyah and Haskell Counties, Okla.
"Chariton River in Schuyler County, Mo.
"Galena River (Fever River) in Illinois and Wisconsin.
"San Jacinto River, and its tributaries, in Montgomery, Walker, San Jacinto, Grimes, Waller, Liberty, and Harris Counties, Tex.
"Kissimmee River Valley and its tributaries, Florida.
"Pejaro River, Calif.
"Dugdemonia Bayou, La.
"Mississippi River and tributaries in vicinity of Memphis and Shelby County, Tenn.
" 'The Narrows' on Fourche La Fave River in Scott County, Ark.
"Cumberland River and its tributaries in the vicinity of Nashville, Tenn.
"Cumberland River and its tributaries in the vicinity of Clarksville, Tenn.
"Floyd River, Iowa.
"Little Sioux River, Iowa.
"Tygart River and tributaries in the vicinity of Elkins, W. Va.
"North Branch of Potomac River and its tributaries in the vicinity of Keyser, W. Va.
"Santa Ana River and Banning Canyon in counties of San Bernardino and Riverside, Calif.
"Mojave River, in the county of San Bernardino, Calif.
"Lytle Creek, Waterman Canyon, in the county of San Bernardino, Calif.
"San Jacinto River and Bautiste Creek in the county of Riverside, Calif.
"Boeuf River, Catahoula, Franklin, Caldwell, Richland, West Carroll, and Morehouse Parishes, La.
"Bayou Macon, Franklin, Madison, Richland, East Carroll, and West Carroll Parishes, La.
"Ouachita River and tributaries, Louisiana.
"Russian River, Calif.
"Buckhannon River and Middle Fork River and their tributaries in the vicinity of Buckhannon, W. Va.
"Bureau Creek and tributaries, Illinois.
"Kiskiminitas River, Pa.
"Illinois River and the Fox River at Ottawa, Ill.
"Santa Clara River, Calif.
"Clinton River, Mich.
"Sans Bois Creek in Haskell and Latimer Counties, Okla.
"Salinas River, Calif.
"Walnut Bayou in Little River County, Ark.
"Cucamongo Creek, Deer Creek, San Antonio Creek, and Chino Creek, Calif.
"Cedar River, Iowa.
"Arroyo Grande Creek in the county of San Luis Obispo, Calif.
"Chariton River, Iowa.
"Bill Williams River, Ariz.
"Big Sandy River, in Arizona, from the junction of Trout Creek and Knight Creek on the north to the Bill Williams River on the south.
"Quiver River, Miss.
"Sunflower River, Miss.
"Iowa River, Iowa.
"Kiskiminitas and Conemaugh Rivers and their tributaries, Pennsylvania.
"Whitewater River, Calif.
"Girtys Run, in Allegheny County, Pa.
"Neosho River and its tributaries, in Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas.
"Nishnabotna River, Iowa.
"Turkey River, Iowa.
"Boyer River, Iowa."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, please remind me when I have spoken 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill. It is generally conceded that the Ohio River flood of 1937 was one of the major disasters of the Nation. It would take a good many years to construct works to prevent a recurrence of the damage and destruction of that flood. It is universally recognized that it is necessary to provide, however, at the earliest practicable date, for emergency and priority projects to protect the most populous areas in the lower Ohio River Basin.

Mankind has always been harassed by floods. When the first white man ever saw the Mississippi he saw the Father of Waters at its worst. There have been great floods in this country from the time of Indian legends. It is a part of the religion and tradition of every people that in the long ago there was a great flood.

It has been erroneously thought that floods have increased in number and frequency recently. There is no evidence that floods have increased in number in the United States. We had probably the largest flood that ever occurred on the Mississippi River in 1844. One of the largest floods that ever occurred on the Ohio River occurred in 1763, before the trees were cut and before the lands were plowed; but because of the increase in our population and because of the improvements in our country floods are becoming more destructive. It is conservatively estimated that 800,000 people were driven from their homes in the Ohio Valley in January and February of 1937, and that the damages to American citizens in that greatest of all industrial areas in this or any other country aggregated direct losses of $400,000,000, and that the indirect losses were around $400,000,000.

Congress was appealed to and we have not been derelict in our duty. We have appropriated, and the Chief of Engineers has spent in the past 9 years $12,000,000 in making plans for flood control and river improvements along more than 200 of the rivers of the United States. The Chief of Engineers submitted a comprehensive report on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. The President of the United States transmitted that report to the committee and he asked that the consideration of the full report be passed over until the next session of the Congress because of studies he had requested by other departments of the Government. The committee insisted, and the President agreed, that there should be priority projects for the populous centers of the Ohio River Basin, during the present session.

This bill authorizes appropriations of $24,877,000 for the construction of priority and emergency projects in the Ohio River Basin, consisting of river walls, levees, and drainage structures.

It is not assumed there will be any additional appropriation requested at this session of the Congress. The President of the United States states that he is going to allocate, under the terms of this bill, around $12,000,000 for the works out of the Emergency Act of 1937, during the next fiscal year.

While the authorized projects along the Ohio River during the next fiscal year are to be financed out of relief funds, under the Emergency Appropriation Act of 1937, it is imperative that Congress authorize the construction of the works. Under the terms of the Emergency Appropriation Act of 1937 no projects can be undertaken unless funds for completion are allocated. However, under section 10 of that act if the projects are approved by Congress the said limitation does not apply. It is imperative, therefore, that Congress authorize the flood-control works even if they are to to be paid for out of the relief funds, as such works are seldom completed in 1 year.

The committee amended the bill so as to authorize the use of about three or four million dollars out of the regularly appropriated flood funds to provide for plant and material, so as to authorize the Chief Executive to use relief funds for the flood-control works authorized. There are 155 projects along the Ohio River, and every project may be considered. The bill is but a partial solution of the large flood problem. It would take from 1 to 2 years to do the work in the pending bill. Under the comprehensive plan reported by the Chief of Engineers, it would probably have taken 15 years to complete the works recommended by him. Under the terms of this bill the projects are to be selected and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War. We have the assurance of the Director of the Budget that in the event any of the regularly appropriated money for national flood control is utilized in the purchase of plant and material, then the Director of the Budget will send in a supplemental recommendation to replace all funds so used in the first deficiency bill of the next session. I speak of section 1 of the bill. We conducted the hearings exhaustively, and in the hearings Members will find a list of 155 communities, with their population and damages in each community. They will find what it will cost to construct the works, also the local contribution required, because this bill is an amendment of the act of 1936, and the principle of local contribution obtains and is brought forward. The same principle obtains in the pending act as obtains in all other flood-control legislation heretofore passed by the Congress of the United States for flood-control works.

Under section 2 of the act there is authorized to be expended on any river where an appropriation has been made not to exceed $25,000,000 to clear the debris and straighten the river, because it was thought this would bring not only as good results but probably better than building the levees higher in some cases.

Section 3 of the act is but an enlargement and expansion of the policy adopted in 1936. Under the terms of that policy of flood control surveys by the Chief of Engineers are now supplemented by surveys for water retardation and soil erosion by the Secretary of Agriculture. Section 3 of the act makes surveys and examinations applicable to the streams that were reported or authorized prior to the passage of the act of 1936, and hence not named in said act.

Section 4 of the act is to provide for soil conservation and it is the exact language of the act of April 27, 1935, so as to provide for local cooperation.

Some 55 or 60 bills for preliminary examinations and surveys were introduced, referred to the committee, and by the committee to the Department of War and the Department of Agriculture, and favorable reports were submitted. All of them have been embraced in an omnibus section, in section 5 of the act. The bill under consideration is a partial response of the Congress of the United States to the great disaster that visited the Ohio Valley in 1936, and this legislation is imperatively necessary if flood-control works are to be constructed. It is a source of satisfaction for me to say at this time that the present administration has approved and passed more flood-control legislation than was ever passed before in all the preceding history of the United States, and that the present session of the Congress of the United States, in addition to providing for flood-control works in relief and emergency acts has appropriated more money for flood control than any other previous session of the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to find out if local communities and the States benefited have to make contributions of land.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I made it clear, and so stated, that this act provides that the principle of local contribution which obtained in the acts passed in 1936 for the Mississippi and all other rivers, is brought forward in this act. The principle of local contribution obtains, as the pending bill is an amendment to the omnibus Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am including a more detailed analysis of the bill, and facts that will be of benefit to those interested in projects along the Ohio River Basin.

I invite attention to the report of the Flood Control Committee on the pending bill. It contains facts and data showing that while the bill under consideration is only a partial plan, nevertheless, reference is made to the necessity for further flood-control legislation. The report shows that under the appropriations of Congress the Chief of Engineers has made careful plans and studies. It is no longer a question of plans, it is now a question of authorization and construction. Congress has adequate plans. The big question remaining for Congress is to adopt those plans.

Permit me to say further that floods have harassed mankind in all ages and in all countries. Mythical and historical writings in all countries are filled with references to great floods. The story of a flood that overwhelmed the entire world is one of the oldest in the traditions and records of man. The most widely known story of hungry waters in all literature is the flood of Noah's time. Flood legends in Europe, Asia, and Africa abound. They are found from Tierra del Fuego, in the south, to Alaska, and in both North and South America from east to west. The flood legend goes away back into the Indian lore of this country. Perhaps the earliest story of floods, according to the historian Bancroft, is told by the Papago Indians of Arizona. Montezuma was the hero of the legend. Many of the Indian legends parallel the story of Noah's Ark. Mankind has always been marked by the dread of floods.

There are records of historic floods in Europe and Asia in modern times. Holland and Hungary in Europe, China and India in Asia have suffered devastating floods.

The first civilized man to ever behold the Mississippi River saw the greatest of rivers at its worst. There was no civilization then; there were no farms to be devastated or cities to be destroyed. Hernando De Soto was thrilled at the magnificent beauty of the Father of Waters, but he was not afraid.

The flood of 1543 is the oldest of recorded floods along the Mississippi River. The next great flood of record was in 1718. Every 5 or 6 years there has been a destructive flood along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. Two of the greatest of these occurred in 1785 and 1844. The record flood in the lower Mississippi was in 1927, and in 1937 occurred the greatest flood that ever swept down the lower Ohio River.

Floods have not increased in frequency, but, because of the progress and advancement of man, the destruction is much greater. In 1785 there were 3,000,000 people in the United States; in 1937 the population had increased to 130,000,000. The industrial development along the Ohio River and its tributaries surpassed that of any other river in this or any other country.

AN OLD PROBLEM

The problem is old, but the remedies are new and recent. Prior to 1936 the Federal Government had contributed to flood control along the Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers. Prior to 1917 flood-control works along the Mississippi River were incidental; they were in aid of navigation. In the act of 1928 flood control along the lower Mississippi was declared to be a national problem. The substantial Federal expenditures for flood control in the lower Mississippi Valley have been made since the great flood of 1927.

PLAN

In 1927 and in 1928 Congress recognized the national aspects of flood control, and during the past 9 years more than 200 streams in the United States have been studied and investigated by the Corps of Engineers and reports covering flood control on the principal navigable rivers and their tributaries have been submitted to the Congress of the United States by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army.

Under the law the reports cover navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and irrigation. These reports are thorough and exhaustive. All plans for flood control and flood prevention have been explored and investigated by the most competent engineers in the country.

FLOODS OF 1935 AND 1936

There were destructive floods in New England, and especially in New York and Pennsylvania, in 1935. The greatest flood in the history of Pittsburgh occurred in 1936. The losses were enormous. It is estimated the annual flood losses in the United States that can be prevented aggregate more than $300,000,000.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROGRAM AND POLICY

On June 22, 1936, Congress adopted for the first time a national flood-control program and a national flood-control policy. The policy declared that the Federal Government should improve, or participate in the improvement of, navigable waters and their tributaries, including the watersheds thereof, where the benefits exceeded the estimated costs if the lives and social security of the people are otherwise adversely affected. Some 270 projects in 30 States were approved; $300,000,000 was authorized to be appropriated. The works were to be constructed by the Chief of Engineers under the direction of the Secretary of War.

We have heard much of dust storms and soil erosion. It is said there is nothing new under the sun. Civilizations have perished because lands were abused. It is said that the Sahara Desert in the long ago was inhabited and cultivated, but the misuse and abuse of the land converted that broad expanse into a desert of sands. We hear much of soil erosion. The lower Mississippi Valley was formed by the erosion of soils. The Gulf of Mexico in prehistoric times extended far inland to the city of Cairo at the mouth of the Ohio River. As a result of erosions the lower Mississippi Valley was being formed and the mouths of the Mississippi River are still being extended out into the Gulf of Mexico at the rate of about 1 mile in every 21 years. But our lands are being needlessly eroded and our forests being ruthlessly destroyed. They have contributed to increased flood heights.

The policy of flood control adopted in 1936 provided for watershed control and soil-erosion prevention. Numerous examinations and surveys were provided for in the act of 1936. The surveys for flood-control works are under the Department of War. The surveys for water retardation, soil-erosion prevention, and reforestation are under the Department of Agriculture. The work of the two departments integrate; there is no conflict; there is coordination. Downstream protective works are supplemented and reinforced by upstream preventive measures.

On June 15, 1936, authorizations were made for the completion and expansion of flood-control works in the lower Mississippi River; adequate provision was made for navigation. The tonnage on the lower Mississippi River today exceeds by many times the tonnage of the Father of Waters in the halcyon days of steamboats. Passenger traffic has disappeared, but barges carrying many times the tonnage of freight transported along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers at the time of the advent of railroads in the lower Mississippi Valley some 60 years ago, ply the streams.

ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION HAS PROMOTED FLOOD CONTROL

Not only has the present administration provided, for the first time in history, for a national flood-control policy, not only did the Congress of the United States in 1936 authorize the expenditure of more money for flood control than in all the previous history of the United States, but the Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, has appropriated during any session more money for flood control than has ever been appropriated in the history of the Republic.

It should be a source of satisfaction to the flood sufferers of 1935, 1936, and 1937 that the Government of the United States has made more generous provisions for rescue and rehabilitation than ever made in behalf of flood sufferers.

The Works Progress Administration has expended millions of dollars for maintenance and rehabilitation. The War Department expended some $5,000,000 in the flood fight of 1937. The people of the United States, through the

American Red Cross, generously contributed $21,000,000 in the great Ohio-Mississippi flood of 1937. Ultimately flood losses must be absorbed by the Nation. The problem of flood control has gripped the attention of the American people in the year 1937.

Following the rush of the hungry waters of the Ohio, the most prolific flood-breeding river in the United States, in January and February 1937, a tidal wave of public opinion swept the Nation. There was a universal opinion that the appalling loss of life and property—a repetition of the 1937 calamity—must be prevented. Congress was appealed to.

OHIO RIVER

The population of the Ohio Valley suffered an unparalleled disaster. All previous flood heights were exceeded. The gages at Portsmouth, Cincinnati, Louisville, and Paducah exceeded previous recorded heights by some 10 feet.

DAMAGES

Nobody knows the amount of damages in the Ohio Valley. When the floodwaters receded Louisville estimated a loss of $71,000,000; Paducah's estimate was $25,000,000. The loss on thousands of farms and in hundreds of smaller towns and villages will never be known. It is believed that the direct damage along the Ohio River amounted to more than $400,000,000. This is not the whole story; families were made bankrupt, there was a cessation of business, citizens lost the savings of a lifetime. There were enormous direct losses. There were many deaths, but it is difficult to estimate the loss of life through accident, through disease and sickness, through undernourishment and lack of clothing and other necessaries of life because of the destruction of the means of livelihood. The floods came at night; they occurred during bitter cold weather. The discouragement to Americans who lost their all through no fault of their own will drag through the years. Some day we may be able to estimate in dollars and cents the direct losses, but it will be difficult, if not impossible, to measure the intangible and indirect losses. It is safe to estimate that in the great Ohio flood of 1937 the direct and indirect losses aggregated the staggering total of $800,000,000.

SOLUTION

The Flood Control Committee, as provided by law, on February 10, 1937, promptly passed a resolution calling up the Chief of Engineers to submit a comprehensive report in the light of the 1937 floods along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers and their tributaries. The report was submitted to the President on April 6, 1937, and on April 28, 1937, this report was transmitted by the President to the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives. The report and letter of transmittal are published as Flood Control Committee Document No. 1, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session. The President advised that the consideration of the report be delayed until the next session of Congress, after stating he had requested a further and complete study of all the agencies of the Government involved.

The Chief of Engineers recommended the construction of a system of 45 flood reservoirs on the tributaries of the Ohio River in addition to those already authorized; the construction of levees and flood walls for cities and towns on the Ohio River; the construction of 24 flood-control reservoirs on the tributaries of the Mississippi River, including the tributaries of the Missouri, Arkansas, and White, and including a reservoir on the Red River; and certain modifications of the Mississippi River Flood Control Act of June 15, 1936, at an estimated cost of some $800,000,000, over a period of from 10 to 20 years, to the Government and to the local interests.

PARTIAL PLAN

Subsequently the President of the United States verbally recommended to the committee an amendment to the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, for an authorization of $24,877,000 for levees, flood walls, and drainage structures for the Ohio River Basin in accordance with the said report of the Chief of Engineers, the projects to be selected and substantially one-half the costs of construction for the fiscal year 1938 to be allocated from funds appropriated in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937.

HEARINGS

Thereupon a bill was introduced to carry out the recommendations of the President and hearings were conducted. The committee decided to limit hearings to the priority and emergency projects in the Ohio River Basin, with the understanding that hearings would be conducted on the comprehensive plan along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers at the next session of the Congress.

SOIL CONSERVATION

On April 27, 1935, the Soil Conservation Act was adopted and provisions were made for local cooperation on lands not owned or controlled by the United States.

The act of June 22, 1936, authorized preliminary examinations and surveys on the streams mentioned in section 6 of that act. As stated, the War Department had already submitted many reports on other streams. The flood-control work along the streams and flood-prevention work along the tributaries coordinate.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS AND SURVEYS

Many bills for preliminary examinations and surveys by the War Department and by the Department of Agriculture, as provided by law, have been introduced and referred to the Committee on Flood Control. The committee adopted the policy of including all such bills, where favorable reports had been submitted by the two departments, in one bill.

POLICY

The bill under consideration, H. R. 7646, is an amendment to the National Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, and enlarges and properly expands the policy of the act.

SECTION 1

Section 1 authorizes levees, flood walls, and drainage structures in the Ohio River Basin, as recommended, and in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers in House Committee on Flood Control Document No. 1, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, projects to be selected by the Chief of Engineers, with the approval of the Secretary of War, at a cost not to exceed $24,877,000. It is understood that the President will make available out of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937 approximately $12,000,000 for such construction. Section 1 contains the provision that regularly appropriated funds may be used for plant, material, supervisory and skilled services necessary in the execution of the projects authorized. It is believed that there will be no diminution in the funds regularly appropriated for flood control, as such funds will be supplemented from relief funds by a much greater amount than any amounts that may be used for plants and materials.

SECTION 2

Section 2 authorizes the Secretary of War, in approved projects where authorizations have been made and where appropriations have been made, to utilize not exceeding $300,000 per year and not exceeding $25,000 on any single stream, in removing debris and accumulated snags and in clearing the channels of navigable streams and their tributaries when, in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers, such work is advisable in the interest of flood control.

In the two Flood Control Acts of 1936 the cost of construction is borne by the United States. It is believed that in many cases flood control can be aided by clearing the channels to supplement levees and, in some cases, levees may be eliminated by clearing the channels. No additional authorization or appropriation is required by section 2.

SECTION 3

Section 3 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, under the policy of the act of 1936, to make preliminary examinations and surveys on projects on which the Secretary of War had been authorized and directed to survey and examine prior to the passage of the act of 1936. No additional authorization or appropriation is necessary or provided.

SECTION 4

Section 4 amends section 3 of the act of June 22, 1936, by including as already stated, the language of the Soil Conservation Act of April 27, 1935.

SECTION 5

Section 5 amends section 6 of the act of June 22, 1936, to authorize the Department of War and the Department of Agriculture to make preliminary examinations and surveys on the streams mentioned in said amendment to said act. These include the bills for preliminary examinations and surveys on which the War Department and the Department of Agriculture had submitted favorable reports, that would, ordinarily, be included in a single or omnibus bill.

PRIORITY AND EMERGENCY PROJECTS

The bill under consideration makes provision for the priority and emergency projects to be constructed in the lower Ohio River basin in the next 2 years. The principle of local contributions obtains; the same yardstick that was used in the Mississippi River Flood Control Act of June 15, 1936, and in the National or Omnibus Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, obtains in the bill under consideration. The local interests are required to provide for rights-of-way and lands for levees and river walls.

There is no dispute among engineers that levees and river walls for the protection of populous centers in the lower Ohio River Basin must come first. They are to be followed by reservoirs and soil-conservation work later.

VALUABLE DATA AND INFORMATION

The hearings contain valuable data. Exhaustive statements were submitted by the Chief of Engineers, the division engineer, and the district engineers. Flood damages in the Ohio River Basin in 1936 and 1937 were reported. They appear on page 27 of the hearings. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following statement of flood damages as submitted by the Chief of Engineers, to wit:

Flood damages in Ohio River Basin for 1937 and 1936

	1937	1936
PITTSBURGH DISTRICT		
Pittsburgh, Pa	$3,100,000	$53,000,000
McKees Rocks, Pa	425,000	5,500,000
Neville Island, Pa	14,000	142,000
Coraopolis, Pa	37,000	1,240,000
Leetsdale, Pa	4,000	100,000
Rochester, Pa	2,000	110,000
West Bridgewater, Pa	14,000	1,260,000
Industry, Pa	5,000	41,000
Smiths Ferry, Pa	6,000	61,000
Wellsville, Ohio	5,000	890,000
Strattonville, Ohio	12,000	104,000
Empire, Ohio	20,000	200,000
New Cumberland, W. Va	36,000	236,000
Follansbee, W. Va	29,000	585,000
Mingo Junction, Ohio	63,000	190,000
Wellsburg, W. Va	110,000	1,640,000
Brilliant, Ohio	12,000	180,000
Warwood, W. Va	15,000	114,000
Martins Ferry, Ohio	9,000	1,960,000
Wheeling, W. Va	900,000	3,900,000
Benwood, W. Va	224,000	1,000,000
Bellaire, Ohio	153,000	2,560,000
Moundsville, W. Va	23,000	187,000
Cambria County, Pa		60,000,000
Damages on tributaries, and to public utilities, highways, railways, and farms, etc., outside of towns	1,582,000	63,800,000
Total	6,800,000	199,000,000
ZANESVILLE DISTRICT		
Muskingum River Basin	3,300,000	
HUNTINGTON DISTRICT		
Powhatan Point, Ohio	42,000	75,000
Woodlands, W. Va	3,000	
Clarington, Ohio	25,000	50,000
Proctor, W. Va	3,000	8,000
New Martinsville, W. Va	340,000	433,000
Brooklyn, W. Va	32,000	54,000
Sardis, Ohio	2,000	5,000
Sistersville, W. Va	12,000	26,000
Friendly, W. Va	7,000	12,000
New Matamoras, Ohio	7,000	9,000
St. Marys, W. Va	42,000	67,000

Flood damages in Ohio River Basin for 1937 and 1936—Continued

	1937	1936
HUNTINGTON DISTRICT—continued		
Newport, Ohio	$3,000	$6,000
Waverley, W. Va	11,000	13,000
Marietta and West Marietta, Ohio	1,300,000	236,000
Williamstown, W. Va	42,000	8,000
Riverview, W. Va	16,000	
Belpre, Ohio	80,000	6,000
Parkersburg, W. Va	1,400,000	289,000
Hockingport, Ohio	6,000	
Portland, Ohio	3,000	2,000
Ravenswood, W. Va	15,000	
Millwood, W. Va	3,000	
Letart, W. Va	2,000	1,000
Letart Falls, Ohio	6,000	1,000
Racine, Ohio	60,000	11,000
Syracuse, Ohio	42,000	2,000
Hartford, W. Va	24,000	
Mason City, W. Va	60,000	6,000
Pomeroy, Ohio	315,000	71,000
Clifton, W. Va	6,000	2,000
Middleport, Ohio	515,000	37,000
Cheshire, Ohio	95,000	
Point Pleasant, W. Va	550,000	150,000
Henderson, W. Va	100,000	30,000
Mapleshade, Ohio	37,000	
Gallipolis, Ohio	165,000	19,000
Chambersburg, Ohio	3,000	
Miller, Ohio	21,000	1,000
Athalia, Ohio	22,000	1,000
Proctorville, Ohio	240,000	7,000
Huntington and Guyandot, W. Va	14,600,000	612,000
Chesapeake, Ohio	4,000	
Burlington, Ohio	7,000	
Ceredo and Kenova, W. Va	2,700,000	25,000
South Point, Ohio	32,000	
Catlettsburg, Ky	2,000,000	39,000
Damages to public utilities, highways, railways, farms, etc., outside of cities and towns	1,500,000	186,000
Total	26,500,000	2,500,000
CINCINNATI DISTRICT		
Normal, Ky	130,000	None
Ashland, Ky	3,200,000	None
Coalgrove, Ohio	175,000	None
Russell, Ky	350,000	None
Ironton and Hanging Rock, Ohio	7,600,000	None
Greenup, Ky	510,000	None
Sciotoville, Ohio	117,000	None
New Boston, Ohio	5,600,000	None
Portsmouth, Ohio	15,300,000	None
Fullerton, Ky	250,000	None
South Portsmouth, Ky	85,000	None
Buena Vista, Ohio	130,000	None
Vanceburg, Ky	1,120,000	None
Manchester, Ohio	680,000	None
Maysville, Ky	1,370,000	None
Aberdeen, Ohio	130,000	None
Ripley, Ohio	650,000	None
Dover, Ky	70,000	None
Higginsport, Ohio	190,000	None
Augusta, Ky	580,000	None
Chile, Ohio	140,000	None
Moscow, Ohio	560,000	None
New Richmond, Ohio	920,000	None
California, Ohio	500,000	None
Cincinnati, Ohio	35,000,000	None
Dayton, Ky	1,320,000	None
Belleview, Ky	270,000	None
Newport, Ky	3,900,000	None
Covington, Ky	5,300,000	None
Ludlow, Ky	435,000	None
Bromley, Ky	133,000	None
Lawrenceburg, Ind	3,900,000	None
Aurora, Ind	1,980,000	None
Rising Sun, Ind	85,000	None
Patriot, Ind	240,000	None
Vevay, Ind	200,000	None
Carrollton, Ky	550,000	None
Prestonville, Ky	130,000	None
Damages to public utilities, highways, railways, farms, etc., outside city and town areas	25,200,000	None
Total	119,000,000	None
LOUISVILLE DISTRICT		
Milton, Ky	141,000	None
Madison, Ind	496,000	None
Westport, Ky	11,000	None
Utica, Ind	208,000	None
Jeffersonville, and Clarksville, Ind	10,000,000	None
Louisville, Ky	94,500,000	None
New Albany, Ind	5,000,000	None
West Point, Ky	710,000	None
Mauckport, Ind	118,000	None
New Amsterdam, Ind	212,000	None
Leavenworth, Ind	272,000	None
Alton, Ind	17,000	None
Concordia, Ky	11,000	None
Derby, Ind	22,000	None
Rome, Ind	11,000	None
Cloverport, Ky	60,000	None

Flood damages in Ohio River Basin for 1937 and 1936—Continued

	1937	1936
LOUISVILLE DISTRICT—continued		
Hawesville, Ky	$90,000	None
Cannelton, Ind	270,000	None
Tell City, Ind	1,800,000	None
Troy, Ind	53,000	None
Lewisport, Ky	130,000	None
Grandview, Ind	254,000	None
Rockport, Ind	63,000	None
Owensboro, Ky., and Evansville, Ind	114,000	None
Howell, Ind	12,100,000	None
Uniontown, Ky	386,000	None
Shawneetown, Ill	1,100,000	None
Caseyville, Ky	23,000	None
Cave-in-Rock, Ill	8,000	None
Tolu, Ky	9,000	None
Elizabethtown, Ill	20,000	None
Rosiclare, Ill	100,000	None
Golconda, Ill	40,000	None
Smithland, Ky	114,000	None
Paducah, Ky	25,500,000	None
Brookport, Ill	400,000	None
Metropolis, Ill	472,000	None
Harrisburg, Ill	4,000,000	None
Belknap, Ill	16,000	None
Karnak, Ill	60,000	None
Ullin, Ill	18,000	None
Damages to public utilities, highways, railways, farms, etc., outside city and towns	89,071,000	None
Total	248,000,000	None
NASHVILLE DISTRICT		
Cumberland River Basin	5,000,000	None

Flood damages in Ohio River Basin for 1937 and 1936—Continued

	1937	1936
MEMPHIS DISTRICT		
Cairo, Ill	$110,000	None
Mound City, Ill	1,690,000	None
Mounds, Ill	800,000	None
Total	2,600,000	None
SUMMARY		
Pittsburgh district	$6,800,000	$199,000,000
Zanesville district	3,300,000	
Huntington district	26,500,000	2,500,000
Cincinnati district	119,000,000	
Louisville district	248,000,000	
Nashville district	5,000,000	
Total	408,600,000	201,500,000
Memphis district	2,600,000	
Grand total	411,200,000	201,500,000

The Chief of Engineers submitted a break-down of the costs of the local priority and protective works for the lower Ohio Basin, and they may be found on pages 45, 46, and 47 of the hearings. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith the names of the cities or towns, the plan of protective type to be constructed, the cost to the Government, the cost of rights-of-way, the total cost and the estimated value of property to be protected by each of the projects:

Ohio River Basin—Local protection plans

Name of city or town and State	Miles below Pittsburgh	Population (1930)	Maximum flood height	Plan of protection type	Estimated cost with 3 feet freeboard above maximum high water			Estimated value of property protected
					Construction	Rights-of-way	Total	
Pittsburgh, Pa	0	669,817	740.2					
Unit No. 1 (Golden Triangle)				Concrete wall	$3,150,000	$1,650,000	$4,800,000	$321,048,000
Unit No. 2 (north side)				do	8,450,000	1,620,000	10,070,000	156,200,000
Unit No. 3 (The Strip)				do	3,765,000	590,000	4,355,000	210,400,000
McKees Rocks, Pa	3	18,116	736.0	Earth levees and concrete walls	650,000	135,000	785,000	36,200,000
Neville Island, Pa	7	1,532	730.0	do	1,400,000	380,000	1,780,000	4,579,000
Coraopolis, Pa	10	10,724	727.4	do	900,000	165,000	1,065,000	17,000,000
Leetsdale, Pa	14	2,774		Earth levee	450,000	48,000	498,000	998,000
Rochester, Pa	25	7,726	712.2	Concrete wall	1,260,000	145,000	1,405,000	3,330,000
West Bridgewater, Pa	25	1,792	712.2	Earth levees and concrete walls	885,000	126,000	1,011,000	3,200,000
Industry, Pa	33	500	704.8	do	550,000	48,000	598,000	1,020,000
Smiths Ferry, Pa	39	271	698.4	Concrete wall	800,000	29,000	829,000	1,130,000
Wellsville, Ohio	48	7,956	690.4	do	325,000	38,000	363,000	10,020,000
Strattonville, Ohio	55	791	686.7	do	1,500,000	60,000	1,560,000	1,060,000
Empire, Ohio	56	703	685.5	do	1,110,000	43,000	1,153,000	1,710,000
New Cumberland, W. Va	57	2,300	684.4	Earth levees and concrete wall	1,065,000	60,000	1,125,000	3,020,000
Follansbee, W. Va	70	4,841	675.7	Concrete wall	970,000	55,000	1,025,000	6,150,000
Mingo Junction, Ohio	71	5,030	675.1	do	740,000	48,000	788,000	2,276,000
Wellsburg, W. Va	74	6,398	673.3	Earth levees and concrete walls	2,405,000	225,000	2,630,000	25,420,000
Brilliant, Ohio	74	1,682	673.3	Concrete wall	1,205,000	38,000	1,243,000	2,320,000
Warwood, W. Va	87	(1)	666.1	do	680,000	67,000	747,000	5,602,000
Martins Ferry, Ohio	88	14,524	666.0	do	1,840,000	220,000	2,060,000	7,305,000
Wheeling, W. Va	90	61,659	664.3					
Unit No. 1 (north of Wheeling, Cr.)				Concrete wall	7,015,000	740,000	7,755,000	35,960,000
Unit No. 2 (south of Wheeling, Cr.)				do	4,435,000	500,000	4,935,000	52,410,000
Unit No. 3 (Wheeling Island)				Earth levees and concrete wall	5,055,000	525,000	5,580,000	40,630,000
Benwood, W. Va	94	3,950	662.5	do	1,300,000	160,000	1,460,000	3,655,000
Bellaire, Ohio	95	13,327	661.4	do	3,000,000	370,000	3,370,000	16,460,000
Moundsville, W. Va	102	14,411	656.8	do	1,210,000	90,000	1,300,000	2,462,000
Powhatan Point, Ohio	110	2,329	651.0	Levee and concrete wall	1,759,000	135,000	1,894,000	1,038,000
Woodlands, W. Va	114	35	648.6	Levees	77,000	10,000	87,000	52,000
Clarington, Ohio	118	506	646.6	Levees and concrete wall	1,012,000	84,000	1,096,000	425,000
Proctor, W. Va	122	127	644.0	Levees	125,000	41,000	166,000	110,000
New Martinsville, W. Va	128	2,814	641.2	Levees and concrete wall	1,707,000	230,000	1,937,000	6,750,000
Brooklyn, W. Va	128	779	640.8	do	1,941,000	81,000	2,022,000	750,000
Sardis, Ohio	132	375	639.7	Levees	106,000	20,000	126,000	34,000
Sistersville, W. Va	138	3,072	637.6	Levees and concrete wall	661,000	96,000	757,000	510,000
Friendly, W. Va	142	170	635.9	do	245,000	22,000	267,000	234,000
New Matamoras, Ohio	142	781	636.0	do	779,000	98,000	877,000	419,000
St. Marys, W. Va	155	2,182	631.5	Levees and concrete wall	560,000	51,000	611,000	2,090,000
Newport, Ohio	156	500	631.1	Levees	119,000	28,000	147,000	45,000
Waverly, W. Va	165	285	628.8	Levees and concrete wall	1,298,000	88,000	1,386,000	193,000
Marietta, Ohio	172	14,285	626.9	do	5,202,000	280,000	5,482,000	19,316,000
West Marietta, Ohio		(2)						
Williamstown, W. Va	172	1,657	626.9	do	961,000	49,000	1,010,000	497,000
Riverview, W. Va	182	211	622.0	Levees	327,000	41,000	368,000	1,504,000
Belpre, Ohio	184	1,724	621.2	Levees and concrete wall	1,323,000	158,000	1,481,000	1,578,000
Parkersburg, W. Va	185	29,623	620.9	do	5,199,000	406,000	5,605,000	36,512,000
Hockingport, Ohio	199	230	612.0	Levees	212,000	80,000	292,000	39,000
Portland, Ohio	216	150	603.6	Levees and concrete wall	386,000	35,000	421,000	90,000
Ravenswood, W. Va	221	1,189	601.0	do	548,000	38,000	586,000	262,000
Millwood, W. Va	231	100	595.8	do	315,000	46,000	361,000	88,000
Letart, W. Va	236	100	593.3	do	350,000	42,000	392,000	45,000
Letart Falls, Ohio	236	375	593.3	do	370,000	42,000	412,000	211,000
Racine, Ohio	242	513	590.0	do	365,000	41,000	406,000	678,000

[1] Included in Wheeling population.

[2] Included in Marietta population.

Ohio River Basin—Local protection plans—Continued

Name of city or town and State	Miles below Pittsburgh	Population (1930)	Maximum flood height	Plan of protection type	Estimated cost with 3 feet freeboard above maximum high water			Estimated value of property protected
					Construction	Rights-of-way	Total	
Syracuse, Ohio	245	678	588.4	Levees and concrete wall	$604,000	$58,000	$662,000	$455,000
Hartford, W. Va	247	423	587.0	do	1,072,000	77,000	1,149,000	107,000
Mason City, W. Va	250	691	584.2	do	383,000	86,000	469,000	679,000
Pomeroy, Ohio	250	3,563	584.2	do	6,088,000	120,000	6,208,000	4,357,000
Clifton, W. Va	252	300	582.7	Levees	86,000	39,000	125,000	54,000
Middleport, Ohio	252	3,505	582.6	Levees and concrete wall	2,107,000	150,000	2,257,000	3,571,000
Cheshire, Ohio	258	320	580.1	Levees	159,000	49,000	208,000	259,000
Point Pleasant, W. Va	265	3,301	576.8	Levees and concrete wall	1,434,000	145,000	1,579,000	5,196,000
Henderson, W. Va	266	330	576.8	Levees	166,000	65,000	231,000	290,000
Mapleshade, Ohio	268	550	576.3	Levees and raising existing railroad embankment.	496,000	100,000	596,000	509,000
Gallipolis, Ohio	270	7,106	575.7	Levees, concrete wall, and raising existing railroad embankment.	997,000	285,000	1,282,000	6,990,000
Chambersburg, Ohio	280	250	572.2	Levees and concrete wall	595,000	18,000	613,000	33,000
Miller, Ohio	295	355	565.5	Levees	194,000	58,000	252,000	83,000
Athalia, Ohio	297	205	564.5	do	235,000	63,000	298,000	165,000
Proctorville, Ohio	305	675	561.8	Levees and concrete wall	1,000,000	75,000	1,075,000	703,000
Guyandot, W. Va	305	(3)		do	8,700,000	2,000,000	10,700,000	122,580,000
Huntington, W. Va	309	75,572	560.6					
Chesapeake, Ohio	309	1,094	560.6	Levees	123,000	47,000	170,000	68,000
Burlington, Ohio	313	309	559.2	do	55,000	40,000	95,000	98,000
Ceredo and Kenova, W. Va	315	4,844	588.7	Levees and concrete wall	2,985,000	300,000	3,285,000	13,172,000
South Point, Ohio	317	499	557.8	do	370,000	40,000	410,000	200,000
Catlettsburg, Ky	317	5,025	557.7	do	2,414,000	180,000	2,594,000	4,688,000
Normal, Ky	319	320	557.2	Levees and raising railroad embankment	1,225,000	650,000	1,875,000	273,600
Ashland, Ky	323	29,074	555.5	Walls, levees, and raising railroad embankment.	2,441,000	640,000	3,081,000	5,205,000
Coalgrove, Ohio	324	2,181	555.4	Walls and levees	650,000	352,000	1,002,000	1,311,000
Russell, Ky	327	2,084	554.3	do	337,000	106,000	443,000	717,000
Ironton, Ohio	327	16,621	554.3	do	3,283,000	1,150,000	4,433,000	15,693,000
Hanging Rock, Ohio	330	550						
Greenup, Ky	336	1,125	551.0	do	1,020,000	530,000	1,550,000	873,600
Sciotoville, Ohio	349	(4)	547.2	Walls	539,000	131,000	670,000	427,200
New Boston, Ohio	352	5,931	546.0	do	2,144,000	360,000	2,504,000	12,044,000
Portsmouth, Ohio	354	42,560	545.5	Walls and levees	3,996,000	24,000	4,020,000	36,150,000
Fullerton, Ky	355	1,237	545.3	do	143,000	120,000	263,000	491,500
South Portsmouth, Ky	356	420	545.3	Levees	192,000	150,000	342,000	192,700
Buena Vista, Ohio	374	335	539.1	do	186,000	150,000	336,000	188,000
Vanceburg, Ky	378	1,388	537.7	Walls and levees	632,000	375,000	1,007,000	727,000
Manchester, Ohio	397	2,009	530.7	do	348,000	352,000	700,000	1,110,000
Maysville, Ky	409	6,559	526.9	do	1,247,000	345,000	1,592,000	2,332,000
Aberdeen, Ohio	409	452	526.9	do	489,000	180,000	669,000	513,800
Ripley, Ohio	417	1,556	524.2	Walls and levees	728,000	345,000	1,073,000	790,000
Dover, Ky	420	418	523.5	Levees	226,000	200,000	426,000	251,100
Higginsport, Ohio	425	374	522.0	Walls and levees	537,000	220,000	757,000	105,100
Augusta, Ky	427	1,675	521.5	do	458,000	180,000	638,000	780,000
Chilo, Ohio	435	265	519.0	Levees	259,000	230,000	489,000	118,900
Moscow, Ohio	443	293	517.0	do	410,000	370,000	780,000	174,700
New Richmond, Ohio	450	1,830	515.0	Walls and levees	844,000	390,000	1,234,000	996,500
California, Ohio	462	(5)	512.5	Levees	434,000	390,000	824,000	1,060,000
Cincinnati, Ohio	470	451,160		Levees, walls and raising existing				
Unit No. 2 (Lunken Airport)	463		512.2	Levees	4,486,000	1,260,000	5,746,000	1,561,000
Unit No. 4 (main section Ohio River front and railroad terminal district).	471		509.0	Walls and levees	3,842,000	1,323,000	5,165,000	45,000,000
Unit No. 5 (upper Mill Creek, east side)				Levees	588,000	720,000	1,308,000	19,200,000
Unit No. 6 (lower Mill Creek, west side)				do	441,000	550,000	991,000	7,550,000
Unit No. 7 (South Fairmount, Mill Creek)				Wall	620,000	170,000	790,000	7,075,000
Unit No. 7A (Fairmount, Ohio)				do	80,000	32,000	112,000	220,000
Unit No. 9 (Cumminsville, Mill Creek)				Walls and levees	1,775,000	1,377,000	3,152,000	11,375,000
Dayton, Ky	468	9,071	510.1	Levees	564,000	412,000	976,000	2,360,000
Bellevue, Ky	469	8,497	509.8	do	408,000	330,000	738,000	715,000
Newport, Ky	470	29,744	509.4	Walls and levees	1,411,000	545,000	1,956,000	3,550,000
Covington, Ky	471	65,252	509.0	do	1,673,000	568,000	2,241,000	3,308,000
Ludlow, Ky	473	6,485	508.1	do	954,000	240,000	1,194,000	748,000
Bromley, Ky	474	1,017	507.7	Levees	468,000	300,000	768,000	249,500
Lawrenceburg, Ind	493	4,072	501.7	Raising existing levees	1,450,000	238,000	1,688,000	3,894,000
Aurora, Ind	497	4,386	500.6	Walls and levees	1,630,000	600,000	2,230,000	3,135,000
Rising Sun, Ind	506	1,379	497.6	do	500,000	52,000	552,000	188,200
Patriot, Ind	519	288	490.4	do	283,000	126,000	409,000	126,000
Vevay, Ind	538	1,183	481.6	do	748,000	220,000	968,000	178,000
Carrollton, Ky	546	2,409	479.0	Levees	773,000	480,000	1,253,000	431,000
Prestonville, Ky	547	163	478.7	Walls and levees	478,000	200,000	678,000	102,000
Milton, Ky	557	347	475.8	Concrete wall	932,000	13,000	945,000	96,400
Madison, Ind	558	6,530	475.3	do	2,160,000	115,000	2,275,000	502,000
Westport, Ky	580	317	468.3	do	602,000	12,000	614,000	12,600
Utica, Ind	596	426	463.4	Levees	587,000	42,000	629,000	131,000
Jeffersonville, Ind	604	11,946	460.9	Earth levee and concrete wall	3,000,000	1,210,000	4,210,000	21,000,000
Clarksville, Ind	605	2,243	460.5					
Louisville, Ky	604	307,745	460.9	do	4,500,000	2,610,000	7,110,000	331,000,000
New Albany, Ind	609	25,819	459.1	do	2,350,000	470,000	2,820,000	27,000,000
West Point, Ky	630	697	453.5	Levee	556,000	85,000	641,000	468,000
Mauckport, Ind	648	203	447.0	Levees	422,000	75,000	497,000	114,000
New Amsterdam, Ind	656	101	444.5	do	179,000	3,000	182,000	30,500
Leavenworth, Ind	664	418	441.0	Levees and concrete walls	400,000	90,000	490,000	163,000
Alton, Ind	679	109	432.5	Levees	96,000	14,000	110,000	42,200
Concordia, Ky	686	163	428.5	do	222,000	16,000	238,000	36,000
Derby, Ind	692	200	425.2	Levee and concrete wall	208,000	21,000	229,000	12,000
Rome, Ind	701	175	420.0	Levees	135,000	24,000	159,000	24,000
Cloverport, Ky	711	1,324	415.1	Levee and concrete wall	258,000	55,000	313,000	213,000
Hawesville, Ky	724	790	409.2	do	685,000	31,000	716,000	240,000
Cannelton, Ind	724	2,265	409.7	do	1,040,000	95,000	1,135,000	1,110,000
Tell City, Ind	727	4,873	408.3	do	1,195,000	95,000	1,290,000	3,000,000
Troy, Ind	731	562	406.7	Levee and concrete wall	189,000	45,000	234,000	115,000
Lewisport, Ky	738	574	403.0	Levee	137,000	64,000	201,000	210,000
Grandview, Ind	742	588	401.6	Levee	203,000	43,000	246,000	230,000
Rockport, Ind	747	2,396	399.4	Levee and concrete wall	145,000	43,000	188,000	200,000
Owensboro, Ky	756	22,765	394.1	do	250,000	55,000	305,000	480,000
Evansville, Ind	793	108,000	382.4	do	1,970,000	300,000	2,270,000	36,000,000
Howell, Ind								
Uniontown, Ky	842	1,235	377.1	Levee	260,000	78,000	338,000	1,084,000

[3] Included in Huntington population. [4] Included in Portsmouth population. [5] Included in Cincinnati population.

Ohio River Basin—Local protection plans—Continued

Name of city or town and State	Miles below Pittsburgh	Population (1930)	Maximum flood height	Plan of protection type	Estimated cost with 3 feet freeboard above maximum high water			Estimated value of property protected
					Construction	Rights-of-way	Total	
Shawneetown, Ill	858	1,440	373.4	Levee	$375,000	$120,000	$495,000	$622,000
Caseyville, Ky	871	224	371.0	do	149,000	9,000	158,000	11,000
Cave-in-rock, Ill	881	430	367.1	do	248,000	40,000	288,000	75,000
Tolu, Ky	886	50	365.0	do	114,000	10,000	124,000	10,000
Elizabethtown, Ill	889	488	363.6	do	210,000	48,000	258,000	48,700
Rosiclare, Ill	892	1,794	362.9	Levee and concrete wall	571,000	60,000	631,000	225,000
Golconda, Ill	902	1,184	357.5	do	380,000	26,000	460,000	368,500
Smithland, Ky	921	519	351.6	do	325,000	120,000	445,000	159,000
Paducah, Ky	933	33,541	347.1	Levee, concrete wall and raising railroad embankment.	5,327,000	2,152,000	7,479,000	66,140,000
Brookport, Ill	938	1,336	346.3	Levees and concrete wall	340,000	130,000	470,000	714,000
Metropolis, Ill	944	5,573	344.2	Levee	543,000	142,000	685,000	827,000
Harrisburg, Ill. (Saline River)		7,125	375.9	Levees	900,000	140,000	1,040,000	10,600,000
Belknap, Ill. (Cache River)		275	346.3	do	90,000	10,000	100,000	60,000
Karnak, Ill. (Cache River)		771	341.5	Levees and raising railroad embankment	190,000	100,000	290,000	291,000
Ullin, Ill (Cache River)		800	340.0	do	45,000	10,000	55,000	275,000
Total					190,753,000	40,916,000	231,669,000	1,906,723,300

I call attention to the fact that there is a break-down of the costs of the reservoirs recommended along the tributaries of the Ohio River and along the tributaries of the Mississippi River. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I give the said break-down, as follows:

Cost of proposed reservoirs

OHIO RIVER BASIN

Reservoir	To be borne by United States—Construction	To be borne by local interests				Total cost to local interests (exclusive of construction)
		Lands	Highways	Railroads	Utilities and other damages	
Beaver River Basin:						
Mahoning	$1,100,000	$1,450,000	$550,000	$285,000	$15,000	$2,300,000
Shenango	1,000,000	1,350,000	250,000	1,675,000	25,000	3,300,000
Little Kanawha River Basin:						
Burnsville	2,300,000	114,000	325,000		9,000	448,000
Leading Creek	2,100,000	211,000	361,000		164,000	736,000
Steer Creek	2,400,000	214,000	150,000		386,000	750,000
West Fork	1,900,000	376,000	662,000		82,000	1,120,000
Hocking River Basin: Athens County	3,200,000	1,720,000	530,000	2,740,000	210,000	5,200,000
Big Sandy River Basin:						
Yatesville	400,000	2,079,000	1,135,000			3,214,000
Dewey	1,550,000	1,450,000	940,000			2,390,000
Fishtrap	4,300,000	741,000	842,000		7,000	1,590,000
Scioto River Basin:						
Bellepoint	1,320,000	1,241,000	1,441,000	196,000	57,000	2,935,000
Delaware	2,550,000	825,000	802,000		13,000	1,640,000
Paint Creek	2,365,000	507,000	900,000	60,000	3,000	1,470,000
Deer Creek	1,920,000	375,000	321,000		14,000	710,000
Rocky Fork	1,035,000	277,000	396,000		12,000	685,000
Little Miami River Basin:						
Caesar Creek	2,720,000	450,000	414,000		11,000	875,000
East Fork	3,935,000	463,000	42,000		10,000	515,000
Licking River Basin: Myers	2,850,553	1,400,000	103,000		13,120	1,516,120
Miami River Basin:						
Metamora	7,600,000	2,709,000	570,000	1,030,000	16,000	4,325,000
Brookville	5,535,000	1,010,000	618,000		23,000	1,650,000
Kentucky River Basin:						
Laurel Branch	1,260,000	296,000	56,000	80,000	3,000	435,000
Buckhorn	2,080,000	320,000	163,000		7,000	490,000
Booneville	3,240,000	620,000	35,000		10,000	665,000
Salt River Basin: Rolling Fork	2,260,000	154,000	35,000	98,000	13,000	300,000
Green River Basin:						
No. 1 Barren River	3,692,000	608,000	155,000		57,000	820,000
No. 2 Barren River	4,565,000	604,000	423,000		43,000	1,070,000
Drakes Creek	4,112,000	334,000	137,000		22,000	493,000
No. 1 Green River	3,572,000	260,000	334,000		26,000	620,000
No. 2 Green River	1,966,000	265,000	27,000	248,000	60,000	600,000
Nolin River	4,983,000	587,000	478,000		32,000	1,097,000
Rough River	4,125,000	229,000	503,000		18,000	750,000
Wabash River Basin:						
Delphi	2,418,000	1,420,000	1,772,000		60,000	3,252,000
Hog Point	1,825,000	385,000	220,000	70,000	20,000	695,000
High Bridge	2,222,000	315,000	325,000	300,000	48,000	988,000
Danville	944,000	2,050,000	426,000	990,000	90,000	3,556,000
Wolf Creek	1,270,000	960,000	245,000	160,000	20,000	1,385,000
Spencer	1,445,000	3,520,000	700,000	2,700,000	80,000	7,000,000
Mansfield	1,370,000	235,000	225,000		65,000	525,000
Cagles Mill	1,023,000	378,000	52,000		25,000	455,000
Cumberland River Basin:						
Wolf Creek	17,600,000	4,340,000	5,850,000	1,305,000	5,000	11,500,000
Dale Hollow	4,100,000	2,100,000	900,000			3,000,000
Center Hill	14,800,000	2,750,000	1,300,000		250,000	4,300,000
Stewarts Ferry	4,500,000	5,525,000	875,000			6,400,000
Rossview	4,300,000	1,700,000	2,100,000			3,800,000
Three Islands	6,100,000	1,725,000	775,000			2,500,000
Total	151,853,000	50,642,000	29,463,000	11,937,000	2,023,000	94,065,000

Cost of proposed reservoirs—Continued

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Reservoir	To be borne by United States—Construction	To be borne by local interests				Total cost to local interests (exclusitve of construction)
		Lands	Highways	Railroads	Utilities and other damages	
Kansas River:						
Tuttle Creek	$16,574,000	$1,422,000	$3,451,000	$5,119,000	$82,000	$10,812,000
Milford	17,408,000	1,710,000	632,000	3,385,000	1,258,000	6,985,000
Grand River: Chillicothe	12,486,000	6,700,000	4,493,000	12,222,000	None	23,415,000
Gasconade River: Arlington	3,535,000	575,000	378,000	None	None	953,000
Osage River:						
Osceola	3,957,000	11,165,000	3,765,000	5,740,000	492,000	21,162,000
South Grand	4,358,000	2,300,000	1,113,000	2,452,000	None	5,955,000
Pomme de Terre	3,605,000	510,000	903,000	None	None	1,413,000
Total	61,923,000	24,472,000	14,735,000	28,918,000	2,570,000	70,695,000

MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

Meramec River:						
Meramec (mile 63.4)	$4,384,000	$1,682,000	$800,000	$1,900,000	$145,000	$4,527,000
Big River	2,457,000	932,000	660,000	None	73,000	1,665,000
Kaskaskia River: Carlyle	3,913,000	2,525,000	225,000	840,000	263,000	3,853,000
Total	10,754,000	5,139,000	1,685,000	2,740,000	481,000	10,045,000

WHITE RIVER BASIN

White River and tributaries:						
Clearwater	$4,500,000	$1,000,000	$60,000	None	None	$1,060,000
Greers Ferry	2,100,000	500,000	50,000	$190,000	None	740,000
Water Valley	4,850,000	1,075,000	30,000	None	None	1,105,000
Bell Foley	2,320,000	350,000	60,000	None	None	410,000
Lone Rock	10,800,000	975,000	60,000	None	None	1,035,000
North Fork	7,300,000	570,000	100,000	None	None	670,000
Total	31,870,000	4,470,000	360,000	190,000	None	5,020,000

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

Arkansas River and tributaries:						
Tenkiller Ferry	$10,300,000	$650,000	$30,000	$5,000	None	$685,000
Nimrod	1,390,000	1,100,000	25,000	None	None	1,125,000
Pensacola	8,000,000	5,000,000	660,000	540,000	None	6,200,000
Blue Mountain	875,000	240,000	45,000	80,000	None	365,000
Wister	2,200,000	1,600,000	390,000	560,000	None	2,550,000
Oologah	2,360,000	3,120,000	180,000	None	None	3,300,000
Mannford	2,500,000	2,500,000	100,000	230,000	None	2,830,000
Total	27,625,000	14,210,000	1,430,000	1,415,000	None	17,055,000

RED RIVER BASIN

Denison Reservoir [1]	$25,000,000	$6,700,000	----------	$4,200,000	----------	$10,900,000

[1] Corrected Denison Reservoir costs—typographical error in report, Committee Doc. No. 1, 75th Cong., 1st sess.

There is also in the hearings a statement of the costs of construction in the various districts along the Ohio River. The Weather Bureau, the Forestry Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and other bureaus of the Department of Agriculture submitted valuable information, all of which may be found in the hearings. The report of the Chief of Engineers and letter of transmittal of the President of the United States are also published in the hearings.

ERRONEOUS IDEAS ABOUT FLOODS

There are many erroneous ideas, and there is much misinformation respecting floods and the solution of the flood problem. Probably the most erroneous statement that I ever heard came from a lawyer in the lower Mississippi Valley whose law office was located on the landside slope of a Mississippi River levee. He had lived in the same little river town for 50 years. His theories were finespun and his notions were most weird; his remedies for flood control were utterly unsound.

There are many fallacious ideas widely held by people of intelligence. I mention but a few of the popular erroneous beliefs:

First. It is said that floods are largely the work of man; he is charged with being the despoiler of the lands and the destroyer of the forests. Run-off has been increased, but the fact remains that in mythical, as well as historical, times many major floods occurred before the forests were cleared or the grasses plowed.

Second. Again it has been stated that floods are much worse than they were when America was young. The greatest flood in the Mississippi Valley occurred in 1844. Probably the greatest flood in the Ohio Valley occurred in 1763. There is nothing wrong with the statement that floods are worse today than previously except that the statement is not borne out by the facts.

Third. It is said that the large rivers carry much more silt than they formerly did. This is especially alleged respecting the Mississippi River. Millions of years ago the Gulf of Mexico covered the region we now call the Mississippi Valley, and the Mississippi River emptied into the sea somewhere in the vicinity of Cairo, Ill. Erosion occurred then as now. The Mississippi River dumped an enormous burden of earth in the ocean. Slowly as the ages came and went the coast line was pushed to the south.

Fourth. It is stated that the bed of the Mississippi River is rising at an enormous rate on account of deposits of silt. It is thus alleged that the building of levees higher and higher is necessary. It is also alleged that the bottom of the Mississippi River at New Orleans is higher than the streets of the city. The fact is that the river is constantly cleaning out. Man is not responsible for all of the moods of the Mississippi River. The greatest erosion results from the

wear and tear on the banks of the stream itself. The statement that the bed of the Mississippi River is rising is found to be utterly unfounded. Occasionally the river bed has risen a little in some locality, but just as often it is scoured deeper in another. All well-informed engineers agree that there is no general or continued trend either up or down.

The levees have been built higher and higher because the people have demanded better protection. Instead of the bottom of the river being above the streets of the city of New Orleans, the fact is that the approximate mean depth of the river at New Orleans is 105 feet below low water. There is no evidence that the river bed at New Orleans, or in the lower Mississippi Valley generally, has ever risen.

Fifth. Again, it is asserted that the way to prevent floods is to keep the waters out of the streams by forests and soil erosion. I do not underestimate conservation. I have already pointed out that some of the ancient floods were the most destructive.

Sixth. Probably the most common of all the erroneous theories is that floods can be completely controlled by reservoirs, and that reservoirs can be paid for by generating power at the dams.

In 1937 there were 2,000,000 cubic feet per second flowing past Cairo. The water which the Ohio River dumped into the Mississippi River during January and February would fill 100 reservoirs the size of the District of Columbia to a depth of 20 feet. The District has an area of 70 square miles. The water would have filled the Boulder Dam reservoir three times over and left an excess that would have covered the District of Columbia 156 feet deep.

I am not arguing against reservoirs. I am saying that dams alone will not do the job. It is wise to protect the valleys of the tributaries themselves by reservoirs when the cost is not too great. But local protective works are imperatively necessary. Including those already adopted and those recommended, there are some 80 reservoirs along the tributaries of the Ohio River. If all those 80 reservoirs had been in operation during the flood this year, only one-half of them would have been effective. There were no major floods in the upper stretches of the Ohio River, and the reservoirs there would not have prevented the floods in the lower river. Again, reservoirs on the tributaries of the Ohio River could not have solved the problem in 1937—too much of the heavy rainfall was concentrated right along the Ohio River itself. Tributary reservoirs would be of assistance in lowering flood crests, but they cannot prevent floods. Ohio floods must be kept out of the cities and towns by walls and by embankments. The Dayton reservoirs protected the Dayton area, but the Miami watershed is only a small fraction of the total Ohio watershed. The water which is kept out by the Dayton reservoirs has little effect on the flood stage of the river itself.

Thirteen earthen dams and one concrete dam are now being constructed on the tributaries of the Muskingum River. The Muskingum drainage area is only about 8,000 square miles. The Ohio watershed includes 204,000 square miles. None of the five Dayton reservoirs and none of the Muskingum reservoirs provides for the development of power. There is a reason. To be effective for flood control a reservoir must be empty, or relatively so at the beginning of the flood season. A dam with no head of water cannot generate electricity. Not one of the 19 dams in the Miami and Muskingum Valleys was designed for the production of electricity. The reason is the engineers were undertaking to control floods. Flood control in the main, and especially east of the Mississippi River, cannot finance itself.

The advocates of the development of power in reservoirs in the eastern United States that are constructed for flood control will be disappointed. Power and flood control in the same reservoir are incompatible. There is but one river east of the Mississippi River comparable to the West and Southwest where power and flood control are possible and practicable in the same reservoirs. That river is the Tennessee River. There is no other Tennessee River in the eastern section of the United States. Flood control and power are provided for at Boulder Dam. Provision can be made for flood control and for the development of power along the Red River, notably at Denison, Tex., and along the White River, but generally, as I have stated, east of the Mississippi River power and flood control in the same river are incompatible.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER CONQUERED

The flood of 1937 from Cairo to Helena was the highest in the history of that stretch of the Mississippi River. For the first time a major flood was carried in safety between the levees to the Gulf of Mexico. The engineers of the Army were entrusted with the flood control of the lower Mississippi River for the first time under the act of 1928. The theory that levees only would control the floods in the Mississippi River was exploded. A floodway to protect Cairo was provided. A floodway to protect the city of New Orleans was constructed. An outlet through the Atchafalaya has been opened up. A diversion to supplement the levees was provided. The levees were raised about 3 feet, but two additional important steps were taken—cut-offs have been constructed and diversions have been provided for. When the protective works have been completed the lower Mississippi River will be controlled.

OHIO RIVER THE NEXT BIG JOB

The next big task for flood control in the United States is the Ohio River. Levees comparable to those along the lower Mississippi River will not work along the Ohio River; it is a different kind of a stream. Continuous levee lines would not be practicable, for nearly everywhere ancient hills slope sharply down to the stream, constricting the flood plain to narrow bottoms. These same hills would prevent cut-offs and auxiliary floodways. The solution of the problem in the Ohio is levees and river walls to protect the cities and populous communities, and reservoirs along the tributaries to supplement the local protective works.

LIBERALIZATION OR FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

It is evident that many of the reservoirs provided in the Omnibus Flood Control Act of 1936 will never be constructed. The local interests cannot provide for the lands and flowage rights. There are some notable exceptions. A populous area like Pittsburgh and a great State like Pennsylvania may provide for lands and flowage rights for reservoirs for the protection of the Pittsburgh area. The New England States, by proper compacts, may provide for the lands and flowage rights to protect the large centers of population in those States. Lands and flowage rights may be furnished for the rather small reservoirs in southern New York.

In the Southwest a similar situation obtains, but it is evident that along the White River, and other tributaries of the Mississippi River, as well as along the tributaries of the Ohio River, the local interests will be unable to provide the lands and flowage rights for reservoirs. State compacts will not avail. It is impossible to estimate the benefits to the different localities and to the different States.

In the comprehensive flood control bill that the country expects next session, I believe that there must be a liberalization of the Federal contribution toward the construction of reservoirs for flood control.

WHAT IS THE UNITED STATES GOING TO DO ABOUT THE PROBLEM OF FLOOD CONTROL?

If there are to be public expenditures for unemployment I know of no better way to disburse these funds than a flood-control program that would give priority to emergency work and prevent a recurrence of the 1937 flood in the lower Ohio and Mississippi Valleys. Great floods, like the sword of Damocles, hang over thousands and thousands of men, women, and children in the United States. I trust that the Committee on Flood Control will report, and that the Congress of the United States, at its next session, will adopt a comprehensive plan of national flood control for all of the rivers in all parts of our common country.

I like to think of America not so much as a land of banks and factories, not so much as a country of great cities and magnificent highways, but as the homes of the greatest and best people in all the world. The first duty of the Government is to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

I believe in internal improvements. Public works obtain in all progressive countries. I sympathize with the problem of unemployment in the great cities and populous communities. If the problem is to be solved, many workmen must leave their present places of abode. The Panama Canal was not constructed by those who lived in the vicinity of that monumental improvement. Laborers were transported for the work. The transcontinental railways in the United States were not built by those who lived on the plains and in the mountains. Here again labor was transported. Unemployment in the congested centers was relieved. Permanent public works will provide for unemployment; the funds will not be wasted or dissipated; permanent improvements will result.

The people of the United States are determined not to perish in great floods, but to be protected from great floods.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall use a few moments to pay tribute to the chairman of the Flood Control Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

This legislation we have here today is the result of a resolution that was submitted to General Markham, Chief of Engineers, from the Flood Control Committee under date of February 10, requesting a complete report on the Ohio River and its tributaries, the Mississippi and the Missouri and their tributaries. The Members of the House well remember the severe flood which we had at that time on the Ohio River, which was highly dramatized by the newspapers and the radio. We were all concerned about it. Today we come in with a bill authorizing an appropriation of $25,000,000 to aid in the flood protection of this stream. The chairman of our committee has stated that the loss due to this flood was estimated at $400,000,000, possibly twice that when you consider the economic loss in that section. Therefore, while I am happy over the amount this bill contains, I think it is regrettable that we did not bring a larger amount for flood control, not only for this river, but for other rivers in the United States.

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

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is fair to say that the committee delayed the consideration of the comprehensive plan reluctantly, and the committee intends to bring in a comprehensive bill not only for the Ohio River and its tributaries, but for other rivers, at the next session of the Congress.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is also true that this bill was reported unanimously by the committee and has the approval of the Budget, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Department.

Mr. CARLSON. If the chairman will permit, I was just coming to that point. This bill has the approval of the committee and it comes with the assurance that next year we expect to go into this matter further and report to this House legislation that will deal with all of these streams with which we are vitally concerned. The Ohio River has a flood one year, your river in your community has a flood next year. In fact, we cannot tell where the flood will be. Therefore I am sincerely hoping that next year we will be able to bring in a comprehensive flood-control bill.

I want to discuss for a few moments one phase of this bill, and that is section 3. The War Department has complete charge of flood-control projects on major streams. The Department of Agriculture in the act of 1936 was given watershed control. This act enlarges that control. That is what I want to speak of. I think most of us feel the time has arrived in the United States when we must begin to have water control at its source. Therefore we used the words in this legislation "water run-off" and "water retardation." I think we should begin immediately to control water at its source. Personally I feel we have been great wasters as a nation. We have destroyed and wasted some of our great natural resources, especially land and water. We are destroying them rapidly. We have destroyed 100,000,000 acres of land by erosion. Dr. Hugh Bennett says we are losing every year 200,000 acres of our most fertile soil. Therefore I am very much interested in this particular phase of the legislation that deals with water run-off.

I am especially interested in that because in the Midwest we have seven or eight States that are vitally concerned in water conservation and water run-off. Personally I am convinced that the future of a large section of seven or eight States, including the Dakotas, Minnesota, Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico is going to be determined by the amount of water we can conserve and use. This legislation is a step in that direction.

I want to speak for the construction of ponds, or anything that we may build out in that section that will hold the water after it falls. As far as the State of Kansas is concerned, I am proud of our pond-building record. Since 1934 we have a program of 50,000 ponds in the State of Kansas. We have constructed now over 3,000 ponds, with a minimum capacity of 15 acre-feet of water. This has been done through the cooperation of the Works Progress Administration and the Governors of our State. I am very happy over the results we have achieved. The State of Kansas is assisting in this and it may be of interest to other States as to the aid we give. Our State gives a reduction in taxable value of $40 for every acre-foot of water that can be conserved in these ponds. It has done a great deal to aid in the construction of the ponds.

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

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

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Kansas 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. FERGUSON. In regard to the ponds in Kansas, I just had the privilege of flying over the State of Kansas right after a big rain, and from the air it looked like that area had turned into the lake region of Minnesota. You have done a very effective job, and a lot of water that ordinarily would have been wasted is now stored in the Kansas plains.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the gentleman for that contribution, because so many people feel we do not have any water run-off. I would like to discuss the flood on the Republican River in May and June 1935, and only wish I had more time.

This stream has its source in Colorado and, after flowing half way across the State of Nebraska, turns down into Kansas and is a tributary of the Kansas River. Few realize the enormity of this flood.

The loss of life was greatest in the upper parts of the valley in Colorado and Nebraska, where the flood occurred at night. A total of 110 lives were lost. The loss of livestock was 20,593. More than 275,000 acres of farm land were damaged, most of which contained growing crops or hay. Several hundred miles of highways and railroads were destroyed or damaged, also 515 highway bridges and many railroad bridges. The number of homes destroyed or damaged was very large, especially in the upper part of the valley, where the water rose to unprecedented heights. In Kansas 1,485 homes and 1,552 buildings other than homes were flooded.

We are much concerned about legislation that will assist us in controlling these flood waters at their source.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentlemean yield for me to make a short statement, in view of the limited time?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The hearings on this legislation are valuable. They contain an exhaustive report by the Chief of Engineers covering flood control and reservoirs for power and flood control. They contain probably the most exhaustive statements ever made by the Soil Conservation Service, by the Forestry Service, and by the Weather Bureau with respect to floods. There are many other statements that would be valuable to those interested in floods, as well

as a letter from the President of the United States transmitting the report of the Chief of Engineers to the Committee on Flood Control.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I realize that the time is very limited for debate on the pending bill, and there is really not much necessity for further debate, because the distinguished chairman of the committee has fully covered the bill in his splendid remarks, and there appears to be very little, if any, opposition to the measure.

I have very actively supported and worked for the passage of flood-control legislation during the entire time I have been privileged to serve as a Member of Congress, and am glad to have an opportunity to raise my voice in support of this bill. While this measure does not go as far as I would like, yet we realize that under the program of the President it is all that we can hope to get at this time.

I have been especially active in my efforts to secure proper consideration and the passage of further legislation for the benefit of that area in Tennessee along the Mississippi River in the district which I have the honor to represent. This is the largest unprotected area along the Mississippi River, embracing some half a million acres of the finest land to be found anywhere. I have been assured by the Government engineers that sufficient provisions have been made both in legislative authority and appropriation of funds to provide for the extension of the levee from Tiptonville, Tenn., to the mouth of the Obion River, and that this work will be under way just as promptly as possible. I am hoping that in the legislation which is contemplated for the next session of Congress that proper provisions will be made for flowage rights for the unprotected part of this area, and I shall certainly continue my efforts to accomplish this result.

I have also been especially active in endeavoring to secure proper and very badly needed assistance for dredging and channel improvement of the Obion, South Fork, Forked Deer, and Hatchie Rivers in Tennessee. A most serious drainage and flood problem has existed on these rivers for some time, and I am especially gratified that provision is included in this bill whereby this much-needed improvement can be made on these rivers. I have conferred repeatedly with the engineers and have been assured that this work will be done as promptly as possible.

The pending bill should be passed by all means, and the investigations of the Army engineers carried forward as now contemplated and a report made, and further flood-control legislation extending even greater benefits should be passed early in the next session of Congress.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, would time permit, I had intended to discuss the bill more thoroughly. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the bill at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, had the pending bill come up under different circumstances; that is, under the ordinary rules of the House, or a special rule which permitted amendment, I had intended to offer an amendment for the serious consideration of the House.

A comprehensive flood-control system for the Sacramento River in California was authorized in the Flood Control Act of March 1, 1937, and modified and extended by the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928. Not going into unnecessary detail, I should like to call attention to the fact that the total cost of this entire flood-control system was estimated at $51,000,000, and that the Federal appropriation authorized for the execution of the parts of the project undertaken at Federal cost was $17,600,000. This authorization, with the passage of the present non-Military Establishment bill, will be entirely exhausted. The amount of money appropriated in that bill for the continuation of the Sacramento River flood-control work is not sufficient to complete the necessary work of wave-wash protection, levee set-back, or bank revetment.

In response to a resolution adopted by the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, December 13, 1935, the Board of Army Engineers has proceeded to review the previous reports with a view to determining whether any modification in the existing project with respect to the maintenance of these project works is advisable at the present time. Under date of June 24, 1937, Maj. Gen. E. M. Markham transmitted the report of the Board, together with his own recommendations, to the Senate committee. Of course, this document was not available to the House Committee on Flood Control, whose chairman, Mr. WHITTINGTON, had already the day before introduced the pending bill in the House; and it would have been impossible for the committee to have included these recommendations in its report.

However, the recommendations provide for a further expenditure by the Federal Government for the maintenance of the enlarged channel of the river below Cache Slough, including the protection of its shores and the maintenance and operation of gages on navigable streams and channels. The State of California is to assume the maintenance of the weirs at the head of the bypasses, except for the construction of such protection of the river bank as may be necessary to insure their permanence. State or local contributions of one-third of the cost of bank-protection works and levee set-backs are recommended. With this contribution, the estimated further cost to the Federal Government will amount to a total of $2,500,000. This work will be undertaken over a period of 5 years, beyond which period the Board of Army Engineers does not make any recommendations at this time. It is obvious that by the end of that period, further consideration of construction and protection will have to be given, particularly in view of the fact that during this same period of 5 years, construction on the Kennett Dam under the Central Valley water project will be proceeding. Toward this dam there has already been authorized a Federal appropriation of $12,000,000. It is obvious that its completion will have a beneficial effect on both navigation and flood control, but it will not completely solve the situation, for not all of the water in the lower Sacramento will come through Kennett Dam. The work recommended by the Board of Army Engineers to the extent of $2,500,000 will, however, accomplish what is immediately and urgently needed in the execution of bank-protection works recommended by the California Debris Commission.

It had been my purpose to offer an amendment adding a new section to the bill providing that the project for the control of floods in the Sacramento River, Calif., should be modified in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 24, 1937, to which I have referred, and subject to the conditions set forth in said report. Amendments not being in order under suspension of the rules, it will be necessary for me to ask one of the California Senators to urge the inclusion of a similar provision in the bill when it is before the Senate; and when the bill comes back to conference, if such amendment is adopted, I sincerely hope that it will have the approval of the conferees.

I have taken the time of the House to explain this matter somewhat in detail so that when such a conference report does come back the Members may be informed. This is not a new work—it is a continuation of an existing work on which over $50,000,000 have been spent, and is vitally necessary to the protection of the Federal interest in both navigation and flood control.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN].

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I hope that Pittsburgh and other places endangered by floods will, in the near future, obtain sufficient appropriations for the prevention of floods.

If we were to spend a billion dollars for the prevention of floods, it would not be one cent too much. In 2 years hundreds of millions of dollars' damage was brought about because of these disasters. The construction of reservoirs, dams, ponds, canals, and other projects would undoubtedly not only prevent disastrous floods but forest fires, dust storms, and droughts. No place in the United States or its possessions would ever need to be without water if such projects were constructed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DIXON] 1 minute.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, it would be presumptuous for me to attempt to deal with the technical engineering features for the elimination of future floods. General Markham has already very ably explained the survey made by the Army engineers to this committee. I come before you, however, to remind this committee of its obligation to the citizens of the Ohio Valley.

There is little need of my delving deeply into the millions of dollars in property damage, as well as the loss of hundreds of lives. However, I should like to mention that it was estimated that the flood drove 103,000 from their homes; 24 counties of the State of Ohio were affected by the flood and there was extreme damage in 8 of those counties. The Red Cross alone cared for and fed 84,000 persons in Ohio, and Cincinnati alone suffered a loss in property damage of approximately $27,000,000.

But the figures tell only part of the tragic story. Mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, and friends separated and dependent upon charity, crowded together in every conceivable kind of shelter, thousands upon thousands homeless—sickness, suffering, and disease tells a powerful story that cannot be calculated in terms of the dollar mark.

Fifty-five disastrous floods have occurred in the Ohio Valley during the last 60 years. General Markham in a recent statement asserted the entire program would not cost as much as the damage done by the recent flood. The damage of the January flood alone equaled $440,000,000. No record seems to have been kept of the total damage of floods, but if $440,000,000 is a modest estimate for damage caused by the past flood, it would be more conservative to place the grand total in excess of a billion dollars for the past 60 years. If we have lost a billion dollars in past floods, we certainly could expect to lose no less in the future, so the investment of $310,000,000 or thereabouts would bring a dividend of $690,000,000, truly a handsome saving to our Government.

I should like to quote to the gentlemen of the committee a few striking points brought out in a splendid article appearing in the Washington Herald January 27, 1937:

> Comprehensive plans for the restraint of floodwaters were worked out in detail by competent engineers and have been available for years, proving that flood control is possible. Responsibility, therefore, for inaction rests largely upon the Federal Government, and the problem exists today mainly because the methods of solution have not been used. There has always been a great deal of talk about flood control, but little action. For at least one decade specific recommendations have been in the Government files. Some of the recommendations have been waiting so long resurveys were necessary.
>
> Congress last year approved a program of flood control that according to Army engineers would eliminate all danger of floods in the Ohio Valley, but the Budget Bureau failed to approve the spending of the money that would have taken that program off the blueprints and put it in action. The program would build great reservoirs on the headwaters of the Ohio River, impounding surplus waters in flood seasons and releasing them in dry seasons. That program would have entailed the expenditure of $310,000,000; certainly an insignificant sum beside other New Deal expenditures.

The time is here; there should be no further delay; the entire Nation is anxious for the Federal Government to begin this work under the direction of Army engineers. The great Queen City of the West, Cincinnati, with its wonderful diversified business, its truly American citizens, who when misfortune visited Chicago, Johnstown, San Francisco, and all other places and serious trouble resulted, were always listed as the first to recognize suffering and disaster with a fine feeling for an American duty and contributed to the fullest extent with money, doctors, nurses, and supplies. Because of this the entire United States is anxious and willing that some worth-while plan be immediately adopted so that preparations for the elimination of future disasters, such as the flood of 1937, may be undertaken. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CROWE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, in supporting H. R. 7646, by Hon. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON, chairman of the Flood Control Committee, I support legislation of unusual merit. Floods in any river and tributaries such as the Ohio become a National Federal problem. Cities are unable to cope with the overflow of many miles above them.

There are various estimates of the losses in the Ohio Valley and its tributaries during the 1937 floods. The War Department placed the losses at something over $400,000,000. Others estimated at figures greatly in excess of this amount. Losses always in the finality from all sources amount to more than can be seen on the surface at the time of the loss.

In my representation in Congress of the Ninth Indiana District there is approximately 150 miles of water front on the Ohio River, starting at just above Lawrenceburg, Ind., and extending to just below the cities of Jeffersonville and Clarksville, Ind. Those two cities were almost entirely submerged by the recent floods. Their losses reach into millions of dollars, as well as tremendous losses at other cities between those two, and in addition to that great losses by farmers on farm lands and buildings, crops, stock, and so forth. This legislation, however, is the forerunner to more permanent legislation and will take care of levees and water walls to cities where the losses were the greatest. It is imperative that this be done and done as speedily as possible before we are menaced with recurring floods next year.

Over the long-haul program of flood control means will be interwoven into it of reforestation and the elimination of soil erosion. Ground covering and conserving the water where it falls is imperative to save the soil, to raise the water level, to reproduce our timberlands, and to allow our river channels to ultimately clean themselves from silt and cause a more uniform flow of water throughout the year in the streams. Temporarily, however, in advance of that must come levees and water walls to protect cities from the return of devastating floods such as those had in the Ohio and its tributaries in the years 1936 and 1937. The chairman of the Flood Control Committee [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is entitled to a lot of thanks by every Member of the House whose district is affected by the floods.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEARIN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to express my appreciation for the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, Mr. WHITTINGTON, permitted us to include in the pending legislation a provision for preliminary surveys of the Nishnabotna and Boyer Rivers in our congressional district and I hope to be able to add the Nodaway in the very near future. It has always been my contention that control of floodwaters should begin on the smaller tributaries of the larger streams. Such action will serve the dual purpose, namely, of preventing vast damage in the lowlands of the Mississippi and Ohio and at the same time conserve moisture in Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and other like regions where it is needed.

The conservation of water at its origin will in a larger sense contribute to the preservation of soil fertility. It is impossible to estimate how many hundreds of acres of rich soil is carried away in every one of our major floods to be spread on the Delta at the mouth of the Mississippi where it is lost to our farmers.

The measure that Chairman WHITTINGTON has brought to the House is directing the energy of the Federal Government in the direction outlined above and for that reason is most commendable. I am sure that the citizens of our congressional district will appreciate the consideration, and there is no doubt but what posterity will benefit from the procedure.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] 8 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am glad for all the indications which point unerringly, I hope, to the passage of this bill this afternoon; and, as one Congressman who comes from a district that has been sorely stricken in the recent floods of 1937, I take this opportunity to thank everybody who has had anything to do with the preparation of this bill and those who will vote for its passage, because it is a very meritorious bill. I am sorry only that it provides for only $24,877,000. It should provide for at least twice this amount. My own individual district has lost nearly $24,000,000 in the recent 1937 flood. This amount will, however, be a start in the right direction. This is not a free grant by any means. But we are going to have to match that $24,000,000 in order to get it. In this connection I want to discuss, just for a minute, how this bill comes up for consideration at this time, especially for those of our friends who are always with us on these flood-control propositions. And I want you to know that the passage of this bill does not answer every call for flood relief. This bill is only the first step in what I hope will develop into a Nationwide plan. This bill goes only in one direction. It provides primarily for the erection and construction of municipal flood defenses.

The bill authorizes $24,877,000 to be used in just about that one way. And it provides that, in order for any municipality to get one single dollar of this money for flood defenses, that municipality must provide all the rights-of-way necessary for the construction, and must arrange to pay all damages resulting from the removal of roads or railroads, and similar changes that may be necessary. The municipality, will in effect, say to the Government: "Here is the land, here is a place; now come along and build for us a flood wall or levees. There is many a town—in fact, practically all the towns along the Ohio River—that will not be able to meet the requirements of this bill. Cincinnati probably can do it, Louisville maybe can do it, Huntington, W. Va., thinks it can do it, but I doubt very much if my own home city of Ironton, Ohio, 95 percent of which was under water, will be able to meet the requirements of this bill. Let me give you some figures which I received from the Army engineers this morning with reference to what will be required of us. The Army engineers estimate that in order to keep out the floods that are classed as the regular floods that come nearly annually, our city will have to spend at least $1,000,000. This proposed protection will not protect against the 1913 or the 1927 floods. It will only hold back the backwater which comes in from a small stream in the lower end of our city. Of this one million the city of Ironton will have to come forward with more than $300,000, which is the estimated value of the rights-of-way and damages.

I am afraid that we cannot do this. I am afraid that the legal debt limitations have already been reached in our city. I expect to have the proper officials investigate to determine whether we can avail ourselves of the benefits of this law. Something will have to be done to enable the municipalities which suffered so badly to secure relief. For a law which only carries relief to the strong, and which denies it to the weak, will not be well received in the long run. If it opens the door to more satisfactory opportunities later it will have served its purpose. I now yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman should bear in mind that when we change the yardstick of basing contributions it will apply or should apply not only to this bill now under consideration but to the act passed in 1936 and to all other flood-control acts. The yardstick should be uniform throughout.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. While I expected to develop this further, I am glad the chairman brought that point out at this time because as things now stand it will be humanly impossible for most of the local communities on the Ohio River to come forward with their portion. I believe that the communities should participate to a certain extent, for otherwise the whole thing could be used as a football of politics, and a lot of small communities would want to have construction out of proportion to their appraised value; but I hope that the time will soon come when the percentage for participation will be lowered, when we will not have to put up an equal share, because then every little city, every little town, will strive to avail itself of the worth-while help tendered by this act, and walls will be built around many of these little towns.

We cannot provide enough money this year to make all the improvements necessary. In fact, it would be impossible to carry on all this work in 1 year or even in 5 years, and I shall encourage the municipalities in my section to make an effort to meet the requirements of this bill and shall continue to do what I can to bring the most practical relief possible to all the small cities.

That brings me to this point: This is not the only flood-relief bill from which relief will come in this session of Congress. My understanding is that we will have about sixty million in addition to this twenty-four million. Most of this sixty million has already been allocated or at least it has tentatively been allocated and much of it will go to the construction of dams and reservoirs in the Pittsburgh territory. These dams will hold back great reservoirs of water. Whenever that is done that will help every community lower down the river. These dams and reservoirs above Pittsburgh will call for the expenditure of several millions of dollars by the State of Pennsylvania or the municipalities that are located near the improvements. The people must provide all rights-of-way, and so forth. Of course, that section being the largest manufacturing section in the world, may be able to furnish these funds. I hope they can. We will all benefit from it.

This brings me to the further point that there is one dam in particular that is very important. In fact, I think it is the most important unit in the whole flood-control program. We must do something about seeing to it that this project is carried on at once. I refer to the Bluestone Dam located on the headwaters of New River. This is the one dam that will do more to help all the people along the Ohio River than any other one project that the Army engineers have passed upon. That is located, as I have said, on the headwaters of the New River, probably 60 miles from its confluence with the Gauley River, which join about 30 miles above Charleston to form the Kanawha River. And the Kanawha empties into the Ohio at Point Pleasant, W. Va.

When that dam is finished, it will have cost approximately $10,000,000. It is estimated it will hold back enough water so that 3 feet on the average will be taken off the crest of floods at all points from where it flows into the Ohio River at Point Pleasant for about 150 miles as it flows down toward Cincinnati. Of course, I mean floods which are caused primarily by unusual precipitation of rain or snow in that vast mountain region which drains into the Ohio. The Bluestone will be a wonderful project. It will be located in the mountain section close to the line between the southeastern part of West Virginia and the southwestern corner of old Virginia.

But what is holding that up? The law at this time provides that the people living in the vicinity of that project or some political subdivision of the State must come forward and provide the rights-of-way necessary for this improvement. This would require the purchase of the dam site, and also many thousands of acres of land, for this reservoir will cover many thousands of acres. The total cost of land and damages would be about two million. The population is sparse in that section and the value of land per acre is very low. The people in the immediate section would receive little or no benefit from the construction of that reservoir, and they could not furnish the funds with which to purchase the rights-of-way. This dam does not mean much to them, and this reservoir will impound a large amount of water and thus keep it out of the main stream in floodtime. It will also have that great storage of water

which can be released in the summer to maintain a steady flow of water when needed.

A dam, similar to the one proposed at Bluestone, has been constructed over at Grafton, W. Va. This is a gigantic structure. It is as large as the Norris Dam. This dam is known as the Tygart Dam. It is almost completed. I visited it a few days ago, and it has been paid for altogether by the Government. The rights-of-way were purchased by the Government, the dam was constructed by the Government, and everything done by the Government, as it should be done. The benefits are Nation-wide. The Government should do the same thing with the Bluestone Dam. The benefits there will be Nation-wide. The Government should provide the right-of-way in all this mountainous country, because Cincinnati, Huntington, and all of the many cities along the Ohio River will benefit by reason of this improvement.

May I say to the Members of the House that a delegation is expected to go down and see the President in a day or two to find out whether or not he will provide some relief money or some other kind of money with which to buy that land so that the Army engineers can go ahead with that project. I understand that the plans are all prepared, and if the Government would buy the land the work could start just as soon as the bids could be received and the contract awarded legally.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say I am in sympathy with the gentleman's statement with respect to the Bluestone Reservoir. As a member of the committee of conference it was intended by section 3 of the omnibus act to include that reservoir and have it provided for under the terms of that act, just as the Conchez proposition in New Mexico was provided for.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman and we will appreciate his help. The plans have been furnished and the Army engineers say that in 2 weeks they could proceed with the necessary preliminary arrangements if they had the money.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. How much power will be generated at that dam when completed?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. What dam does the gentleman mean?

Mr. RANKIN. The Bluestone Dam.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I do not know anything about that. In fact I hope it will be held as a flood-control project and not a power project. I hope there will not be any power generated, as far as I am concerned, for the reason that if we have to provide for a power dam it will cost so much we will not get any flood relief. I have heard many prominent engineers testify as to whether it is wise to combine power and flood control into the same projects. They all disapprove of that plan. They claim that for power purposes there must be kept a full head of water against the dam, while for flood control the reservoir should be emptied before the flood and filled up with floodwaters.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I was wondering if, as a matter of fact, under the relief bill, which allows large sums of money for the Public Works Administration, it would not be possible to get some money out of those funds?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. My understanding is that Mr. Hopkins has agreed that in the general allocation of relief work he will be able to assign enough relief work to amount to about $48,000,000. It is not always safe to rely on a general statement, for the amount of labor available in one of these mountain sections is very uncertain, and again we find that relief labor is not adaptable to flood-control projects. The building of huge steel and concrete structures is dangerous and skilled men are usually required. The average relief workers have had no experience and are not qualified to do it, although I am glad to say that upon the occasion of my recent visit to the Grafton Dam a good deal of work was being done by relief. The constructing engineer told me much of it was satisfactory. I saw many men doing carpenter and similar work. I hope that Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hopkins will see to it that we get a very good contribution in this respect. While this bill may not be of much benefit to my section I am supporting it loyally. I hope that Congress will continue to look with favor on a comprehensive flood-control program so that we will within the next 5 or 10 years have provided ourselves so that we can compel Old Man River to stay away from our doors. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control a question. I am wholeheartedly supporting this legislation, but I am particularly interested in a survey of the Kickapoo River.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. My recollection is the Flood Control Committee reported that bill, the House passed it, and it is now pending in the other body. I may say it is the purpose of the other body, and I am so advised, to include all preliminary examination and survey bills that have been introduced in that body, and passed by this body, and not passed by the other body by way of amendment, and I think that course should be pursued with respect to the river mentioned by the gentleman.

Mr. WITHROW. In case the Senate bill and House bill go to conference, it will be the policy of the conferees to include the Kickapoo survey?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All survey bills have been passed by either body, and not by the other, will be included.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, first, I desire to congratulate the chairman of the Flood Committee, Mr. WHITTINGTON, and the members of the Flood Committee for the noteworthy work that they have done in reporting a bill with much merit. Their work has been most difficult, actuated by the many floods that have occurred in the United States the past few years, leaving behind nothing but ruin. Unquestionably, it is true that the committee has not been able to include in this general bill all the bills introduced with the purpose of remedying flood conditions, but it evidences a determined intention on the part of the committee to continue from year to year such a bill which when executed will eventually eliminate the greater part of flood destruction throughout the entire United States.

It is true that work necessary in the reducing of flood hazards is costly. The building of dams and locks, the building of reservoirs and retaining walls, the clearing of channels is expensive. But with the completion of the work we will have the knowledge that many lives will be saved; we will have the knowledge that hundreds of millions of dollars of homes and other private property will be saved; we will have the knowledge that thousands of men out of work will receive employment. Their work will be something worth while, something of a permanent nature, something that will be of benefit to millions of people. The great majority of the people are not adverse to the Government engaging the services of the unemployed on worth-while projects. They appreciate that those who are unable to find work must be provided for. The only criticism that I have found is that the Government has too often employed these men on unworthy projects. Too often the unemployables have been assigned to work that accomplished little or no good. The delegation of men on work of this nature would receive the hearty endorsement of every taxpayer. The people of the

United States are united behind us in the expenditure of money for the control of floods. They know that for every dollar we spent in this work, thousands of dollars will be saved in property in the various flood areas.

In the main, this bill provides for the expenditure of $24,877,000 for the construction of levees, flood walls, and drainage structures for the protection of cities and towns in the Ohio River Basin, the projects to be selected by the Chief of Engineers, with the approval of the Secretary of War. It provides that any funds appropriated may be used for plant, material, supervisory, and skilled services necessary with relief labor furnished under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937. You are all familiar with the January flood of the Ohio River, which resulted in the loss of many lives and the destruction of hundreds of millions of dollars in property.

The entire population of several cities had to leave their homes and the necessity arose for the sending in of Federal troops. The President of the United States, the War Department, the Flood Committee, every Governor of those affected States, the various chambers of commerce and business organizations urge a prompt remedy. They are waiting for us to come to their assistance, and I am sure that we will not disappoint them.

In addition to the Ohio River phase this bill provides for an authorization for preliminary surveys and examination in a list of localities under section 5. There is a total list of 51, reaching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, embracing practically every State. It makes us realize that flood disasters play no favorites. The history of floods brings us to a realization that quiet rivers of the present day may in a generation overflow their banks, bringing ruin to its inhabitants. I speak from experience.

The Flood Committee has most kindly included in this bill an authorization for a preliminary examination and survey of the Galena River in Illinois and Wisconsin. The Chief of Engineers and the War Department has requested it. Living in Galena, Ill., and being vitally interested in a remedy for flood conditions there, I have gone extensively into the history of the Galena River. I have found that floods have been reported in the Galena River Valley long before the first white settlement. The Galena River flows into the Mississippi River. The earliest floods in the Galena River Valley were the result of abnormally high water in the Mississippi River, backing up the valley. Gradually street and building grades in the city of Galena were raised to a level that protected them from this danger. Since 1870 came a group of floods that resulted from unusually heavy rains over the watershed of the Galena River. Fifty years ago the largest Mississippi boats came up the Galena River to Galena. Many times there were as many as 10 of the largest Mississippi boats docked at Galena. At the present time the river is not navigable for even canoes or rowboats. The water under ordinary conditions is from 12 to 24 inches deep. It is generally agreed that the cutting of timber on the hills above Galena has permitted the filling of the Galena River by soil washed from the hills. This soil has washed down below the city, filling up more and more, until now when a heavy rain comes to the valley the small channel of the river, plus the piled-up soil below the city, does not permit the water to flow freely to the Mississippi.

There have been 18 recorded floods in the Galena River Valley, which have resulted in the loss of several lives, as well as the destruction of millions of dollars' worth of property. The worst flood occurred on February 21, 1937, which resulted in the loss of three lives and an estimated loss of over a million and a half dollars in property. Hundreds suffered from severe colds and influenza. To you Members who are free from flood areas I would have you visualize a city of 5,000 people in northern Illinois, in the cold month of February, under approximately 7 feet of water. It means that in February, with all the furnaces and other modes of heat under water, the people were without heat for several days. After many hours the water receded and the people went back to their homes, and their business in ruin, without heat.

Sufficient plumbers could not be obtained. People were without heat in zero weather for days. They went back to work, though, cheerfully. Painters, plumbers, paperhangers were engaged, and within a week Galena was back to normal, with the exception of the three lives that were lost, with the exception of several businessmen who were forced out of business by their losses, and with the exception of the loss of over a million dollars' worth of property. They were back to normal for only a few days, because, on March 4, 1937, only 10 days afterward, there came a second flow, nearly as severe. Again merchants and businessmen were compelled to remove their stock and vacate their business. Again many people were forced to leave their homes. Again there was damage and a destruction of property.

This account of increasingly disastrous floods at Galena shows that this historic town, nationally famous because it contains so many exceptionally well preserved examples of early architecture, is in peril of being completely destroyed by floods.

The record indicates that much of the damage at Galena can be prevented because it appears that the original valley was adequate to care for the seasonal precipitation over its watershed, and that extensive damage has only occurred since the stream bed has become narrowed and filled by silting. Probably the damming of floodwaters above the town and the widening of the stream bed below Galena to the mouth of the river but a short distance would reduce flood damage to a negligible quantity.

There is a district engineer's office of the War Department but a few miles south of Galena, at Rock Island, Ill. The cost of a preliminary examination and survey would be very small. I feel certain that this House will pass this bill overwhelmingly. By so doing, you will be doing something worth while; you will be doing something that has the unanimous backing of the public; you will be doing something comforting to the millions of people located in the disastrous flood areas, not of one locality but in every State of the Union. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. JENCKES] so much time as she may desire.

Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress representing a congressional district which has, through a lack of Federal flood control, suffered a loss of $2,000,000 annually for the past 10 years, I rise to support House Resolution 7646 and to thank the chairman and his committee for their splendid work in preparation of this bill. For 10 years prior to becoming a Member of the Seventy-third Congress, I have been appealing to the Federal Government to provide flood-control protection to the citizens in the Wabash and White River drainage area.

The Wabash-White River drainage area covers 22,000 square miles of the richest and most productive country in America. The center of population of the United States is in this area. A great volume of the Federal taxes which are paid to the Federal Treasury comes from the Wabash-White River drainage area.

I appeal to my colleagues from congressional districts not affected by flood waters to support this measure. I hope this measure passes, and when it does pass, I hope that the United States Army engineers will proceed immediately to correct certain dangerous areas along the Wabash and White Rivers which deflect the flood waters into our cities and over our rich and fertile farms. This will be an investment which will return to the Federal Government, in the shape of income taxes, a sum of money many times the original investment on the part of the Federal Government.

I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRAY] so much time as he may desire.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, little did the pioneers realize when they were clearing the land and preparing the ground for cultivation that they were undermining the soil fertility, that they were breaking up the fountains of water, and because of this great loss and waste their children and grandchildren would desert their inheritance.

Little did the pioneers comprehend that in cutting down and removing the forests and leaving the land barren of vegetable growth they were lifting the floodgates holding back the water in the reservoir of the earth, to gather in mad rushing torrents carrying away soil fertility and deluging the valleys and the lands below.

Little did the pioneers apprehend that the soil only a few inches deep was held and maintained in moisture and fertility under Nature's blanket of vegetation and when left barren and exposed the underground water level would fall or recede and the flowing springs would give way to drought and floods.

And from this careless indifference or oversight and their criminal disregard for nature's way of conserving the soil fertility and the water supply, we are reaping the reward of our folly in the blight of withering droughts, and the ravages of devastating floods, attended with appalling loss of property and life.

TOOK 10,000 YEARS TO CREATE 7 INCHES OF SOIL

Natural scientists tell us that by the slow processes of Nature 10,000 long, tedious years were required to create or accumulate the shallow 7 inches, the average depth of the soil fertility of the land, and without which America would have been a barren, lifeless desert of clay and sand.

LOSING 100,000,000 ACRES OF SOIL FERTILITY A YEAR

And conservation experts tell us now that by clearing the land for cultivation and leaving it barren of vegetation and exposed to the action of water we have already lost 50,000,000 acres of soil fertility, and we are losing 100,000,000 acres a year, and this is in progress even more rapid than before.

MORE THAN $200,000,000 LOST TO FARMERS A YEAR

It is estimated that soil waste from action from the waters running from the land removes from the cultivated and pasture fields not less than 126,000,000,000 pounds of plant food material every year, or more than 21 times the amount required and taken from the land by growing crops.

The estimated financial loss annually to the farmers is more than $200,000,000, and the annual ultimate damage to the land is many times the immediate loss, as the fertility of the land is gone beyond the hope of a recovery, or even a part, in a lifetime or one generation.

Land left bare of all vegetation has been losing from 50 to 100 tons an acre of soil fertility per year. Land planted continually in corn has been losing 59 tons an acre per year, and from such land left barren of all vegetation the loss has been as high as 112 tons an acre per year.

ALL LAND LOSING SOIL FERTILITY

While the steeper the land slopes the greater will be the loss of topsoil, yet all fields are suffering a loss according to the slope of the ground, and the fertility of the soil is passing from all cleared or cultivated fields wherever colored or muddy water is running from the land.

At this rate of soil loss and waste this average 7 inches of soil, if left wholly barren, may be taken from land in less than 10 years' time, from continuous corn land in 16 years, while from properly rotated crop fields 99 years would be required to take away all the soil fertility.

HOW WATER IS HELD IN THE EARTH

In nature the ground is kept open and porous by roots and the action of insects and worms. Into these pores and soil openings the rain held by vegetation passes into the earth until the ground is made a greater water reservoir, excepting only the oceans and the seas.

From this great underground storage the water slowly filters out through the constant running of springs and seepage from the porous, spongy earth in gradual release to maintain the streams, and in an even stage throughout the year, with clear, filtered running water.

ONCE STREAMS RAN WITH CLEAR WATER

In the early days of America the rivulets, creeks, and streams ran with clear and transparent water, even in time of rainfall and floods. The vegetation and the porous earth filtered the water as it came in rains without sediment to fill the streams' channels.

And the waste from excess rainfall thus absorbed and held back by infiltration was released from springs and the porous ground gradually throughout long seasons, not only safeguarding against floodwaters but maintaining the streams at even water stages for more reliable and dependent uses.

CUTTING OFF THE TIMBER AND VEGETATION

Cutting off the timber and removing the vegetation and plowing and cultivating the top soil breaks and closes these pores and earth openings against the infiltration of water into the earth and leaves the ground surface upon which the raindrops fall like a glazed watertight roof.

As a result, with no vegetation to hold the water and no pores or openings to take in the water, the water rushes off the glazed ground and down into the stream channels like the rain water from the roofs flushing down the downspouts to carry away the soil and make the floods.

After water has left the roof slopes of the earth, commonly called the watersheds, and is gathered in torrents in the river channels, it is beyond the control of man. And all they can do in the emergency is to warn the people of the valleys to flee their property and homes until the crest of the mad waters has passed.

THE UNDERGROUND WATER RESERVOIRS

The water level and the underground reservoir is falling lower and lower from year to year. The once constant-flowing streams are dried up. The one time never-failing wells are going dry. The myriad little rivulets, brooklets, and streams are empty again as soon as the rain is over, and their beds are left to dry and crack in the sun.

MANY PROBLEMS IN ONE

The problem of flood control, the problem of irrigated lands, the problem of inland water navigation, the problem of water pollution, the problem of soil conservation and the underground water level, and the problem of hydroelectric power are all one problem—the problem of the raindrops.

And the problem of the raindrops is first back on the farms, in the fields, pastures, and woodlands. The problem is here to receive and hold the rain for infiltration into the ground reservoir for gradual release through the pores of the earth and the even flow of the springs and seepage.

MUST GO BACK TO THE SOURCE

Men cannot safeguard against floodwaters, nor control the even stage of the water level for dependable, reliable, and even water flow, for irrigation and inland water navigation; nor safeguard against the polluted waters, nor for an even flow of water power, nor for any control of river channels' currents until they have gone back to the source, to the slopes of the fields and pasture land, gone back to where the raindrops fall and there restore vegetation to hold the waters, and there reopen the pores of the ground to drink in the waters falling from the clouds to be held back in Nature's great reservoir, the earth.

THE LOWER ENGINEERS MUST WAIT

The lower river channel engineers, planning the levees and the dikes, the dams, and artificial reservoirs, must wait on the upstream engineer, working with his force of men back upon the fields and sloping pastures to hold or delay the raindrops falling.

The lower river channel engineers must wait until the ground pores are open, and to fill the lower and great, capacious reservoir, the reservoir of the ground or earth, before he can plant the heights of levees, banks, and dikes, or the capacity of artificial reservoirs for storage to hold the river within its banks.

After spending billions to control floodwaters; after building hundreds of miles of dikes and levees; after playing with the continent for over 50 years, using the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and finally the C. C. C., Red Cross,

and relief service, the floods are coming greater and more destructive than before.

MUST GO BACK TO FIRST PRINCIPLES

We find that we must go back to first principles and nature to conserve both the fertility of the soil and control destructive floodwaters to save the soil of America from being carried to fill up the river channels and sifted over the bottom of the seas.

We find that we must go back where the raindrops fall on the hills and slopes and upper valleys and there prepare them a resting place in the sod and soil of the earth to hold and detain the waters there for gradual release from the streams and rivulets.

WATER MUST BE HELD IN THE GROUND

Conservation of the soil and water supply and the control and direction of floodwaters must begin back upon the fields and farms, back with the streams and rivulets. The water must be held in the ground and controlled before leaving where it falls.

The gentle raindrops falling must be received and made welcome to the friendly bosom of mother earth before, for want of a resting place, they join in mad onrushing currents, tearing away the soil and fertility of the land, and wreaking destruction and havoc in the valley below.

Not only the control of water for soil conservation and reclamation, but the control of the flow of waters for irrigation and inland water navigation, for water purification in towns and cities, for the conversion of falling waters into power, and the control of destructive floodwaters must begin back at the source.

THE FIRST STEPS MUST BE TAKEN IN THE FIELDS

For all these purposes and uses the first step taken for their accomplishment must be taken back in the fields, back in the forests and pasture lands, there to hold the water for gradual release, from springs and pores of the soil and from a stored underground water level.

We must go back where the raindrops fall to hold the fertile soil of the land from leaving the fields and sloping pastures and from being carried in the currents of waters to fill and clog the channels of the streams, causing them to overflow their banks and to seek other channels for their current.

We must go back to the source where the gentle raindrops fall to gather and hold the waters in the soil and underground reservoirs for gradual release and flow to maintain an even water stage for all the many uses of the streams of the land.

And this is equally true for the control of floodwaters by extending the time for their passage to accommodate the natural river channels and to provide for the use of falling waters for water power in the generation of electricity, gradually over the year for their regular, continued, and prolonged use.

CESSPOOLS OF FILTH SWEPT INTO THE STREAMS

It is the mad surface water in their immediate precipitous run-off after rains and melting snows which scour the recesses of filth and without infiltration through the earth's soil throw their contents into the streams to pollute and poison the water supply.

Without beginning back at the source to hold the waters in the soil and replenish the underground water level for gradual release and flow, the banks of the river streams cannot be raised high enough nor made strong enough to carry the water leaving the land as it falls.

And the river channels will be overflown, inundating low-level and farm lands beyond the banks of the streams, wreaking havoc and destruction, and then will be followed by the falling of the water stage below the level and the volume required for regular and dependable water uses.

LARGE DAMS AND RESERVOIRS WILL NOT HOLD THE WATER

Large down-river reservoirs have their proper use at the proper time in the economy of flood control and the many uses served by water. But all of the dams which can be built and all the reservoirs which can be provided will not hold the water falling if allowed to run off immediately from in the rains.

To preserve and reclaim the fertility of the soil, we must go back to first principles. We must begin at the source to remedy the cause. We must begin back where the raindrops fall. We must begin before the water currents form. We must begin, not to hold the water on the ground, but to receive and hold the water in the ground.

The devastating, destructive floodwaters, starting on their mad and angered course of inundation, death, and destruction, down the valleys and over the lowlands, first from the barren fields and slopes, frowning upon and resisting the raindrops and control, must be held back from where the water first comes.

THE RIVER CHANNELS FILLING UP

The sediment filling up the river channels, reducing the current capacity of the streams, and causing their banks to overflow and sweeping the fertile land and populous valleys, comes first from the surface soil, from the denuded fields and pastured slopes, and the water must be held before it starts.

The mad, onrushing, wasting waters; the sudden fall of the water stage; the exhausting ebb and diminished flow for reliable, dependable, and useful services; the poisons of a contaminated, polluted water supply, all have their origin and source back in the land repelling the raindrops.

FROM WHERE THE WATER CAN BE CONTROLLED

And back in the fields and denuded pastures is from where all river waters can be held, is from where all floods can be controlled, is from where all water pollution can be safeguarded, is from where all precautions can be taken to maintain the even flow and stage of water for constant, dependable water uses.

THE GREAT RESERVOIR OF THE EARTH

But before we build the reservoirs below we must go back to the source and water storage, the far greater reservoir of the earth, by opening the intake of the pores in the ground and holding the water to replenish the million springs for the gradual release of treasures of water.

WE MUST FIRST BUILD THE LITTLE DAMS AND RESERVOIRS

Before we can build the big dams below to hold the waters to lessen the volume in the streams, we must go back to the farms and the fields and build the little dams and the ponds to hold the water for gradual seepage and release throughout the whole season of the year.

We must go back to the source and welcome the raindrops as they come to the great bosom of Mother Earth and there to repose in leisure and contentment before they reach the swollen streams in mad, turbulent, seething currents.

In other words, we must do first the many little, myriad things. We must take care of the fundamentals. We must go back to first principles. We must begin at the foundation to build for soil and water conservation and to lay the basis for flood control.

Before we can build the big dams below we must hold the water in the lesser streams above, we must go back to the fields and farms to build the little dams and ponds and hold the water there for gradual seepage throughout the whole season of the year.

THE WASTE OF EROSION

Erosion is the washes making gullies from which the ground held in solution and the top fertile soil is carried away by the water run-off and is filling up the river beds and is silting or filling to the top level the dams and reservoirs constructed to hold back the water.

The damage and destruction to dams and reservoirs can only be estimated when it is known that the cost of cleaning out this mud and silt to restore the capacity of the dams and reservoirs is found to be an impractical undertaking or more than equal to building new dams and reservoirs of the same or equal capacity to hold water.

THE 1937 FLOOD

The last great 1937 flood carried over 300,000,000 tons of soil from the farms, fields, and pasture lands and deposited

this with sediment in the channels of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, reducing still further the capacities of these river channels to carry the waters.

The small dams and reservoirs back at the source of the springs and rivulets are not only the key to soil conservation, but they are the only remedy and relief for the protection of the larger dams and reservoirs from filling with silt and soil wastage and the control of the floodwaters below.

WHAT THE FARMERS CAN DO

The farmers themselves can do very little. The force of an army of laborers, working under a comprehensive construction program, must be put in operation on the land, back upon the fields and pasture slopes to conserve the water in the reservoir of the ground before beginning construction of artificial reservoirs to hold and release the waters gradually to reach the river channels.

The payments to farmers now being made should be made under a program of soil conservation carefully planned, and the farmers should be given full information and instructions to be observed in their farm operations to carry out most effectively soil conservation.

The farmers should be paid for their work and expenses, except that part bringing in immediate profit, and made to conserve both immediate farm fertility and general watershed improvements, looking to solve the immediate farm problem both to serve the individual farmer and to carry out a national conservation program.

A STATE, NATIONAL, AND COOPERATIVE PROBLEM

Conserving the fertility of the soil and its counterpart, the water supply, is more than an individual farm problem. It is a State and national problem. It is a problem calling for the cooperation of the State and Federal Governments with the farmers to save the disappearing soil and the water level.

Soil conservation and flood control is first an individual and local problem, then a State and national problem. And it is both an individual and cooperative problem in which all must do their part, individuals, the State, and the Nation.

At one time, in the early stages of soil erosion and wasting soil fertility, the progress of land disintegration could have been arrested and controlled by the individual farmer and landowner alone taking precaution in the cultivation of the soil and the proper use and management of the land.

But this opportune time has passed and gone for the individual to cope with conditions. Much of the fertile soil is in the stream beds. The erosion has already eaten its ugly way far into the fertile fields and to deface with frowns and scars a once smiling and radiant nature.

The avalanche of crumbling, wasting earth, and the moving wall of mad floodwaters resenting the violation of Nature's plan calls for the cooperation of State and Nation to stay the tide of rising destruction, stop the rolling, crumbling masses of earth, and calm the seething, troubled waters.

FARMERS ARE ABANDONING THE LAND

As many farmers, growing poorer with their soil-impoverished farms, have been compelled to abandon their farms, so it will be with the Nation, with the American continent. It will be at least in part abandoned unless the Nation acts to stop the waste and reclaim the loss.

It is evident the farmers and landowners cannot meet or pay this tremendous cost of soil reclamation and water conservation at this advanced progress or stage of the loss and waste of these two vital resources. The problem is more than stopping or arresting the further progress of the damage. It is a problem of reclaiming and recovering back.

The farmers, carrying the burden of crop production and taxes, interest, and repair obligations, cannot contribute to this work in money but they can make their contribution of the work with teams in part hauling and in constructing the small upstream dams and reservoirs.

The farmers and landowners of the country cannot and should not bear the cost of the work more than other people of the country. It involves a National and State problem of flood control, irrigation, and navigation, safeguarding against polluted water supplies, and is for the benefit of all the people.

Improvements for soil and water conservation must be assumed by the joint operations of State and Nation as a public obligation and responsibility, and should be carried on and directed under a well-planned waterway system and a survey of the land and watersheds looking to serving all these uses and purposes.

THE STAGGERING COST

And then again the staggering costs of such a mammoth interstate program cannot be entered upon or paid and taxes assessed from the people; and yet we are brought face to face with a problem that must be solved promptly to save the country from the shadow of the desert.

Fortunately there is a way open, not only to pay the costs without burden by with profit and advantage to the people. The water forces with which we are to deal and which have brought this great economic disaster upon us may be harnessed as hydroelectric power to produce a revenue equal to the cost of the works.

While this great loss and waste has been in progress carrying away the soil, new inventions, discoveries, and developments have been made to enable man to harness the forces of water and made to do his will and bidding to lift and carry his burdens and to bring him profit and income.

WATER POWER CONVERTIBLE INTO CASH

Today, under these new inventions and discoveries, every pound of falling, wasting water flowing in all the streams and watercourses can be converted into electricity so as to bring in cash returns, and this conversion into electric power can be reproduced over and over again from the source to the mouth of every river.

And what is even more fortunate and a most remarkable coincidence is that the same works and improvements which are required for flood control, irrigation, navigation, and safeguarding against water pollution will develop and harness the power of water to generate electricity and bring the revenue to pay the costs.

The falling waters of all the streams and watercourses of America, if harnessed for power and generation of electricity, electric current could be developed sufficient to light every highway and streets intersection, light and furnish power to every home and fireside, and turn the wheels and pulleys of every mill, factory, and workshop.

Such volume of electric current sold at a low and reasonable charge would construct all these works and improvements, conserving soil and underground water supply, safeguarding against floodwaters, conserving their future use and service for irrigation, navigation, and a pure water supply.

This program will recover and reclaim the wasting fertile soil and the underground water levels, bring the inland watercourses to serve these many useful purposes, and at the same time will electrify America from coast to coast and from the Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico.

THE ONE OBSTACLE TO OVERCOME

There is only one obstacle standing in the way from the completion of such a conservation program without cost and taxes levied from the people, and that is the obstruction and opposition of the private electric holding companies, who are conspiring to take possession and tie up the waters of the streams and water courses and monopolize their power for private profits and gain.

THERE WILL NOT BE AN OVERSUPPLY OF LABOR

As we approach this great problem and realize the magnitude of the undertaking and the labor required for its completion, we see the folly of the theoretical claim that there is not enough work for all and that active and competent men must be retired to afford all an opportunity for others to labor to live.

The work of man on earth has not been performed, completed, or contemplated. The ground has scarcely been scratched. There is more work waiting to be done than

all the men and automatic machines working full time and overtime can do in a lifetime or generation.

When the Nation calls for recruits for the labor to meet the emergency immediately pressing, the employment lists will disappear and the large relief rolls will fade away, and the exhausting drain of wasting taxes will be relaxed from the earnings of the people, and America will become a veritable beehive with the works restoring the living currents of water.

MANY MILLIONS HAVE BEEN SPENT IN VAIN

Many millions of dollars have been expended in raising the banks of the rivers and streams to hold the increasing floodwaters. But all this has been futile and in vain. The earth washed from the eroding soil has raised the river beds higher and higher, leaving the channels shallower and with less capacity to carry the ever-increasing currents.

Millions have been expended yearly to build great dikes along the Mississippi to hold the ever-encroaching waters from inundating the fertile bottom lands, but as the dikes are built still higher the river bed has been raised and lifted, leaving the channel to carry still less water.

FLOODING THE LAND TO SAVE THE CITIES

With the return of ever-increasing floods the watergates are thrown open wider to relieve the strain upon the channel banks, flooding thousands of acres of land, compelling the lowland population to flee their property, farms, and homes at a loss of millions annually.

And now still opening the floodgates to relieve the ever-filling river channels and the floodwaters rising still higher, almost another million acres are to be flooded in Louisiana at a cost of $103,000,000, forcing thousands of farmers to move and find their homes elsewhere.

DAMS AND RESERVOIRS FILLING UP

Millions have been expended by the Nation in building dams and flood reservoirs to hold a portion of the floodwaters back from gradual release as the floods recede, but the millions of tons of fertile soil from far-distant fields and farm lands have been carried into these dams and reservoirs and then to fall from the resting waters until the dams and reservoirs are filled to a level with silt and sediment, leaving no water capacity.

Many millions of dollars have been spent to maintain an even river-channel stage of water for irrigation and inland navigation and to safeguard against water pollution. But, with the flood tides too high and the subsiding waters too low, the expenditure has been worthless and lost.

Millions have been expended in river and stream improvements to safeguard city water supplies, but the waters from the fields and lands have swept the cesspools of corruption into the rivers sought to be safeguarded, and in the end the same water pollution continues on.

All these gigantic expenditures of money, all these great herculean works and improvements, all these ingenious plans and systems to make the river carry the floodwaters, have been fruitless and in vain, all because we have failed to begin at the source from where the evils of floodwaters come.

MUST GO BACK TO WHERE THE RAINDROPS FALL

We must go back to where the rains fall, back to the fields and pasture lands, and there prepare a resting place for the gentle raindrops to pause and linger in the holds of vegetation and the pores of the soil, and then, after infiltration in the earth, to be released through gradual flowing springs.

The restoration and reclamation of the soil and the underground water level must begin or be entered upon not only to prevent further loss from the soil but to save the towns and cities along the streams from the floods which are rising higher and higher as the land pores are closed more against the rains.

The gullies, giving up the earth in solution to be carried away in the rising waters, must first be planted in trees which are of quick growth in clay soil, and then the slopes in grass and vegetation, and the smaller dams and reservoirs must be built wherever water can be collected and held back.

MUST BEGIN ON A LONG-TIME WORK

It would be a failure of comprehension to say all this loss and waste can be restored back to the land or even all the damage in progress stopped in a few short years of time, or even all this work could be done in one generation or in the time the soil has been leaving the land and wasting.

THE FIRST PROGRAM MUST BE FOR INFORMATION

There should be some regular program outlined to give proper information to the farmers and the landowners of the country and a uniform plan formulated for farmers to cooperate and act with the Government in making soil-conservation improvements, and the amount of contribution the farmers can make must be fixed well within their ability to pay or perform.

First. An economic and social survey should be made of the area to be reclaimed and the population to be affected.

Second. A temporary program should be entered upon until a permanent one can be planned and put into operation.

Third. A program of education to give the inhabitants of the territory information of the character of the improvements to be made.

Fourth. A plan formulated for the readjustment of land conservation to meet the needs and requirements of the owners and their operations to make a living on their farms.

Fifth. The land to be removed from cultivation and from use even as pasture land should be definitely ascertained and set aside.

Sixth. The character of the forest trees and vegetation required to arrest erosion and wasting soil and best suitable and adapted to the climate and soil condition should be decided upon.

Seventh. The operations and practical cultivation of the land to be kept and continued in use should be determined.

Eighth. All this should be under a system to coordinate the improvements made in a uniform manner to embrace the area included, with the operations extending continuously beyond property lines.

ALL RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS MUST BE UNDER ONE SYSTEM OF WORKS AND OPERATIONS

In my remarks in presenting H. R. 3872, a bill introduced by me to create an executive department, in the House of Representatives, January 29, 1937, to coordinate all the inland waterworks and improvements under one plan of system or operation, I have already shown the great savings and economy to be effected under a comprehensive program of improvements to accomplish all these uses and purposes under one coordinated system.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON] so much time as he may desire.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to say a few words in support of the flood-control bill, not only because I am a member of the committee which drafted the bill but also for the reason that three of the streams recommended for survey originate in my district. And so as not to seem to be speaking selfishly, I hasten to add that even if my district were as barren of rivers and flood danger as the great American desert, I would still be for this bill, because I am a firm believer in flood control, water conservation, and the prevention of soil erosion.

The provisions of the bill having to do with the survey of these three streams and scores of others throughout the country contemplate safeguarding of our natural resources on a broader front than heretofore attempted in such legislation. In previous surveys the primary objective has been flood prevention. Now, we approach the problem with a view to not only averting the floods but conserving the water for use in season of need, and lastly to prevent damage and erosion to our most priceless heritage of all, the farm soil which is the source of our sustenance.

There is nothing intricate or complicated about this program. On the contrary, it is a most simple and fundamental thing. Those of us who as small boys lived anywhere

near a creek or swimming hole are familiar with the simple engineering possibilities of a small stream of running water. Most of us have built dams and run-off ditches and canals, and even miniature bridges, and as we gave play to our boyish engineering imagination have pretended that we were harnessing the Mississippi or the Amazon or the Nile. We have watched the creek in springtime run suddenly full and yellow and furious with the melting of the snow and ice, and then slink back in summer to a tiny trickle and oftentimes run altogether dry. Perhaps some of us have had the experience of conquering the problem in a small, local way by removing obstructions in the creek, straightening the channel, digging a diversion ditch here and a dam there until in that small, local way we had the problem licked as far as our farm was concerned. And that is fundamentally the procedure proposed in this bill for approaching our flood, famine, and erosion problem on a Nation-wide scale.

I believe that it is the consensus of engineering experts that in the correction of floods and their attendant evils we must start with the sources and headwaters rather than proceed by patchwork where the greatest damage is felt. That is why in this bill you will find so many small and little-known streams included for survey. Stop, divert, and control the water up yonder by the old swimming hole, and the folks down at Cincinnati, Louisville, Portsmouth, and Cairo will not have to worry about floods.

In my district in northwestern Iowa, three streams have been recommended for inclusion in the Nation-wide program, the Floyd, Little Sioux, and the Boyer, all of which flow into the Missouri River and later help to swell the volume of the mighty Mississippi.

The Floyd and Little Sioux Rivers drain an area of 5,285 square miles, 925 square miles being included in the Floyd area and 4,360 square miles in the Little Sioux area. The upland soil involved here is the Marshall silt loam. The counties of Sioux, O'Brien, Clay, Dickinson, Plymouth, Cherokee, Buena Vista, Woodbury, Ida, Monona, and Harrison are included in these watersheds. There is a very serious flood problem in the case of both streams, much valuable farm land being injured by erosion and flooding and the flood problem at Sioux City is extremely important. The erosion in this area ranges from moderate with occasional gullies to severe with frequent gullies.

Probably the most serious erosion occurring anywhere in the State is found along the Boyer River which rises in Sac County in my district and flows through Sac, Crawford, and Harrison Counties down to the Missouri. The area of the watershed is 1,136 square miles. The area is characterized by severe sheet erosion and frequent gullies, and there is a real flood problem, especially noted at Council Bluffs.

In conclusion, may I say that although interested chiefly from the standpoint of a proper and scientific program of water and soil conservation, I feel further that the measure we are discussing contains much that is vital and essential to the people of the great Ohio and Mississippi Valleys. The flood of last January indicated that only through efficient coordinated and well-planned programs can hundreds of thousands of inhabitants of these valleys be made reasonably safe from the devastation of floods. This is by no means a sectional problem, it strikes into the very geographical and population centers of the United States and this bill provides some of the steps so necessary to accomplish the results which we are so anxious to obtain, namely, a sound, workable, and safe flood-control policy. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEMUTH], so much time as he may desire.

Mr. DEMUTH. Mr. Speaker, there are three methods of flood control—namely, reservoirs, local protective works such as flood walls and levees, and watershed retardation as practiced by the Department of Agriculture by such methods as reforestation, strip cropping, and similar practices.

On the lower Mississippi dikes or levees and diversion channels are principally used, and have been most successfully utilized by the United States Army engineers in meeting the particular problem encountered there.

In the Ohio River Basin the two principal methods recommended by the Army engineers is the use of reservoirs on the tributaries and headwaters of the Ohio River. Local protective works such as flood walls to protect such cities and towns as Pittsburgh, Louisville, Wheeling, Cincinnati, and other cities and towns in the Ohio River Basin, where such expenditures are economically justifiable are recommended to supplement the reservoirs.

H. R. 7646 is a bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved June 22, 1936. This amendment authorizes the appropriation of $24,877,000 for construction of flood walls as recommended by the Chief of Engineers with the approval of the Secretary of War.

The passage of this act is most necessary to the peace of mind, safety, and preservation of the homes and property of the citizens of those cities and towns of the Ohio River and the metropolitan district of Pittsburgh, that suffer such heavy losses, and which recur at such rapid frequencies. For example, the town of Sharpsburg, with a population of 8,500 people, was under 18 feet of water in the year 1936, and was under an average of 4 to 6 feet of water three times already in the year of 1937. The patience, the resources, and the sturdiness of these people have been taxed most severely and their future welfare is most precarious.

Under my amendment, which reads as follows:

Provided, That the protection for Pittsburgh, Pa., is to be interpreted as applying to the metropolitan district of Pittsburgh—

the citizens of the towns contiguous to, but outside the corporate limits of the city of Pittsburgh will receive the same treatment as their neighbors, the citizens of the city of Pittsburgh. It should be remembered that Sharpsburg is the lowest lying town in the Pittsburgh metropolitan area, and that 90 percent of the town was inundated by the 1936 flood. It suffered more heavily in proportion to its size than any other town or city in this district.

I want to thank Chairman WHITTINGTON for his sense of fairness, and each and every member of the Flood Control Committee, both Democratic and Republican, for their unanimous approval of this clause which means so much for the metropolitan district of Pittsburgh. I also extend the thanks of the citizens of these towns to my fellow committeemen and Chairman WHITTINGTON for the insertion of this clause.

In our district they have talked flood control for more than 50 years but only due to the tireless work of Chairman WHITTINGTON and his committee, under the direction of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, was a comprehensive program of flood control for the entire Nation adopted. Under the direction of President Roosevelt and this committee, so ably led by Chairman WHITTINGTON, the first appropriation in the history of the country was made this year.

You gentlemen by your vote in favor of the passage of this act will be making the second major step in flood control, and I feel sure your action will meet with the approval of every American citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a telegram from the president and council of the town of Sharpsburg, also from the flood control committee of the town of Sharpsburg.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to is as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *July 18, 1937.*

Congressman PETER J. DEMUTH,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We understand that the flood-control bill is being debated. Please do something for Sharpsburg—a major flood last year, three floods this year, many before, since 1810; immense losses. The future of the town is at stake. A letter explaining in detail follows.

Gratefully,

THE CITIZENS OF SHARPSBURG,
Per J. F. ZEHLER,
M. MICHAELOWSKI,
Chairmen.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MITCHELL] so much time as he may desire.

Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to give my whole-hearted support to this bill, known as H. R. 7646, introduced by my colleague [Mr. WHITTINGTON] from Mississippi. The bill is known as a bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, approved June 22, 1936." The measure provides that the projects are to be selected by the Chief of Engineers, with the approval of the Secretary of War, in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers in House Committee on Flood Control, Document No. 1, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, at a cost not to exceed $24,877,000 for construction, and which is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of flood control, and so forth.

I am glad to say that the report of the Chief of Engineers includes a recommendation for six reservoirs on the Cumberland River in my State, five of which will be located in Tennessee, and three of these five reservoirs will be within my congressional district. These three are the Dale Hollow Reservoir, formed by a dam on the Obey River 7.3 miles above its mouth; the Center Hill Reservoir, to be formed by a dam on the Caney Fork River 26.6 miles above its mouth; and the Stewart's Ferry Reservoir, to be formed by a dam located on Stones River 6.8 miles above its mouth. The estimated cost, as submitted to me by the Acting Chief of Engineers of the War Department, for construction of these dams is $4,100,000 for the Dale Hollow Reservoir, $14,800,000 for the Center Hill Reservoir, and $4,500,000 for the Stewart's Ferry Reservoir.

I appreciate the work being done by the Flood Control Committee of the House, of which Mr. WHITTINGTON is chairman, and am likewise most grateful for the fine cooperation given by Brig. Gen. G. B. Pillsbury, Acting Chief of Engineers, in connection with the pending bill. I am familiar, in a general way, with the location of the proposed dams, and especially those in my district, and am glad to know that relief is in sight for our people from the destruction and waste which has existed in the past because of high waters and floods in the Cumberland River Valley in middle Tennessee as well as that in west Tennessee. Perhaps the western area, along the Mississippi, has suffered more because of floods than has the middle section of our State, but it has been bad enough in middle Tennessee and along the Cumberland River and its tributaries for years. The bill is a step in the right direction. I am pleased to note that there is no serious opposition to the proposed measure and that it has practically united support of the Members of the House.

The people of Tennessee and of my congressional district will feel relieved to know that this progressive legislation is meeting with such favor in the Congress. It has long been needed. It will eliminate and do away with the disasters incident to the floods and to soil erosion that has obtained for years along the rivers of my State. Many millions of dollars in property values have been washed away and a great loss of life has occurred from time to time, as well as untold hardships visited upon my people because of floods and high waters in the rainy seasons. This is now, and soon will be, largely behind us because of this and kindred legislation. Much good has been accomplished by the building of dams from relief moneys in some sections, but the proposed bill is on a Nation-wide scale and means real relief from further flood disasters in many sections of our common country, and especially in my congressional district.

I am happy in the realization that the bill is to pass and that the long-felt need of my people will be realized. I am grateful to each and every member of the committee who have helped to write the present bill and am grateful to the Army engineers and all those who have contributed so much in time and effort to make this legislation possible. Money expended in flood-control work as provided in this measure will result in savings throughout the years and a great protection to all of our people. I do not know of a bill that has been proposed to the Congress that is entitled to more wholehearted support or is receiving more wholehearted support than has this measure. It should have had the attention of Congress long before this.

The land along the Cumberland and Caney Fork Rivers in my district, and especially the bottom land, is the most fertile soil we have. It is vitally important to those living in the area affected, as well as elsewhere, that future floods be avoided so as to conserve the property of the people living along these rivers and streams which have been so seriously affected in the past.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] so much time as he may desire.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. This bill should be passed by the House without dissent. It represents a minimum priority project program for the immediate protection of the cities along the Ohio River. It certainly is the very least we should do to meet this pressing need.

Many of us are beginning to realize that flood control can never be effected merely by constructing levees or building dams. We are realizing that the destruction of soil fertility has caused the decay and death of more than one great civilization. We are beginning, I hope and believe, to see our national problem as a whole instead of attempting to continue forever to look at it as a piecemeal task.

Sections 3 and 4 of this bill, indeed, are recognition of the necessary function of the Department of Agriculture in connection with flood control. These sections give the Secretary necessary duties and powers to provide for proper land use in future on lands whose drainage affects our flooded areas. This is as it should be. It is well for us to remember that too close and long-lasting an adherence to the principles of extreme individualism led to the destruction of China's forests, the wasting away of her topsoil, her present-day terrible floods, and the decline of her agriculture.

America, let us hope, has awakened soon enough. Flood control is the most dramatic phase of a great single challenge to us to preserve and properly develop all the natural gifts of God in America for the sake of future generations.

Reforestation, soil conservation, flood control, drought prevention, and public power development at low cost—all these are necessary part and parcel of one another. The forces of nature in their impact on human life in America are no respecters of the lines that separate the jurisdiction of committees of the Congress.

It is my earnest hope that the time will speedily come when all these matters can be dealt with in a coordinated manner. I believe this requires that these be central planning authorities for the various sections of the Nation. I do not believe such authorities should be turned loose to do as they please. I think Congress should require, receive, and study their reports and appropriate their funds from year to year. But I believe every dollar that is appropriated should be made to serve as many useful purposes as possible and without coordinated consideration of the whole natural resource problem I do not believe this is possible.

What I am really saying, of course, is that I hope we may speedily pass the legislation already introduced in this as well as the other body which will provide natural-resource planning and conservation authorities for the entire Nation. Future generations will thank us if we do.

In the meantime the least we can do is to provide necessary protection for the areas most threatened with flood. I agree with the chairman. I wish this bill were more extensive than it is. But I believe we are going about the thing in the right way—doing what is most essential now, and preparing for a truly sound attack on the entire problem as soon as full consideration can be given to appropriate legislation to accomplish this.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] so much time as he may desire.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this bill, H. R. 7646, impresses me favorably in at

least two respects. First, although it is aimed principally to take care of the flood condition in the great central valleys of the country, such as the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, and the Missouri Valley, where the recent floods have been most disastrous, yet it contemplates some provision for the distant fringes of the country, as in the far West, as well. Again, I am favorably impressed with the nature of this bill in this respect, that while it is curative or remedial in its intention, it is also designed to be preventative. The old saying "that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" certainly applies to the management of our rivers. If America had begun two or three generations ago to practice a little prevention in this respect, we would have less of remedial work to do now.

A remark made by our late colleague from Texas, Congressman Buchanan, impressed me as a sage observation. He thought that in the management of our lawless rivers we would not only need to practice one plan but a varied program involving several different kinds of tactics, perhaps the building of levees or retaining walls, perhaps the dredging of river beds, and perhaps the erection of storage dams. However, even these, in his judgment, would not be enough, for something must be done to retard the flow on the upper reaches of the watershed. Therefore, combined with great engineering works must be a treatment of the "little waters", the twig-end rivulets, and the watershed itself. The far-seeing statesman no doubt felt that soil conservation through reforestation and revegetation would be as much a part of total river-control and flood-prevention program as would dams, basins, dikes, levees, and the like. I agree with that view and am pleased with this measure, for I see exactly this sort of treatment contemplated in section 3 of the bill.

The gentleman from Ohio calls our attention to one feature that is not so good—the aspect of local contribution on cost. I take it that that refers to all engineering treatments involving expenditures for materials and labor. If it is extremely doubtful whether many small towns along the banks of a river, like the Ohio, cannot afford to pay their share of the total expense, then this program will break down. But it is even more to the point that relatively expensive engineering works on a stream through a mountain country, or a sparsely settled community, cannot be treated at all under this legislation calling for local contribution. Obviously, in such a case, there would be little or no contribution that could be made. Of course, I understand that the surveys authorized in the last section of the bill are to be paid for out of moneys appropriated, and in such cases no local contribution will be called for.

In my far western State of Arizona there are several streams that need to be surveyed and carefully investigated with a view of flood-control treatment. I might mention the San Pedro, in the southern part of the State; the Little Colorado, in the northern part; the Bill Williams, in the western portion; and the Big Sandy, a tributary of the Bill Williams. The last two named are included on page 7 of the bill in the list of rivers to be surveyed. Of course, I might have mentioned the Gila River in general, but, according to my understanding, a great deal of study has already been given to the scientific treatment of the Gila watershed. Much work has already been done on it. In my judgment, the greatest possibilities of combined scientific erosion control, flood prevention, and silt disposal that could be found in this country is in the vast project of that nature on the Gila watershed in two Southwestern States.

Some weeks ago the Governor of Arizona acquainted me with the fact that the Big Sandy in Mohave County, Ariz., was seriously in need of scientific treatment or several hundred farming families would be unable to subsist longer in its narrow valley. I believe the inclusion of the Big Sandy in this list of rivers for investigation will be the first step toward furnishing them relief. I am happy to say that the Bill Williams River also is included here and would like to point out, especially to my California colleagues, that the Bill Williams flows into the Colorado River just above the Parker Dam. It is frequently a wild and turbulent river and now capable of doing southern California much harm.

Twenty miles or so up the Bill Williams from its junction with the Colorado is an ideal dam site in a box canyon. When I say it is an ideal site, I imply that there is a splendid reservoir site upstream from the canyon. This Bill Williams River has an enormous watershed with an area about equal to that of Mohave County itself. Let me remind you that the counties in Arizona are larger than certain New England States. I have a feeling that an investigation of the Bill Williams River will reveal the need of a dam at this site, both for flood control and for irrigation. But such a dam would also protect the Parker Reservoir from being continually filled with muddy water and eventually filled with silt. It should be remembered that the Parker Reservoir is the one from which the city of Los Angeles and the metropolitan area around and about will obtain a water supply from the Colorado River. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with these local interests in view, as well as the larger need of flood control in the Middle West, I hope for favorable action on this bill and fruitful future efforts later under its provisions.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] so much time as he may desire.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, there is no subject that should be and is of greater interest to the people of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys than flood prevention.

The Committee on Flood Control by its intensive study of this problem and by its comprehensive hearings has rendered a great service, and I commend the chairman and the committee for the fine work they have done. I am heartily in favor of this bill because its object is meritorious and because it is the best bill that could be passed at this time.

No one who has not seen the devastation wrought by the flood in the Ohio Valley can have any idea of the awful destruction it wrought and the resultant suffering of the people. The actual damage will never be known. It was a major national disaster. We have had floods before that have wrought damage, and the loss sustained by reason of the highest previous flood was looked upon by the people as the extent of damage that could be inflicted by the waters of the Ohio River, but the last flood in the Ohio Valley was entirely unanticipated and unprecedented.

It has caused the Army engineers to revise their plans for flood prevention. They have come to the conclusion that impounding reservoirs must be supplemented by flood walls and levees, and it seems obvious that no adequate protection could otherwise be furnished to the cities. It has been the opinion of the President, which he has publicly expressed, and others connected with the administration that States and local subdivisions should furnish the lands, easements, and rights-of-way for the impounding reservoirs and for the flood walls and levees.

I am not disposed to argue that it would not be just for the States to make some contribution for the protection that flood-prevention measures would afford. It might be possible through comprehensive compacts of all the States benefited that contributions could be made by the States, not in regard to the number of works and prevention measures that will be constructed in each of the States but based upon the benefits that would accrue to each of them. If such compacts could be made and promptly carried out I would not be opposed to them.

But there is a condition demanding immediate action and not a theory that confronts us. I doubt seriously that some of the States would be able to comply with the conditions that would necessarily have to be made in these compacts. However, the requirement in the Flood Control Act of 1936 that the States and local subdivisions shall furnish the lands, easements, and rights-of-way is impossible of compliance, and as long as it is in the law there can be no substantial progress made in the construction of flood-prevention works.

The local subdivisions are not benefited by the proposed impounding reservoirs, but the benefits accrue to great valleys and to many States and far-distant territories.

I represent a district that has suffered greatly from the floods in the Ohio Valley. Eight of the nine counties in the

Fifth District of Kentucky are bounded by the Ohio River. Each one of the eight has been a victim of these recurring disasters which were climaxed by the terrible flood of this year.

I speak of conditions in my district and in the State of Kentucky because I am familiar with them, but I have no doubt that the same conditions exist in all the other States and cities similarly situated.

Of the 45 impounding reservoirs which have been planned for the Ohio Valley by the Army engineers, 18 are in the State of Kentucky. The area submerged as computed by the Army engineers for the 18 reservoirs is 137,700 acres. Much of this land includes settlements, roads, bridges, and so forth, and a great part of it has considerable value. When the land is acquired for flood-prevention works it will be taken from the tax lists of the State to its constant annual loss. The cost of the land to be used in Kentucky in construction of these impounding reservoirs is computed by the Army engineers at $30,949,000, and I have no doubt it will actually go very much higher than that. There is a proposed reservoir authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, at Falmouth, Ky., in the district I represent, which, I am informed, the Army engineers would like to commence the construction of, but the area to be submerged for that reservoir is computed at 9,250 acres, much of which is good farming land and well settled, and the estimated cost of same is $1,822,000.

The mere statement of the facts, it seems to me, demonstrates this proposed impounding reservoir can never be constructed under the present law.

It is also evident that the other reservoirs proposed cannot be constructed under existing law. The reservoirs are planned at headwaters of the Big Sandy, the Licking, the Kentucky, the Salt, the Green, and the Cumberland Rivers and afford no protection to their immediate vicinities, for these localities have never been subject to floods.

The reservoirs will have no recreational value and will be of absolutely no benefit to the localities where constructed. The difficulties that obtain with reference to the States and local subdivisions acquiring the lands, easements, and rights-of-way for reservoirs also obtain in having the municipalities acquire the lands and easements for the levees and flood walls for their protection. Estimates, by the Army engineers, of the cost of lands and consequent damages for flood walls and levees for three cities in my district, where I am familiar with conditions, have been made. The cost of lands and damages which will have to be borne by Dayton, Ky., will be $412,000; Newport, $545,000; and Covington, $568,000.

Under the constitution of Kentucky there is a limitation on the tax rate of municipalities and also a constitutional limitation on municipal indebtedness, and all of these cities have practically reached that limit. It will be impossible for any of them to comply with the existing law.

These remarks have not been made in the spirit of criticism but to call attention to the obstacles placed in the law which will make the carrying out of the comprehensive flood-control plan impossible. They are made with the devout hope that some amendments may soon be passed to the present law that will obviate its present requirements and that the people of the Ohio Valley as they see these great works progress may be justified in the renewed assurance that there may be no recurring disaster such as has recently visited them.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FRED M. VINSON] so much time as he may desire.

Mr. FRED M. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my attitude toward the bill under discussion, H. R. 7646. I favor it as the initial start toward a program of flood control in the Ohio River Valley. However, I would not be frank with the House or myself if I did not say that this initial amount of approximately $25,000,000 is a very limited sum with which to start such a vast program; but, as I say, it is a start in the right direction, and I favor it as such.

Further, it is with regret that we find that the bill is presented under a suspension of the rules, which does not permit an amendment to it. So far as the Kentucky side of the Ohio River is concerned, we are and will be quite hampered in the flood-control program unless the present law is amended that will permit Federal contributions for the purchase of lands, rights-of-way, and the payment of damages due to the flood-control work, as in Kentucky we are limited by constitutional prohibition against the creation of debts which evidence money to provide these projects.

We know of no governmental unit in Kentucky, whether it is State, county, or city, that can, under our constitution, sell bonds which will take care of the expense of flood-control projects. The State of Kentucky has a constitutional provision limiting the indebtedness which it can incur to $500,000. There are similar constitutional provisions limiting the obligations which a county may incur. As I recall it, this limitation is 2 percent of the assessed value of the property in the county. There is a further constitutional provision that prohibits a city from incurring indebtedness in excess of 10 percent of the assessed values of the properties within the corporate limits if it is a city of the first, second, or third class, population over 15,000; if it is a city of the third class, with a population less than 15,000, or a city of the fourth class, 5 percent; if it is a city of the fifth or sixth class, 3 percent. With the present indebtedness of those governmental units, the State, the counties, and the cities, it is folly to consider that expenditures to construct flood walls can be made at local expense. I do not know a single city or county in my district that borders on the Ohio River that can make any contributions, as a matter of law, toward doing this job. It is not because they do not want to, but it is because of a constitutional provision that bars the way. I feel certain that this is typical of the other counties in Kentucky. The theory of local contributions may be argued, but how can this constitutional barrier in Kentucky be overcome?

Of course, it will be my purpose and the purpose of those of us who are interested in this flood-control work to do our dead level best to bring about an amendment to the law which will permit Federal contributions for the purchase of lands, rights-of-way, and payment of damages following the flood-control work.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the relation of the initial authorization, $25,000,000 to the sum total necessary to do this job is not commensurate with the needs of the situation, but, under the suspension of rules, there will be no chance to amend the bill to increase this sum on the floor of the House and we will have to continue the fight to secure further moneys so that this great valley will be protected from the huge flood losses it has suffered in the years gone by.

To me this job is truly a national problem. Frankly, it appears to me that it is high time for action rather than a continuation of theorizing about how this job will be or ought to be done. All of the finespun theories of the past in regard to the local communities doing this job has resulted, insofar as the Ohio River Valley is concerned, in the sum total of nothing in the way of flood prevention or flood control. It is a pretty thought to divide up costs among the various localities, but, in my opinion, the practical situation is such that unless it is considered to be a national problem very little or nothing is going to come out of such course.

I realize that such a tremendous undertaking is a long-haul proposition and that the whole job cannot be done overnight. It is a most difficult matter for Congress to determine the points at which local flood-prevention projects will be built. Starting at the point where the Ohio River touches my district, we have the cities of Catlettsburg, Ashland, Russell, Worthington, Wurtland, Raceland, Greenup, Fullerton, South Portsmouth, Vanceburg, Maysville, Dover, and Augusta, being the larger cities, which were covered up in this recent flood. There are many smaller communities where the damage was likewise great. This same situation is typical in the other districts. I do not see how Congress or the War Department is going to fairly choose the places where flood walls will be constructed. It, of course, will

be argued that in the more thickly populated centers, greater damage in dollars was suffered, but it is a rather difficult problem to overlook the damage in dollars per capita. When a "feller" with small means has lost all he has or suffered material property damage, it means the same to him and his family whether he lives in a small community or in a metropolitan center. My thought is that this problem must be visualized as a unit of work with a comprehensive plan to do this job over a period of years that would see the whole job done as best it can be done.

Every Representative in Congress wants his district protected first. I know I feel that way about mine and rightfully so—every other Member in the flood area feels the same way about his district—and rightfully so, but I am inclined to think that if the job is viewed as a whole, with the shortest number of years that can be taken in which the money can be obtained to do this job that these splendid people in the Ohio Valley will appreciate that the job cannot be done in a day. I feel that the Federal Government should obligate itself to do this job and if such is the result of this intial movement I feel that it will be a job well done.

I want to express my appreciation and the appreciation of my people for the initiation of this work. I know that no Congress has ever listened with a more sympathetic ear or a more sincere feeling to the needs of the people. Throughout my experience in Congress I have never seen a more determined exhibition of the desires of Members of Congress to serve their constituency than was demonstrated during the flood of 1937. As you know, I was honored with the chairmanship of the group of Congressmen representing the flood areas in the Ohio Valley during this flood. The serious and effective work done by them is a monument to their work here as the representatives of a great people.

Again I want to express my appreciation for the manner in which Congress has responded to this bill. I believe that this is the best that can be done under the circumstances. It is a real start toward doing a real job. It is only natural for those of us representing districts which suffered during the recent flood to feel that the amount that is authorized under this bill is inadequate with the needs as reported to us by the Chief of Army Engineers as necessary to meet the problem; but, as I say, it is a start toward doing the job, and I feel that we must favor it and continue to fight with all our efforts in succeeding Congresses to have the job continue until it is fully and well done.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON] so much time as he may desire.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to contrast for a minute the response the House is giving this bill (H. R. 7646) providing for flood-control works in the Ohio Valley, with the response given H. R. 8455, passed in the Seventy-fourth Congress. The Flood Control Act of 1936 passed the House by a bare majority amid cries of "pork."

If I may mention to the House, the Flood Control Act of 1936 was the first step toward the great national problem of flood control. It set out, in short, the policy that the Federal Government should improve, or participate in the improvement, of navigable waters including watersheds, for flood-control purposes if the benefits to whomsoever they may accrue are in excess of the estimated costs and if the lives and social security of people are otherwise adversely affected.

In addition to this it called upon the Secretary of Agriculture for further investigation of watershed and measures for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention. This great national policy is the basis of the act of 1936.

In addition, this act authorized the construction of $300,000,000 of projects with localities paying a portion of the cost. This bill insures the desirability of the projects because local interests must contribute and in contributing thus guarantee the desirability of the projects' construction.

In the hearings on the Ohio Valley bill we are considering today, which I recommend for the consideration of every Member, it was developed by the Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, the Weather Bureau, and the Game Commission that every effort is being made to conserve natural resources and to investigate every possibility for the betterment and conservation of natural resources in the construction of flood-control works.

I take a great deal of pleasure in being a member of the committee which drafted the original flood-control bill that started the Nation on a great program of flood control.

Looking into the possibility of flood control from every angle, even including power, the act of 1936 provided for the installation of penstocks in all projects, where there seems to be a possibility of the development of power. So I may say to the Congress today that in passing this bill extending the flood-control measures to the recent damaged Ohio Valley this is one more step in an all-embracing national flood-control program started in the Seventy-fourth Congress by the Flood Control Committee.

I sincerely urge the Members of the House to investigate and study this program, because next year the Flood Control Committee plans to bring before the Congress a comprehensive national flood-control bill based on surveys already in the hands of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture. These surveys shall include the construction of levees, spillways, diversion channels, channel rectification, reservoirs, and utilization of water resources through the building of power dams or a combination of power, reclamation, conservation, and flood-control dams, and all works necessary for an effective soil and water conservation for all such rivers and their watersheds.

And so the Committee on Flood Control, having pioneered the start of this work, may be looked to, under the able leadership of its chairman, Mr. WHITTINGTON, to bring before the next session of this Congress a utilized plan that will insure greater returns on the expenditure of public money for the ever-present problem of work relief than under any other form for which money can be expended.

Now, to come to one technical provision of the bill, I want to point out to the Members of this House that the War Department appropriation bill, now in the hands of the President, makes available $30,000,000 of regular funds for carrying out provisions of the Flood Control Act of 1936, and this is also the bill that will make necessary funds available for carrying out the provisions of this act we are passing on today. So we may say that the start of the flood-control work in the Ohio Valley hangs entirely upon the President signing the War Department appropriation bill now on his desk.

In addition, I want to point out that since this bill may use funds from the $30,000,000 regularly appropriated, the Flood Control Committee, represented by Chairman WHITTINGTON, Mr. SECREST, and myself, were assured by the Director of the Budget, Mr. Bell, that any funds taken out of the regular $30,000,000—which was appropriated to carry out projects previously authorized in the 1936 act—will be replaced by request of the Budget for deficiency appropriations to be asked for at the beginning of the second session of the Seventy-fifth Congress next January. It is understood that relief funds will be used to carry out flood-control projects exceeding $30,000,000 earmarked by the Senate. So we may say that this administration and this body has started a great national system of flood control by enacting the authorization act of 1936 and now amending it by including the Ohio Valley today, and providing funds for execution of these authorizations in the appropriation bill now before the President.

We have started a great work. I say again, I am proud to be a member of the committee that instituted this program, and I sincerely hope that the Congress will read and study the hearings developed under this bill and will not retard this great program so well started by adopting other legislation which would require that the whole subject of flood-control legislation, and appropriation carrying out the legislation be started all over.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] so much time as he may desire.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, that the construction of an adequate flood-control system for the rivers of the United States constitutes one of our gravest national problems has been a recognized fact from an early date in our history. Floods in our great river valleys have been practically of annual occurrence for many years, with the resultant loss of millions of dollars in property damage and the frequent loss of lives. It is estimated that, in less than 50 years, the loss by floods in property damage has reached an excess of $1,000,000,000, and that the loss in lives has been from 1,000 to 1,500. Annually thousands of people have been driven from their homes in these river valleys, and literally thousands of homes have been swept away—a total loss to the home owners and a loss to the local and National Governments in taxable values.

These disastrous and terrifying floods, coming with increasing frequency to cause havoc and despair to the peaceful and happy people dwelling in the river valleys, originate from causes beyond the control of those living in the pathway of danger and beyond the help of local communities. It has long been recognized that, if there is any remedy for this condition, that remedy must be found in effective efforts by the National Government. It is well known by those acquainted with the facts that the engineers of our War Department have for many years had this problem before them for study. Tirelessly, these engineers, splendidly equipped by training and experience, have been engaged in the formulation of comprehensive plans for effective flood control. While it seems that the rest of the world has only progressed to the point of engaging in long discussions as to what steps might be taken to control this deadly menace to the residents of our river valleys, the Army engineers have steadily gone forward, not only in an exhaustive study of this situation, but also in the formation of plans for real and effective protection. These engineers have been ready for years and are ready today to go forward in the construction of a comprehensive and adequate flood-control program. Their efforts, however, along these lines have either been slowed up, handicapped, or even entirely prevented by lack of authorization or by failure in the appropriation upon the part of the Federal Government of sufficient funds to commence, continue, and complete the necessary constructive work.

It is a well-known fact that we have had frequent authorizations of this work passed by the Congress of the United States with great enthusiasm. In these cases the effort has usually ended with authorization only and with no provision whatever for appropriations to carry the work to completion. In these cases all that could be done was for the engineers to pigeonhole their carefully prepared plans and await possible future action on the part of the Congress. In the meanwhile the disastrous floods continue to occur annually, causing in every case a greater yearly loss than would have been necessary to have been appropriated for the purpose of preventing them.

It would require too much time and space for a full discussion of the flood situation within our entire national domain. For my present purpose I wish to discuss the flood situation in a part of the Ohio River Basin, including the Great Kanawha River and that section situate between the mouth of the Great Kanawha and the city of Cincinnati. I wish also to dwell particularly upon one project, to wit, what is known as the Bluestone Dam and Reservoir, the construction of which was authorized by the Flood Control Act known as Public, No. 738, of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

It is an admitted fact that flood control of the larger rivers can only be effected by the control of the flow of their tributaries. It is this fact, no doubt, which controlled the Army engineers in their preparation of the plans for the control of the floods in the Ohio River Basin. As is well known, the Ohio River is formed by a junction, at Pittsburgh, Pa., of the Allegheny River flowing from the north and the Monongahela flowing from the south. Therefore, and naturally, the first problem was to control the floods in these two rivers and thus protect the city of Pittsburgh and contiguous territory from the annual recurring inundations to which this section is subjected. This protection would extend also to points on the Ohio River far below Pittsburgh. With this end in view plans have long since been formulated by the War Department for the control of the two streams which, flowing together, form the Ohio. Therefore we find in the general plan for control of the Ohio River Basin proposals for the construction of flood-control reservoirs in both streams. As a matter of fact, the great Tygart River Dam across a tributary of the Monongahela and located near Grafton, W. Va., is now practically completed at a cost of something in excess of $16,000,000. This dam will naturally be supplemented by other reservoirs across the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers or their tributaries, both in Pennsylvania and West Virginia. The plans of the War Department engineers also provide for many other reservoirs of like character across other tributaries of the Ohio between Pittsburgh and Cairo. These plans have been approved but no money has yet been provided for the construction of the works.

The chief tributary of the Ohio River between the two points last named is the Great Kanawha River, which meets the Ohio at the town of Point Pleasant in West Virginia. The Great Kanawha is formed at Gauley Bridge, Kanawha County, W. Va., by a junction of the Gauley River with the New River. The Gauley River, flowing from the north, is a stream of considerably less importance than the New River. The New River has its source in the mountains of North Carolina and flows practically in every direction of the compass until it meets with the Gauley to form the Great Kanawha. In North Carolina, the New River flows for a considerable distance southward; it then turns to the east and seems to wander around along the foothills of the Blue Ridge and Allegheny Mountains, finally turning northward to flow through a considerable section of Virginia. Turning to the east at, or near, Radford, Va., it flows into West Virginia at a point located in the extreme southeastern portion of the State, and then cutting its way through the hills, it meets the Gauley at a point about 32 miles from where it crosses the Virginia-West Virginia line. The Great Kanawha River is, because of the large drainage area taken care of by the New River, a full-grown river at its source. It has been, since the early history of the country, one of the navigable tributaries of the Ohio. Many years ago it was improved for navigation by the United States Government and is much used today by river steamers. Within the past 2 years, the Government has undertaken further to improve this river for navigation, and in doing so there has been eliminated 12 of the old locks and dams, and these have been taken care of by the construction of three superdams, built solely for the purpose of improving the navigability of the stream. It is my understanding that at the present time the Government has leased the use of these three superdams to a power company for the generation of hydroelectric power. My further understanding is that the Government is paid for the production of the power at the dams and the distribution of this power is made by the power company through its own facilities. Therefore, the present dams are intended solely for the purposes of navigation and power and not for flood control.

That the Great Kanawha River is subjected to severe and disastrous floods goes without saying. Its main tributary, the New River, is uncertain in its conduct. The territory drained by this last named stream is frequently subjected to extremely heavy rainfalls. Piercing as it does the higher mountain regions of three States wherein the forests have, to a considerable extent, been cut away and where many of the mountain chains are practically barren, the rainfalls increase in quantity from year to year and the flow-off is increasing, also, in rapidity as the years go by. As a matter of fact, there is not a year that passes wherein the residents of the Great Kanawha Valley, from Gauley Bridge to Point Pleasant, have not good reason to expect either one or more heavy floods. As this is one of the richest valleys in the State of West Virginia, not alone in agriculture, but in manufacturing interests, these floods grow

more costly each year. The capital of the State, to wit: Charleston, W. Va., is located in this valley on the banks of the Great Kanawha. Around Charleston, and from that city up the river to Gauley Bridge, we find located the greatest chemical producing plants in the United States. The hills upon both sides of the valley carry large seams of workable bituminous coal. By drilling a short distance down into the earth, there may be found streams of salt water which have been utilized since pioneer days in the manufacture of pure salt and all its byproduct chemicals. Oil wells are also drilled in this valley as well as natural gas wells, the products from which are used either for fuel or for local consumption, or piped to other markets. In other words, this valley is a rich, thriving, enterprising, and up-to-date section of the Nation. Yet it is constantly subjected to the dangers and the excessive costs of devastating floods. In addition to this, the results of these floods are more far reaching than merely the Kanawha Valley, for the vast flood waters that are turned into the Ohio by the Great Kanawha at Point Pleasant add to the burdens carried by the Ohio and increase the damage of Ohio floods in every Ohio River city from Point Pleasant to Cincinnati and beyond.

As has been stated, for over 10 years the engineers of the War Department have had ready a comprehensive plan for the effective control of the floodwaters of the Ohio River Basin, including the floods of the Great Kanawha, and yet nothing has been done about it. With reference to the plans for the Kanawha Valley, to which I am particularly addressing myself at present, it need only be said that these plans comprehend the construction of four reservoirs, to wit: One on the Elk River above the city of Charleston and at or near the town of Gassaway, one on the Gauley River just above the point where this river enters the Great Kanawha, one at what is known as Big Bend on the Greenbrier River, and one across the New River just below the point where this river is joined by the Bluestone River and just above the town of Hinton, W. Va. These four proposed dams are contemplated, in the first instance, for flood control only, and together they will completely take care of the flood situation in the Kanawha Valley. Among these proposed dams and reservoirs the chief one is the one across New River, which is known as the Bluestone Reservoir, near Hinton. The construction of this dam was authorized by the Seventy-fourth Congress in Public, No. 728, at a cost of approximately $13,000,000. However, it must be remembered that this authorization was not the first movement to be put on foot for the construction of this Bluestone project. The construction of this dam and reservoir had long been recognized by the engineers of the War Department as a very important project in their general plans for flood control of the Ohio Valley Basin. I have, in fact, been advised that the plans for this dam were among the first to be completed by these engineers.

For a number of years, I have been personally interested in the need for flood control. I have had a special interest in efforts made in this direction for the benefit of the Great Kanawha and the Ohio Valley Basin. Since becoming a Member of Congress from the most southern district of West Virginia, this interest has materially increased and I have exercised every effort consistent with my ability to secure not only the authorization for the construction of all of the dams included in the plan of the War Department engineers, but particularly of those affecting my immediate constituents whose interest I am representing. It has been my idea that, purely as a flood-control proposition, the plans of the War Department engineers should be carried out and that if we could secure the construction of the Bluestone Dam, we would have but little trouble in securing a sufficient appropriation to complete the plans for the other dams proposed for the protection of the Great Kanawha, and which may be constructed at considerably less cost than the Bluestone.

After the passage of the Federal Emergency Relief Act, I made every effort to secure from the proper authority an authorization and an appropriation from this fund to inaugurate the work of construction of the Bluestone Dam. With this idea in view, I had interviews with many agencies in reference to the matter. Practically all of these agencies refused to recommend the allocation of funds for the construction of this project out of the emergency-relief funds, basing their refusal upon the statement that the labor required for this work was disproportionate to the cost of materials and all other necessary expenditures in connection therewith. I had an interview with General Markham, Chief of Engineers of the War Department, and, while he placed his stamp of approval upon the project, he refused to recommend its construction out of relief funds for the same reason as that assigned by the other agencies.

However, on September 12, 1935, President Roosevelt, recognizing the importance of this Bluestone Dam as a flood-control project, issued an Executive order in which he stated that this project had been recommended by the United States Army engineers, was approved by the Mississippi River Commission and by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and by the Secretary of War. He stated, also, that upon investigation he had found that the construction of the Bluestone Dam and Reservoir project would "aid in flood control and in the prevention of soil erosion and stream pollution, and will promote navigation, agriculture, sanitation, and power production." Whereupon the President ordered and directed the Secretary of War, through the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, to proceed with the construction of said Bluestone Dam and Reservoir in accordance with the report to the Chief of Engineers and the plans and specifications submitted therewith. And the President, in this order, allocated the sum of $1,000,000 for beginning the construction of this project, which amount was to be made available out of the moneys appropriated by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. This Executive order stated, also, that, out of this sum of money, so allocated, the sum of $800,000 should be made available "for the acquisition by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise of lands necessary for the said project, and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to acquire and clear, or cause to be acquired, or cleared, such lands in anticipation of their use for such project."

Immediately after the President had issued this Executive order, the Army engineers established headquarters at Hinton, W. Va., and commenced the preliminary work leading to the construction of the dam and reservoir. The final plans and specifications were checked and completed; the actual location of the dam was determined; the necessary soundings and borings were done to the end that the dam be located upon a proper foundation. In addition to this, two or more Civilian Conservation Corps camps were located in the valley above the site of the proposed dam and, with the consent of the landowners, the area to be covered by the impounded waters was partially cleared away. In other words, all the preliminary steps were taken up to the actual acquisition of a large portion of the right-of-way which was owned by the West Virginia Power Co. and which had been acquired by this company for the purpose of building a power dam under private ownership. This company would not agree upon a price for their holdings, and thereupon proceedings were brought against the power company on behalf of the Federal Government to condemn the holdings of the power company, which were necessary for proceeding with the work of construction. These proceedings were instituted in the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, of which the Honorable George W. McClintic, of Charleston, W. Va., is judge. After the filing of the petition of the Government praying for the condemnation of the property of the power company and the appointment of commissioners to assess the value thereof, the power company, through its attorneys, appeared before the court and filed its demurrer to the Government's petition. I have not had an opportunity to examine the papers in this case, but it is my understanding that this demurrer was based upon the point that there is no specific act of Congress authorizing either the purchase or condemnation of the land and that Congress could not delegate to the Presi-

dent the authority upon which the President relied for his Executive order under which the construction of the dam and reservoir was directed.

I do not know just when this demurrer was filed, but I do know that on July 2, 1936, Judge McClintic heard argument on the demurrer, and on November 2 of the same year advised counsel that the demurrer had been sustained by him, and that he would enter an order dismissing the Government's petition, which I presume was done. I am advised that no oral or written opinion was delivered by the judge in the matter. Therefore, I am, unfortunately, unable to state the exact grounds upon which the judge based his order sustaining the demurrer and dismissing the petition of the Government. I do know this, however, and this fact should not be lost in the consideration of this matter, the demurrer of the power company to the Government's petition was not argued until July 2, 1936, and the order sustaining the demurrer was not entered until November 2, 1936. And this is a recorded fact, before this argument was made and before this order was entered, the Congress of the United States passed an act authorizing the construction of public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, being Public, No. 738, of the Seventy-fourth Congress, and which act was approved by the President of the United States on June 22, 1936. This act, duly passed by the Congress and signed and approved by the President, fully authorized and approved the building and completion of the Bluestone Reservoir, using the following language: "Construction of reservoirs including the completion of the Bluestone Reservoir now under way." This approval by Congress of the construction of this project certainly ratifies the act of the President in directing such construction by his Executive order issued September 12, 1935.

If it does not ratify the President's Executive order, then it certainly must be considered as an independent authorization to the War Department to construct this dam and reservoir and clothes the War Department with the power to do all things necessary for this construction, including the right of condemnation or necessary rights-of-way. And it authorized an appropriation to meet the cost. If it requires no specific act of either a legislature or of Congress in any particular case to vest a railway company or power company or any other public-service corporation with the right of eminent domain, then why can it be held that in each instance where this right is necessary to the welfare of the United States Government and to its public works, a special act of authorization must be passed by Congress to enable the United States Government to condemn land upon which to build an authorized public service project for the welfare of the people of the country? The construction of the Bluestone Dam and Reservoir was fully authorized by an act of Congress signed by the President on the 22d day of June 1936, and yet, on the 2d day of November 1936, a Federal judge refuses the right of condemnation to an authorized agency of the Government on the claim that at some time in the past the President had ordered this same work to be done without having authority to make such order.

In discussing the matter of the Bluestone Dam project with our Flood Control Committee, and as well with the subcommittee on nonmilitary activities of the War Department, I have found it difficult to get it understood that further work upon this project has not been stopped by an "injunction." As I understand it, there has never been an injunction issued by any court restraining or inhibiting the Government, or any agency thereof, from proceeding with this construction. Further work on the dam was stopped merely because of the order heretofore mentioned denying to the Government the right of eminent domain in the matter of acquiring the rights-of-way owned by the West Virginia Power Co. And, as stated above, this order, according to my understanding, was purportedly based upon the determination that the President of the United States exceeded his authority in the issuance of his Executive order. In my opinion, it would serve no good purpose now to argue whether the President exceeded his authority in issuing this order or whether he did not. Congress has, since the issuance of the order, approved the work, authorized its continued construction, and, to all intents and purposes, legally and otherwise, has ratified the acts of the President. Therefore, upon what grounds doth this court order stand?

Not only the people of West Virginia who reside in the great Kanawha Valley, in the capital, Charleston, in the historical city of Point Pleasant, in the large and growing city of Huntington and in the border town of Kenova, but all of the residents of the Ohio Valley, including those who live in Gallipolis, Ironton, Portsmouth, and Cincinnati, Ohio, and those who dwell on the Kentucky shores and in the cities of Catlettsburg, Ashland, Maysville, Newport, and Covington, Ky., are deeply interested in the construction of the Bluestone Dam and Reservoir. It is claimed upon good authority that the control of the floodwaters in the great Kanawha River will lower the floodwaters at Cincinnati in the Ohio to the extent of approximately 7 feet. The Bluestone Dam will impound practically 918,000 acre-feet of floodwater and will take care of the waters from a drainage area of 4,860 square miles. It is estimated that this dam and reservoir can now be completed with an expenditure of approximately $13,000,000. After the allocation by the President of $1,000,000 toward this construction, the War Department expended in engineering, labor, and final plans, approximately $300,000.

Some days ago, I asked from the Department information with reference to the distribution of the $700,000 which remained after the expenditure of the $300,000 mentioned. I was advised that the $700,000 remaining after the War Department expenditure of $300,000 had been turned back into the Federal emergency-relief fund. In other words, I take it that this means that this amount has been recovered back into the Treasury of the United States. I am not advised as to what or whose orders the War Department acted under in returning this money back into the Treasury. When Judge McClintic dismissed the Government's petition in its condemnation proceedings, this order of the judge was certainly subject to an appeal to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Judicial Circuit and, in my opinion, such an appeal should have been taken at once.

An adverse decision in the United States circuit court of appeals would certainly be subject to review by the United States Supreme Court, and, in my opinion, an order of the court based upon as grave a matter as an alleged action of the President which exceeded his authority should be a matter demanding review. However, I have not been advised of any further steps in the proceedings. In the meanwhile nothing further is being done toward the construction of the Bluestone Dam.

I am honestly of the opinion that the determination of the United States district court was erroneous, but that is merely an opinion entitled, perhaps, to no greater weight than the opinion of any other individual. What we need now is action which will lead to the final construction of this important link in the chain of projects necessary for the control of floods in the Ohio River Basin.

I view with favor the bill brought before the House by the very competent chairman of the Committee on Flood Control [Mr. WHITTINGTON], and I wish to pledge to him my future cooperation in his worthy efforts. The only objection that I have to the bill known as H. R. 7646 is that it does not carry with it sufficient authorization to meet the present emergency. It should also have carried authority for the appropriation of at least $2,000,000 for continuance of the work upon the Bluestone project, provided the authorization already made is not deemed sufficient. It may be true that we have a wave of economy sweeping over us at the present time which drowns out our efforts in behalf of controlling what is perhaps the most deadly menace with which we are yearly confronted. I do not believe in this kind of economy. It seems to me that there is no economy in withholding flood-control appropriations which will correct for a comparatively small amount a situation under which our people

annually lose anywhere from twice to four times the amount of the required appropriation. Would it not be the better judgment for us to appropriate today, or as soon as we can possibly do it, a sufficient amount of money to enable our Army engineers to correct and control the threatening flood conditions in our river valleys than for us to plead economy and thus permit the people of this country to be subject to losses which every year amount to many times the sum of money it would require for us to entirely correct the situation? The matter of flood control must of necessity be met by us at some time, and therefore why not meet it promptly and finally and thus insure our people from this deadly menace?

Another question which has erroneously been raised for the purpose of hindering and delaying the construction of the Bluestone Reservoir is based upon the requirement contained in the Flood Control Act of 1936, that the various States, political subdivisions thereof, or other responsible local agencies, shall give assurances that the lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the various flood-control projects will be provided without cost to the United States. It is frequently, and with a complete disregard of the facts, stated that this requirement applies to the Bluestone Reservoir project and that, therefore, the work thereon cannot be continued by the Government until the State of West Virginia, or local agencies therein, provide these rights-of-way. This statement is entirely without foundation.

As heretofore fully set out, the construction of the Bluestone Reservoir was started by an Executive order issued by the President on the 12th day of September 1935. Immediately after the issuance of this order, work was commenced upon the construction of the project. This work was continuously prosecuted, under the direction of the War Department and with the aid of the Civilian Conservation Corps until further work was stopped because of the order entered by Federal Judge McClintic on November 2, 1936. Therefore, the work of construction of the Bluestone Reservoir was "under way" at the time of the passage of the Flood Control Act of 1936, in which it was provided that States or local agencies furnish free rights-of-way to the Government.

The Flood Control Act of 1936 recognized this fact, and, including in its act an authorization for the completion of the Bluestone Reservoir, specifically describes this project as being "now under way", and by the terms of that act exempts all such projects from the provision in reference to the contribution of rights-of-way by States or local agencies. At the time of the passage of this Flood Control Act there were other flood-control projects which were under way, notably the Tygart River Dam, near Grafton, W. Va., work upon which is still being prosecuted, and where no requirement was enforced as to contribution of rights-of-way either by the State or other local agency. I distinctly recall that at the time of the passage of the Flood Control Act in 1936 the situation with reference to the effect of the act upon the further construction of the Bluestone Reservoir was discussed upon the floor of the House, and the act was passed with the understanding that the Bluestone Reservoir would be exempt from the right-of-way provision of the bill.

After taking everything into consideration, we are now confronted with this proposition, to wit: A flood-control project of the very gravest importance and which has the approval of practically every agency of the Government, which was placed under construction by order of the President, which was authorized and approved by the Congress of the United States, which was partially completed in that all of the preliminary work has been finished, is now lying idle, useless, and neglected simply because of an order of a district court which no interested agency of the Government has seemed to either have the wish or will or nerve to even question. How long are we going to permit this condition to remain? Thousands of our people dwelling in the Great Kanawha Valley and in the basin of the Ohio River are vitally interested in the matter. While we delay action, the elements are not stayed. Floods will continue their ravages in these valleys. Homes will continue to be swept away. Vast damages will continue to accrue. Is the declaration of policy as set out by Congress in its Flood Control Act of 1936 a true expression of the sense of the legislative branch of our Government, or is it merely an assemblage of meaningless words?

In closing, I wish to make it clear that my deep interest in this matter is from a flood-control standpoint only. To my mind, the effect of the project herein described upon navigation is a secondary consideration, as is also all other schemes or plans which are frequently sought to be tied in with this project and made the basis for objections thereto.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time allotted to me to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, in 1936 we passed a comprehensive flood-control bill for the entire United States. The Ohio flood of 1937 was so great the plans we had made in the 1936 bill were deemed to be insufficient for our protection. Consequently we asked the Chief of Engineers of the Army for a further report. He reported an enlarged plan for the Ohio River, contemplating approximately 70 great reservoirs, including some already constructed, and the building of levees for the protection of 155 towns along the Ohio River on both sides, some in Kentucky, some in West Virginia, some in Ohio, and some in Pennsylvania.

This bill provides for carrying out the recommendation for the building of levees. Any town which can furnish the money for rights-of-way and the necessary pumps to carry the water back over the levees after it has seeped through can take advantage of the provisions of this bill.

This measure goes a step further and provides that any river in the United States upon which the Chief of Engineers has completed a survey shall be given a survey by the Department of Agriculture. This means the Miami, Little Miami, Muskingum, Scioto, and Sandusky Rivers in Ohio, in fact all the rivers where the Army engineers have made surveys, in every State in the Union, can now be given a survey by the Department of Agriculture to determine water retardation, water run-off, and soil conservation. This bill should pass. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein from page 27 of the hearings a statement furnished the committee by the Chief of Engineers, giving the amount of the flood damages for each of the communities in the Ohio River Basin in 1936 and in 1937, aggregating for the 2 years some $600,000,000.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not think I shall object, I wonder if the chairman could tell us with respect to the estimates for the regular permanent bill for next year whether they have gone far enough into their plans to give us some idea of the probable cost.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The probable cost of what?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The cost under the bill for next year.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The bill for next year has not been passed on by the Congress and has not been reported.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. But the gentleman has been working on that and I would like to have his estimate.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say for the benefit of the gentleman from Kansas and for the other Members of the House that the Chief of Army Engineers has recommended certain works, including reservoirs, along the tributaries of the Ohio, tributaries of the Missouri, and the tributaries of the Mississippi, the aggregate cost of which will be around $600,000,000, such works to cover a period of from 10 to 20 years.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. That is about what I had in mind and I will ask the gentleman the further question, if that were all accomplished, would there be any assurance that you have got the floods controlled, and is there not a real question as to whether it is worth the money, since we have

too much land anyway, and should we not let these rivers kind of take their course?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would say that this is not a question of reclamation, but of protecting the best valleys we have, as well as important cities, and important industrial areas.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, of course, but I should like to ask the gentleman a question which I did not have time to ask him before. The $300,000 in section 2 does not come out of the $24,000,000?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And the same thing is true with respect to the surveys, in that they are not to come out of that amount?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Oh, no.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LANHAM]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent in the extension of my remarks to include a statement with respect to the protective works along the Ohio River, the character of the work reported on and recommended by the Chief of Engineers, the cost of construction, the total cost of all works, and the cost of the rights-of-way.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do this because of the question asked by the gentleman from Kansas as to a comprehensive flood-control program which the Chief of Army Engineers has recommended. It is a fact, is it not, that despite this recommendation of the Chief of Army Engineers, it is the desire of the President that you not go into that next year and additional funds will not be appropriated next year?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I stated in my opening comprehensive remarks that the President had requested that the comprehensive plan be continued until the next session of the Congress.

Mr. GRISWOLD. And all that is to be expended next year is the money you are now authorizing to be appropriated?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And the moneys heretofore appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I cannot imagine anyone from Ohio, where we have had disastrous flood conditions in recent months, doing anything but giving his enthusiastic support to this bill. Up in the northern part of the State we now have the Sandusky-Scioto Conservancy District and in recent weeks, and as a matter of fact, right at the present moment, flood conditions exist in that area. On top of that we have had a flood for 3 weeks in the town of Bellevue, Ohio, with water reaching as high as half way up the telephone poles, not derived from any river, but due to the fact that the community is built upon subterranean passageways.

The cities in the Sandusky River district are Fremont and Tiffin. There has been high water in and around these points, with great destruction to crops in the surrounding countryside. However, there is no river at Bellevue. Yet the flood has been worse there.

In order to meet the flood ravages we have sought to enlist the assistance of every governmental agency that is available under these conditions. First of all, the Army engineers, the best flood experts in the world, sent one of their representatives to give guidance in getting rid of the water at Bellevue. Constantly recurring downpours have greatly complicated this problem. The water, blanketing several parts of the community so long, has created a serious health menace.

The presence of the Army engineer has been extremely helpful. In addition to dealing with the immediate problem, his report will undoubtedly provide a formula for dealing with this problem in the future. He has also checked up on the conditions in the Tiffin-Fremont area so that this newest flood data can be included in the program of activity for the Sandusky-Scioto Conservancy District.

A flood without a river is more rare than the proverbial case of a "man bites dog"; maybe this is the first case of the kind in this country; at least, it is extremely unusual. The Army engineer who went to Bellevue remarked that ordinarily, in dealing with a flooded community, they go to the nearby river and there it is; but in Bellevue it is a case of "Where is it?"

Underneath this town is a series of passageways, of underground streams, and in some places, elaborate caves. Think of a flood arising from this condition. An Ohio expert who is familiar with the territory contends that sinkholes which mark the area around Bellevue lead to underground channels which carry off water from the lowlands of the vicinity. When rainfall becomes excessive, he says, the water which has entered the rock crevices at a higher level to the south, creates such a pressure at the openings in Bellevue and farther north, that it gushes up and floods the lands there. He believes Bellevue is on a direct line of the underground drainage which begins many miles south of Bellevue and ends at Castalia, where the world-famous Blue Hole is located, near the Sandusky Bay. The subterranean water, according to this man, has been at work for thousands of years, dissolving the limestone and carrying the dissolved material to lower levels. There are fields where the rock over many acres has subsided several feet, presumably brought about by the washing away of the rock layers underneath.

These peculiar conditions have brought about a flood of unbelievable proportions. As previously mentioned, the water has been more than halfway up telephone poles, both in and out of town. It is still a very serious problem to get rid of the water, get it out of the homes, off ruined streets and fields where crops have been ruined. The water moved with such force that it swept away railroad embankments and tracks; it piled dirt around garages in one area within a couple of feet of the roofs. While not so extensive, the rehabilitation problem is the same here as in the Ohio River region around Cincinnati.

My colleague from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] has been an outstanding leader in flood-control work here in Congress. We all know that is true, and we appreciate that he knows this sort of problem from A to Z. I doubly appreciate the cooperation of the Army engineers, because he tells me that this is the first time to his knowledge that they have ever dispatched a representative to a flood scene under circumstances like these. In this case the request was made one day and the engineer was there the next day.

In similar manner the assistance of the Federal Housing Administration has been enlisted for restoration, rebuilding, and replacement of improvements on real property in line with their policy in guaranteeing flood-relief loans in this classification.

The Disaster Loan Corporation has authorized its agents at Detroit and Cleveland to make a survey of the need for their services in the Fremont, Tiffin, Bellevue region. If they find the survey indicates the need of assistance on the basis of character loans, including farming areas, on first and second mortgages and to fixed property losses like barns or fences that have been destroyed, they have agreed to send their representatives to the local field to give help to the R. F. C. set-up. Similar cooperation has been sought from the Resettlement Administration in relation to stock losses, the production-credit banks, the Farm Credit Administration, and Resettlement Administration dealing with crop losses, seed advances, and activities in this category.

Only today the Army engineers also expressed the belief that they may be able to provide a badly needed home rehabilitation survey, which under their expert methods has been extremely valuable to other communities stricken by flood.

Now, then, all of these things give the picture of the conditions and outline the action taken to meet the situation. But an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and the bill before us now deals with flood control or flood prevention. I am heartily in favor of the bill. However, I

regret that today's bill deals only with levees and flood walls in the areas announced. I wish it included the area and type of work indicated by the situation I have tried to describe, and the work for additional upstream communities. Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that it does make provision to carry out some limited activities in other regions, like the Sandusky River area, where a survey has already been made?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Oh, no; not where a survey has been made, but only where the projects have been approved by the Congress of the United States, and it is necessary before any relief funds can be expended that such projects be approved by the Congress of the United States. However, the doors of the Committee on Flood Control will be open to the gentleman at all times, and we will give him a sympathetic hearing on any such proposition.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. But with respect to other conservancy districts, this bill does put them in a position to deal better with these problems?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Like the gentleman, I have a great many more matters that I would like to have included, but this measure deals primarily with the Ohio River Basin.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of a moment's delay, I submit a further unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the revision of my remarks I may include therein the names of the reservoirs included in the Chief of Engineer's comprehensive report, to which we have referred, the estimated cost of construction, the estimated cost of highways, of railroads, and of other items that the local interests are expected to pay, together with the total costs as they appear in the report of the Chief of Engineers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I was interested in what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] said regarding the expenditure of these large amounts of money on flood control. There is this to be said about flood control. It is a rational undertaking to accomplish some good for the community and for the country. There is one way in which we expend money on our rivers that is not modern or rational. I refer to the lavish expenditure of money to restore the river transportation of 75 years ago. We have an example of it for about 100 miles along my district in the upper Mississippi River, where the War Department is expending a trainload of money, not on something modern but in a futile effort to restore obsolete river transportation. I refer to the 9-foot channel in the upper Mississippi River, which will cost the Treasury something like $170,000,000 before it is completed, and which the Army engineers estimate will cost one million and three-quarter dollars each year for upkeep after its completion, and which, as can be demonstrated mathematically, cannot possibly be justified in an economic way. On top of that, in this 9-foot channel that is costing this large sum of money, something like 25 or 26 dams are to be put in, which will be an aggravation of floods. After the dams have been built all of the natural reservoirs for flood waters that go down the Mississippi will be occupied when the floods start. I suggest to the gentleman that he is exactly correct in again and again advocating the conservation of public moneys. We can afford to expend the money necessary to do every necessary good thing that we ought to do in this country, but we unbalance the Budget and waste the taxpayers' money when we expend money on things absolutely worthless. I here and now prophesy that the upper Mississippi 9-foot channel not only will prove to be economically unjustifiable but that it will be a positive damage to the people along that river, and that it will be an aggravation of their floods.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Every dollar that we have spent and will spend on flood control for 10 years to come will not be nearly as much as we suffered in loss last year and in the 1937 flood in Ohio.

Mr. BIERMANN. I am in favor of rational flood control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill (H. R. 7618) relating to the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands situated in the State of Oregon, at a point in the RECORD immediately following the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Harry Brown, delivered in the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana recently, on soil conservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADVANCEMENT OF FUNDS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7835) to provide authorization for the advancement of funds for the District of Columbia, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BIGELOW. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to propound a parliamentary inquiry. If this consent is granted, will there be an opportunity under the 5-minute rule for discussion of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The bill will be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. The bill will be under the 5-minute rule and all germane amendments would be permissible.

Is there objection?

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as I understand, this bill was covered by one title in H. R. 7142?

Mr. PALMISANO. That is true.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. I think the objections that ran against the title at that time still prevail. I think we at least ought to have ample time to discuss it.

Mr. PALMISANO. Will the gentleman reserve his objection and let me make a statement?

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of calling this resolution up under unanimous consent is because of the fact that unless the District government is able to borrow some money from the Treasury, and, of course, under the resolution they will have to pay interest to the Treasury, within the next few days it will be unable to pay the employees, such as police officers, members of the fire department, and everyone working for the District government. As I understand, the tax bill, which is on the other side of this Capitol, may not come back here until some time in August. The Senate has rewritten the entire bill, and it will require a great deal of time in conference. So I am asking this privilege at this time, in order to permit the employees of the District government to be paid.

In the last Congress we permitted the District government to borrow money to erect some municipal buildings that the Federal Government wanted. It seems to me that at this time we should not permit the employees of the District to go without being paid. Of course, it is not our fault, it is true.

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

Mr. PALMISANO. They will not be able to obtain any revenue for a month or two, even after the tax bill is passed.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McFARLANE. Why can we not pass the tax bill that has been pending before the Senate for some time, instead of passing some kind of an alibi which will perhaps put us in a defensive position?

Mr. PALMISANO. Unfortunately, due to the Court bill being considered in the Senate, I understand the Senate will not consider any debatable bill. As I understand, under the rules of the Senate, if this bill is passed by unanimous consent, they may be able to pass it before they go back on the Court bill.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. If they can pass this resolution that will permit the borrowing of money, why can they not take a little time and pass the tax bill and get the job done?

Mr. PALMISANO. Because the tax bill in itself is more questionable and more debatable than this resolution.

Mr. McFARLANE. If they do not try, how de we know that?

Mr. PALMISANO. I am sorry, but I cannot tell the gentleman the procedure, and I cannot tell the Senate what to do. I wish they would pass it.

Mr. McFARLANE. They are trying to tell us what to do. What is the difference?

Mr. PALMISANO. I am willing to stay here until 12 o'clock at night any night in order to thrash out in conference the disagreements between the House and the Senate. I have spoken to the minority leader, and he knows the condition, and he said he thought by all means we should not stop payment to the employees.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. The House has considered this matter. I do not want to be placed entirely in the light of cutting the employees of the District of Columbia out of receiving their pay, but it seems to me that as the District has its regular day a week from today, because of the importance of this matter, I think it should go over until that time.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, it is not a question of the employees of the District of Columbia getting their pay. It is a question of whether the District shall raise the money necessary to meet the District's end of the District appropriation under the existing tax law, or whether it shall do so in accordance with new laws, such as have been proposed in the bill now pending in the Senate. My understanding is that the District Commissioners have a right to fix a tax rate, under existing law, on real estate and personal property, sufficient to raise the amount necessary to meet the expenses of the District government. The trouble is, as I understand it, that the District Commissioners do not want to exercise the authority with which they are now clothed to raise the necessary funds under existing law. Am I not right?

Mr. PALMISANO. That is true.

Mr. MAPES. So that it is sort of a camouflage to say that the District employees are not going to get their pay under the existing set-up.

Mr. PALMISANO. At the present time, due to the fact that there is pending a bill to raise sufficient money, seven or eight million dollars, which is a deficit, the Commissioners are inclined to wait to see what the Congress will do.

Mr. MAPES. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the objection I see to the gentleman's resolution is that the Federal Government will lend this money to the District, this tax legislation may not be passed and then the Federal Government, sooner or later, will have to cancel the loan.

Mr. PALMISANO. Oh, no, no; I would not agree to that. The gentleman will recall that sometime ago the District Government borrowed some $20,000,000.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. May I ask the gentleman from Maryland whether there are any limitations that forbid the Treasury from advancing the Federal contribution to the District Commissioners in a lump sum at the beginning of the fiscal year or at any one time?

Mr. PALMISANO. I understand that the Federal contribution will be depleted in the first week or so of August.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. I may say to the gentleman that the whole cost of operating the District of Columbia is only $46,000,000 or $47,000,000 per annum. If they spend money at that rate, they will be entirely out of funds long before the year expires.

Mr. PALMISANO. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, speaking of the matter coming up in the regular course, that the reason for passing this legislation is that they may possibly be able to bring it up in the Senate tomorrow morning before they enter into a further discussion of the Court bill. I understand that once they resume consideration of the Court bill they will not let anything interrupt it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. I would remind the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia that the House has passed upon this issue.

Mr. PALMISANO. I realize that it has.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. The House struck out title I of the bill H. R. 7422, that would have permitted the Treasury to advance funds to the Government of the District of Columbia to allow the District to anticipate funds out of the Federal Treasury. The only difference between that and the pending bill is that the pending bill carries a provision that if they borrow from the Federal Government they shall not pay more than 3-percent interest. Mr. Speaker, I feel that we should have some time in which to discuss this important question, and therefore I am compelled to object.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, in order to comply with the demand of the gentleman from Illinois for time in which to discuss the matter, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7835) to provide authorization for the advancement of funds for the District of Columbia, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7835) to provide authorization for the advancement of funds for the District of Columbia, as amended. The Clerk will report the bill as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That until and including June 30, 1938, the Secretary of the Treasury, notwithstanding the provisions of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, approved June 29, 1922, is authorized and directed to advance, on the requisition of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, made in the manner now prescribed by law, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be

necessary, from time to time, during said fiscal year to meet the general expenses of said District, as authorized by Congress, and such amounts so advanced shall be reimbursed by the said Commissioners to the Treasury out of the taxes and revenue collected for the support of the government of the said District of Columbia, with interest at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, but not to exceed 3 percent per annum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it proper to make a statement, although the Chair does not think it necessary for the Chair ever to have to explain what the Chair decides to do.

It was represented to the Chair that this was a matter of some emergency with reference to the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia. For that reason the Chair agreed to recognize the gentleman from Maryland to suspend the rules. In the last analysis, of course, it is a matter for the determination of the House.

Is a second demanded?

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, as I stated before, the purpose of bringing this bill up at this time is because the tax bill has been tied up in the Senate. It is absolutely necessary that something be done to provide the District government with revenue to pay its employees. It is my understanding that if consideration of the Court bill is continued in the Senate we shall not be able to take up the tax bill for 2 or 3 weeks, or perhaps longer. It is my further understanding from my colleague who spoke to Senator KING that Senator KING is under the impression that he may be able to have this resolution passed on Tuesday, tomorrow, before the Senate resumes consideration of the Court bill. Once the Court bill is brought up on the floor no interruption of any kind will be permitted.

The District government cannot, as can the governments of other municipalities of the States, borrow money from the banks or in the open market. Unless this resolution is passed the District will have no funds whatever to pay its employees.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Do I understand the gentleman to say that if this tax bill that is pending in the Senate committe passes the Senate that the pending bill would be unnecessary?

Mr. PALMISANO. If the tax bill should pass in time, but I understand that they will not be able to bring up the tax bill in the Senate because of the controversial items in the bill, and they will not permit any interruption of any kind in the consideration of the Court bill except perhaps for a noncontroversial resolution of this kind which might be passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Do I understand that the tax bill now pending in the Senate will provide sufficient funds, if passed, to take care of the expenses of operating the District government, or will they have to borrow operating funds?

Mr. PALMISANO. No. The pending bill is for the sole purpose of lending money to the District government, to be repaid as the revenue comes in. As I understand, several new methods of taxation are being considered by the Senate committee; for instance, they are considering the single-tax idea. Should such a provision be included in the bill the whole tax system of the District government would have to be revised, and it would take some time before they could get it into operation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Did I understand the gentleman to say if the bill the House passed should pass the Senate there would be sufficient funds?

Mr. PALMISANO. I understand so.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But there is some controversy about it in the Senate?

Mr. PALMISANO. The bill that was passed by the House carried sufficient funds to pay the 1937 expenses of the District government. The members of the Senate committee have stricken out a considerable number of items that were passed by the House, and I feel that we will have to have a lengthy conference in order to get the bill straightened out. I hope we will receive enough revenue to pay the expenses of the District government for the current year.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman suggested to the President that he withdraw his court-packing bill long enough to permit the Senate to act on this tax bill?

Mr. PALMISANO. I may say to the gentleman I have not the right to ask the President or anyone else to withdraw a bill that is pending in the Senate.

Mr. BATES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Is there any provision of law whereby the District may borrow money in anticipation of taxes?

Mr. PALMISANO. No. I understand they have no authority whatever to borrow money.

Mr. BATES. In anticipation of taxes?

Mr. PALMISANO. No.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman realizes that practically every city in the United States has that authority?

Mr. PALMISANO. I stated before that every municipality in the country was able to borrow money, except the District government.

Mr. BATES. What harm is there in permitting the District to borrow money in anticipation of taxes until this bill is passed?

Mr. PALMISANO. That would suit me. Whether they borrow it from the Federal Government or the banks would make no difference to me.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. As I understand the gentleman, if the Senate should pass the tax bill which the House passed, this resolution would not be necessary?

Mr. PALMISANO. I understand they would not be able to collect enough taxes to meet the current expenses even if this resolution passed today. The revenue would not come in fast enough to meet the running expenses of the District government.

Mr. MAPES. Has the gentleman submitted this proposition to the Committee on Appropriations which handles the District appropriation bill?

Mr. PALMISANO. No; I have not.

Mr. MAPES. This in effect overrides and supersedes the provision in the appropriation law which states that the Federal Government shall contribute $5,000,000 to the expenses of the District government?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes; but I would not say this overrides the Appropriations Committee. This does not ask the Federal Government to appropriate anything. It simply permits the District Commissioners to borrow money from the Federal Government. May I say to the Members of the House if they want to authorize the District government to borrow from the banks in anticipation of tax receipts, I would be satisfied. I do not want any contribution to be made by the Federal Government. The only thing I am trying to do is to permit the District government to borrow sufficient money to continue its functions.

Mr. MAPES. If the tax bill now pending in the Senate does not pass, how is the District going to raise revenue to repay the loan which the Federal Government advances?

Mr. PALMISANO. I hope the Senate will never tie up the tax bill in that way. If an occasion of that kind should arise, then I say the Congress should pass some law giving

to the District government the absolute control of its affairs so that they will never be tied up in that way again.

Mr. MAPES. I know the gentleman hopes that condition will not be brought about, but suppose it is brought about?

Mr. PALMISANO. I cannot say, of course. I do not feel that the Senate or the Congress will permit a condition of that kind to exist.

Mr. MAPES. Does it not mean that the Federal Government must then contribute more than $5,000,000?

Mr. PALMISANO. No. If the gentleman feels that way, he may offer an amendment to this resolution permitting the District government to borrow from banks.

Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana. Should the Congress fail to pass the present tax bill and we do not pass this resolution in time to give the District government the right to borrow from the Federal Government, how are the firemen and policemen going to be paid during the fiscal year 1937?

Mr. PALMISANO. I may say if the tax bill had been passed in the usual course, the District government would have been collecting taxes beginning with the 1st of July. They would have received some money through the payment of taxes, but up to date they have received nothing and will receive nothing until the tax bill is passed. It is for this reason that the necessity arises for the passage of this resolution.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. In other years we have not had similar legislation. The District has not found it necessary to borrow from the Federal Government?

Mr. PALMISANO. That is right.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman state briefly how the situation has changed so that it now becomes necessary to do that this year? That is a very important matter, in my opinion.

Mr. PALMISANO. Due to the fact there was a deficit in the District government to the extent of some seven or eight million dollars, in order to meet that deficit the Congress considered certain taxes, which has tied up the tax system of the District. This being so, it also tied the hands of the District Commissioners, who were unable to proceed with the collection of taxes. That is the only reason.

Mr. BOILEAU. Was there a deficit last year, or did that deficit of seven or eight million dollars occur only in the present fiscal year?

Mr. PALMISANO. Last year.

Mr. BOILEAU. If there was a deficit last year, it became the duty of the Commissioners to increase the real-estate tax rate, did it not?

Mr. PALMISANO. Well, that was an item considered by the District Appropriation Committee, and nothing was done.

Mr. BOILEAU. Is not the gentleman going to explain the situation further?

Mr. PALMISANO. I really do not know anything further about it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this bill were included as title I in the bill (H. R. 7422) to raise additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which was considered in the House several weeks ago. The House in Committee of the Whole House, by a vote, struck out title I of that measure and it went over to the other body without that title included.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the reasons which impelled the House at that time to strike out the provisions authorizing the Federal Treasury to advance money to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia prevail at this time just as forcibly as ever. For myself, I fail to see why the Federal Treasury should be a clearing house for the District of Columbia. I do not know why the Federal Treasury should advance money to operate the government of the District of Columbia any more than it should advance money to operate the city of Chicago, the city of Pittsburgh, or any other city in the United States. It seems to me the District of Columbia should stand on its own feet.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Is it not true that many cities throughout the country have special authority under the law to borrow money in anticipation of taxes? This privilege is given by the legislatures of the various States. The reason the District Commissioners do not borrow is that the Congress ties their hands. Is not that the truth of the matter?

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Probably; but let me point out to the gentleman that there is not a city in the United States which is in financial difficulties where such difficulties cannot be traced back to the fact that some time in the years gone by it was permitted to anticipate its taxes and get away from a cash or a pay-as-you-go basis. If the legislatures of the gentleman's State and my State and every other State in the Union had denied municipalities the right to anticipate taxes, these cities would not have had the financial trouble they have had during the last 5 or 6 years. I believe it is a bad policy to start here in the Federal city.

Mr. BATES. As the gentleman knows, I am a member of the committee, and I believe I know something about this problem. The gentleman knows and I know that these revenue notes are the first notes paid off when the receipts come in. Therefore there is no obligation on the part of the Government, for the first receipts are taken to pay off these revenue notes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. I do not subscribe to that.

Mr. BATES. Well, I subscribe to it, because it is the truth.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Because this bill is about as broad as anything that has ever been considered by the House. Just let me read to the House that portion following the enacting clause:

> That until and including June 30, 1938, the Secretary of the Treasury, notwithstanding the provisions of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, approved June 29, 1922, is authorized and directed to advance—

And so forth. This has absolutely no limitations.

Mr. BATES. It also says, does it not, that such amounts shall be reimbursed by the Commissioners to the Treasury out of the taxes and revenue collected by the District as soon as such taxes and revenues come in?

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. The Commissioners can embark upon and continue to grow in a policy of borrowing and tax anticipation, which, in my opinion, is fundamentally wrong and should not be permitted to prevail in connection with the government of the city under the control of the Congress.

Mr. BATES. Every city in the entire United States has this power today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. This city is entirely different. This is a Federal city, operated fundamentally for the United States Government.

Mr. BATES. You are tying the hands of the District so it cannot operate.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. I read the local newspapers here, and I have as much consideration and sympathy for the people in the District of Columbia as anybody, but it does seem to me they do not do everything they can to help themselves. In the 5 years I have been in Washington I have noticed that the Congress of the United States is blamed for almost everything that happens to local business downtown here. I have read stories in the local papers to the effect that the Commissioners and other officials of the District of Columbia are either condemning or worrying about what Congress will do. I think this is highly improper. I do not deny, Mr. Speaker, the right of citizens, groups of citizens, and organizations in the District of Columbia to condemn Congress for anything it does. I do

not believe we should be "thin-skinned." We should be able to "take it." However, I do say it is entirely wrong, and I think it borders on insubordination, when the Commissioners of the District—and there is nothing personal in this as far as I am concerned, for I have not had the pleasure of meeting any of these gentlemen—continuously condemn or criticize and worry about what Congress is going to do about matters affecting the District of Columbia.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. Does not the gentleman believe the District Commissioners ought to put in a little more time and show a little spine in administering the laws down there and in raising the tax rates, rather than ache and come back to Congress, wanting Congress to do these things, when they already have all the authority they need to raise ample funds to take care of the District government?

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. I regret I cannot answer the question of the gentleman with reference to how much time the District Commissioners put in. I do not know whether they put in any time, but assume they make an effort to do their duty.

Mr. BATES. If the gentleman will permit, do the District Commissioners at this time have authority to borrow money to pay the bills, the wages, and the salaries they must pay?

Mr. McFARLANE. The District Commissioners have ample authority to raise the tax rate, in order to raise all the money necessary to take care of all the expenses for running the District government.

Mr. BATES. At this moment?

Mr. McFARLANE. Yes; they have that authority at this moment.

Mr. BATES. The chairman of the Commission says not.

Mr. McFARLANE. They do not need authority to borrow money. What they need is spine enough to raise the tax rates in order to raise the money necessary.

Mr. BATES. But they cannot raise the money unless they have authority, and they cannot pay bills unless they can borrow in anticipation of taxes.

Mr. McFARLANE. They have authority under the law now to raise taxes on both real and personal property, and they have not had the spine to do it.

Mr. BATES. But until those taxes come in, they must pay the bills.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I must decline to yield any further for the moment.

I would like to call the attention of the House to the looseness or lack of limitations in the measure we now have under consideration. It was only a week or so ago that this body was compelled to pass over the veto of the Executive, a measure which would permit the farmers of the United States to borrow money at 3½ percent per annum. This bill, with the committee amendment written into it, provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall fix the interest rate on the funds advanced to the District of Columbia at not to exceed 3 percent per annum.

Mr. Speaker, I hold that if anybody is going to fix the rate or if we are going to embark upon the policy of lending Federal funds out of the Federal Treasury for the operation of the District of Columbia, the Congress itself should fix the rate and not turn that authority over to the Secretary of the Treasury. Of course, under the parliamentary procedure by which we are considering this bill it is impossible to offer an amendment, so the only thing that those of us who are opposed to this proposed policy of the Capital City of the greatest Nation in the world becoming involved in the old system of tax anticipation can do is to vote down the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BIGELOW.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I think in considering a matter of this kind we should have the benefit of the advice of the District Appropriations Committee, and I therefore make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUM). Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 111]

Amlie	Eaton	Johnson, Minn.	Robinson, Utah
Anderson, Mo.	Eberharter	Keller	Robsion, Ky.
Andrews	Edmiston	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Okla.
Bacon	Ellenbogen	Kirwan	Ryan
Boehne	Faddis	Kitchens	Schuetz
Boylan, N. Y.	Farley	Kloeb	Seger
Brewster	Fernandez	Kopplemann	Short
Buck	Fitzpatrick	Lambeth	Sirovich
Buckley, N. Y.	Fleger	Lemke	Smith, Va.
Caldwell	Forand	Lewis, Md.	Smith, Wash.
Cannon, Wis.	Frey, Pa.	McClellan	Smith, W. Va.
Cartwright	Fries, Ill.	McGroarty	Snyder, Pa.
Casey, Mass.	Fuller	McMillan	Somers, N. Y.
Celler	Fulmer	Mahon, Tex.	Stack
Chandler	Garrett	Mansfield	Starnes
Cluett	Gasque	Miller	Sumners, Tex.
Cole, N. Y.	Gifford	Mouton	Sweeney
Collins	Gilchrist	O'Connell, Mont.	Taber
Cooley	Goldsborough	O'Connell, R. I.	Taylor, Colo.
Cravens	Greenwood	O'Malley	Taylor, Tenn.
Creal	Greever	O'Neal, Ky.	Teigan
Crosby	Hancock, N. Y.	Parsons	Terry
Crosser	Hancock, N. C.	Patrick	Thom
Crowther	Harter	Peyser	Thomas, N. J.
Culkin	Hartley	Phillips	Thomason, Tex.
Cummings	Healey	Plumley	Tolan
Daly	Hildebrandt	Ramspeck	Treadway
Dingell	Hill, Ala.	Rayburn	Wadsworth
Dirksen	Hill, Okla.	Reed, N. Y.	Wene
Drew, Pa.	Hunter	Reilly	Wigglesworth
Driver	Jacobsen	Rich	Withrow
Duncan	Jenks, N. H.	Robertson	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and twelve Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BIGELOW].

Mr. BIGELOW. Mr. Speaker, we are now about to vote on the question of whether we shall consent to allow the District Commissioners to borrow from the Federal Treasury. This is a proposal that we voted out of the District tax bill when it passed the House.

It has been represented here as though if we do not pass this resolution, firemen and policemen and other employees of the District will be without their salaries. This is a mistake. If the present pending District tax bill were now passed, there is no contention that there would not be money to pay these bills.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make this point. The power now exists, without one line of law, to provide a tax measure that will pay all of these bills. Under a law that was passed in 1922, and which is still in force, the District Commissioners have the power to fix any tax rate upon real estate necessary to meet the bills that are authorized. The tax rate in the District is 15 mills. The deficit is $8,000,000, or probably $7,000,000, but we will call it $8,000,000, and they can meet this deficit by raising the tax rate on real estate in the District 7 mills, making the total tax rate 22 mills. If the District Commissioners would exercise the power they have under the law to fix the tax rate on real estate at 22 mills, all the money could be raised and there would be no need of bothering with any tax law in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, if the District Commissioners exercised the power they now have under the law, instead of coming in here and asking for a new law, they would fix a rate at 22 mills, and that rate on real estate in the District would be lower than the rate paid by any large city in the United States today.

I have here the Jacobs report for which this Government paid $50,000. This report sets forth that there are 35 larger cities of the United States, comparable in size with the District, all of which are paying a higher tax rate than would be paid by real estate in the District if the District Commissioners exercised the power they have under the law, and which they should exercise, to raise these rates.

The Congress is being whipsawed by the real-estate interests of this District. This is a paradise of landlords, and I beg of the House not to give this power today, but to make the District Commissioners exercise the power they have of raising the rate, and even so the rate will not be as high as my city pays. Why is it that with a reasonably low rate on real estate all the revenue needed can be met in the District? The reason is that my city and your city and all the other cities are paying nearly one-half of their tax levies for debt charges, while this community has no debt charge. Therefore the 22-mills rate on real estate in this District will raise all the revenue the District needs.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIGELOW. Yes.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Will the gentleman tell me what the District is going to do for money in the meantime? If the gentleman's argument holds in this case, how are we going to pay the 10,000 employees of the District between now and next October, which is the length of time that will be required to raise the real-estate tax?

Mr. BIGELOW. The gentleman evidently missed my point in the beginning. We have a tax bill now pending in the Senate.

If this tax bill were passed within the next few days, the tax issue would be fully met. There would then be no pretense that it was necessary to borrow money for the District to carry on. Now my contention is that while, if the tax bill pending in the Senate is not passed within the next few days, the tax issue cannot be settled in that way, it nevertheless can be settled just as speedily by the action of the Commissioners in raising the tax rate on real estate.

The reason for my action in opposing this resolution is that I want to see the District Commissioners forced to exercise the power which the law gives them to raise taxes on real estate. This is not because I think it is desirable to raise the tax rate on the houses in which people live or upon other improvements on land. But it is desirable to raise the taxes upon the land values. As long as buildings and land values are lumped together, we cannot raise taxes on land values without raising taxes on buildings. A distinction should be made between these two subjects of taxation. A committee of the Senate has made this distinction. The District tax bill, as awaiting action in the Senate, proposes a tax of 1½ percent on buildings and a tax of 2½ percent on land values. That is sound economics. It is the first light that has dawned on this dark subject of taxation since many years ago the Pennsylvania Legislature permitted the two cities of Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh and Scranton, to levy a higher rate of taxation upon land values than upon buildings. I am grateful for this evidence of progress in the philosophy of taxation that now, for the first time in the history of the Nation, it should be proposed by a committee of at least one body of this Congress to shift at least some of the burden of taxation from improvements on land to land values in the Capital City. This beginning of tax intelligence, if retained, should be a wholesome object lesson to the Nation.

There is, of course, no opportunity under the restricted rules by which this unanimous-consent resolution is being considered to really get into the essence of this discussion. The 1-percent tax rate which the Senate committee is proposing to place upon land values, in addition to the 1½ percent on both land and buildings, does raise a question of fundamental and very great importance, which has been almost universally ignored in tax theory and practice in the United States. I am hoping that if the extra tax levy on land values which the Senate committee proposes is retained in the Senate bill and the bill is returned to the House with this amendment included, there will be a better opportunity than is now presented for a further discussion of this proposal for which I contend, that when the city taxes land values it is merely living on its own earned income, but when the city taxes buildings or any other form of wealth it is making a tax raid upon private property. I contend that it is not sound economics and it is not sound public morals for a community to deprive individuals of private property that they have earned in order to allow the land values produced by the community to go into the pockets of individuals who have not earned them.

In this city of Washington there is one half billion dollars of pure land values. Not $1 of this was ever the individual creation of a single soul living or dead. These values have come in response to an economic law of gravitation, just as cream comes to the top of a pan of milk. Not one penny of tax should be put on any building that men build, until this value that individuals do not make but that the community makes, is adequately taxed. There is where the weight of taxation should go, on community values, on the advantages of location, on monopoly privileges, and not on individual labor values.

As the years pass these rising land values of the Capital City are pouring little streams of gold into the laps of the old families and the rich estates who here, as everywhere, own the most of such holdings.

These ground rents are the pension rolls of the rich. The Bourbon or Stuart kings never granted to court favorites any more unadulterated privileges than our cities bestow on those who are lucky enough to own the sites on which these cities grow.

Here in Washington we let the holders of these privileges off with a tax of 1½ percent and we soak the builders and the workers for the rest.

In my city of Cincinnati if you wanted to clear slums for rehousing, down in the most blighted section of the city, where the shacks are literally rotting and festering with disease and crime, you would have to pay $50,000 an acre for the ground. Why do we put tax penalties on building when we should know that these building taxes, shifted to those land values, would both cheapen the land and encourage building? It is because we have not appreciated the essential difference between land values and house values which are earned.

For the land for one of the Federal housing projects in New York City the New Deal paid Mr. Vincent Astor $189,281.31 worth of 65-year 3½-percent bonds in addition to amortization in equal annual installments over the period. The New Deal also gave Mr. Baruch $36,000 for a little strip of his ground. Yes, this is brilliant economics. We drive people out of slums into worse rat holes, to build houses that these poor can never live in, because they cannot afford to pay this ground rent along with the taxes that are added to the houses. People for whom they were not intended will be the ones to live in these houses and their wages will go down because, with subsidized rents they can afford to underbid their brothers. But these two things will happen. A few millionaires will unload some land on the Government, as in the case of Messrs. Astor and Baruch, and the buildings will increase the land values in the surrounding neighborhood. You cannot beat these economic laws, not if you have ostrich economics and stick your head in the sands and refuse to see.

Land values are social values. The lighter the tax upon these values the greater the unearned wealth that goes to owners. House values are labor values. The higher the tax on houses the more they have to cost. The higher the tax on land values the less the land costs. Until we learn this much economics, rehousing projects will do nothing but benefit landlords and burden taxpayers.

There is, of course, no opportunity under the restricted rules by which this unanimous-consent resolution is being considered, to really get into the essence of this discussion. The 1-percent tax rate which the Senate committee is proposing to place upon land values, in addition to the 1½ percent on both land and buildings, does raise a question of fundamental and very great importance, which has been almost universally ignored in tax theory and practice in the United States. I am hoping that, if the extra tax levy on land values which the Senate committee proposes is retained in the Senate bill and the bill is returned to the House with

this amendment included, there will be a better opportunity than is now presented for a further discussion of this proposal for which I contend—that, when the city taxes land values, it is merely living on its own earned income, but, when the city taxes buildings or any other form of wealth, it is making a tax raid upon private property. I contend that it is not sound economics and it is not sound public morals for a community to deprive individuals of private property that they have earned, in order to allow the land values produced by the community to go into the pockets of individuals who have not earned them.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. JENCKES].

Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the District Committee ever since I came to Washington. We have had many arguments on the floor at different times, and I have heard the District people themselves arguing the question of their part in self-government. Today, to my mind, is conclusive argument that the people of the District should have the right to run their own affairs and not have all of these small questions brought to Congress. I know that my home community has the right to go to the bank and borrow money. I know that the District should have the right to anticipate its collections. The bill which is now pending in the Senate, which we sent over there, even if it had been enacted into law, would not take care of the present situation, and if we do not now give the authority to the District Commissioners to provide themselves with a running capital, it will not be the Commissioners, it will not be you and I who will suffer, nor will it be the Treasury of the United States, but it will be those people who are giving their lives and service to the District, and also to you and me, because when we live in the District we are protected by the policemen and the firemen and by those citizens who are serving the District. So I appeal to you, my colleagues, to think of that, and to think of this as if it were your home community, and what an embarrassment it would be to have it sent out over the Nation that you had failed to meet your pay roll, and I ask you to give to the Commissioners the right to get this money from the Nation's Treasury in anticipation of their collecting it from the people of the District. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON].

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it was exceedingly unfortunate that a composite tax bill was brought in here that touched so many different avenues of revenue that obviously there was a considerable amount of opposition to it. It seems to me that inasmuch as we have inheritance taxes and income taxes in various States, likewise a higher gasoline or automobile tax, it would be exceedingly easy for the Committee on the District of Columbia to bring in a series of bills and have these taxes fixed on about an average gasoline tax within the States, or an inheritance tax or an income tax on the same basis. I venture to suggest that such bills would pass this House by unanimous consent, but if they continue to bring in these omnibus bills and touch so many controversial phases, it is doubtful if we will have any legislation on this subject during this session. If the committee would bring in these separate bills as they do in the general assemblies of the respective States, fixing their taxes bill by bill, there will be no doubt of their passage, and then the District would have ample tax legislation.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there is absolutely no limit to the repayment of this money, or out of the receipts of what year it is to be paid. It could run on until Gabriel blows his horn so far as limitations in this bill are concerned.

Mr. THURSTON. The gentleman's suggestion is sound and gives an additional reason why the bill should not be passed.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Members of this House have paid very much attention to the measure pending before us. In the first place I think you will agree with me that you are writing a blank check. There is no limit to the amount that you are going to loan to the District of Columbia under this bill. We are told that you will loan this money at a rate of not more than 3 percent, and yet we quarreled the other day because we are loaning money to the farmer at 3½ percent.

I appreciate what the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. JENCKES] said a moment ago about these folks who will not get their money. Everybody wants these employees to get their money. They are entitled to be paid now. Something has been said about representation, and not having the right to levy their own taxes. I do not blame anyone for wanting to be represented. I do not believe that the people who live in the District would expect to have such low taxes if they were represented on the floor themselves, and if they ran their own government. They would not expect to have an automobile license tax of $1, the lowest rate in the United States, when as a matter of fact the average rate is six or seven dollars in the States. They would not expect to go without inheritance taxes or estate taxes as they do here. We have no income tax here; no inheritance tax, no sales tax. So I say, if they could levy their own taxes they certainly would not expect the low taxes they are getting. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BIGELOW] has told us that if you raise this real-estate tax to half the rate in other cities of comparable size, even then they could raise enough money. We are writing a blank check except that it says in this bill the money is to be repaid in 1 year. It seems to me that there should be a limit of the amount to be borrowed and some provision for its definite repayment.

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

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to answer a question asked several times during the debate. The question is, When will this money be paid back to the Treasury?

The organic law of the District of Columbia compels the Commissioners to pay back every cent obtained under this loan by the 30th of June next year. The law forbids the Commissioners to remain in debt and they must discharge this obligation by June 30, 1938. And this law has teeth. It provides that the Commissioners may be sentenced to terms in jail if they fail to raise the money to discharge the obligation. That is how strong it is. The Federal Treasury cannot possibly lose if this bill is passed today. The District Commissioners must raise the money by some means so that obligation will be dicharged next June. That is the law.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. How much money will be involved in the passage of this bill?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. It costs $4,000,000 a month to run the District of Columbia.

Mr. DONDERO. The bill says "such sums as may be necessary." There is no limitation.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. That makes no difference. The District of Columbia must have money on which to operate, and the District must pay back to the Treasury of the United States every cent that it borrows under this bill. What will the 10,000 employees of the District do if Congress fails to authorize this loan? It will be impossible to raise money through an advance in real estate taxes, as has been suggested, before October. What are the employees of the District going to do in the meantime? How will they live? Issuance of scrip will be the only solution, and I am sure no Member of this Congress would have that on his conscience. If this bill fails to pass that is just what will happen. The District will be forced to issue scrip. Many Members have talked about this bill here this afternoon who ordinarily pay no attention whatever to District affairs. Many of them do not know what they are talking about. Time and again they have been unable to

answer vital questions concerning the bill under debate. It seems that every bill brought into this Chamber by the District of Columbia Committee has two strikes on it before the debate gets under way. They talk about increasing the District's real-estate tax. Pass this bill and Congress will take a sure step toward creating higher real-estate taxes, and I believe these taxes should be increased. The fact that the organic law of the District makes it mandatory that the Commissioners pay back this loan next year will cause the Commissioners to find ways and means of raising the money. They are empowered by law to raise the real-estate tax rate if necessary, and they have no other way of raising the money that will be required.

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

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio talked about increasing the tax rate on real estate. Of course, I appreciate his views. He believes that real estate should pay all of the expenses.

In the tax bill that is over on the other side we have tried to put the District government on a par with other municipalities of the country. They have had no inheritance tax. We created an inheritance tax. They had no estate tax. We put on an estate tax. They had an automobile tax of $1, regardless of the size of the machine, whether it was a 10-ton truck or whether it was a little Ford. We placed a weight tax on, in order to put the District on a sound financial basis. We increased the real-estate tax. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] said they cut out the so-called chain-store tax and they inserted a sales tax. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas and the Members of this House that I, for one, as a member of the conference committee, will never agree to a sales tax on that bill.

Now, we are endeavoring to do something to put the District on a comparative basis with other city governments. Let us say we will increase the tax and put it all on real estate, or whatever you will, they will not be able to collect it until after a lapse of 2 or 3 months. What is the District government going to do during that period? Where is it going to obtain the money in order to pay employees?

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. BATES. I just discussed this with the Auditor of the District, and he told me that unless this bill passes within the next few days the employees of this District will be unpaid and the police of the District will be unpaid. They have no authority, under present law, to borrow money in anticipation of those taxes.

So, Mr. Speaker, it becomes imperative, if we are interested in keeping this community going, to pass this authorization this afternoon.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Members of the House that I talked with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], of the Appropriations Subcommittee, in the absence of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], chairman of the subcommittee, and he told me that there would be no objection so far as the Appropriations Committee was concerned, that they should hold down the District government. If there is any fear that the District government will not repay whatever it borrows in this emergency, I, for one, will go before the Appropriations Committee next year and take from the District government so much of the Federal contribution as may be necessary to repay what the District government receives on account of this resolution.

This is an emergency, Mr. Speaker, and I appeal to the Members to give to the District this power to borrow money during this limited time, a power enjoyed by every other municipality in the country. Every legislature in every State permits the municipalities to borrow money for operating expenses. I appeal to the Members to give the District the right to borrow during this emergency.

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

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. It has been the experience of many municipalities in the borrowing of money that they frequently incurred a greater indebtedness than they should have; that they spent more money than they should have. If this resolution passes, will the authorities here in Washington spend more money than they should if they were not permitted to borrow?

Mr. PALMISANO. The Treasury will take care of that; the District has certain appropriations they may not exceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUM). The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired; all time has expired.

The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the bill pass?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PALMISANO)—there were—ayes 65, noes 90.

So (two-thirds not having voted in the affirmative) the rules were not suspended, and the bill was not passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a copy of a speech delivered by Mr. Ray Murphy, past commander of the American Legion, at the banquet of insurance commissioners in convention at Philadelphia on June 23, 1937.

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. FORD of California and Mr. IMHOFF asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a memorial tribute to our late lamented colleague from California, Hon. Henry E. Stubbs, by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. KRAMER].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an address delivered by the Honorable Karl A. Crowley, Solicitor of the Post Office Department, at Brady, Tex., on July 6.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the speech of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, Tuesday, following the special orders already entered, that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN], may address the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after the reading of the Journal, the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, of the legislative program for the day and special orders heretofore agreed to, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after other business has been

disposed of I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House heretofore made the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a few short weeks ago our colleague from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] told you how 7,000 railroad cars of free mail had cost the taxpayers of the Nation in excess of $217,000,000 in 4 years. Today it will be my endeavor to tell the Members of the Congress and expose to the people of America how and where more than $206,000,000 more of the taxpayers' money has been or will be spent in travel expense alone for the fiscal years of 1936, 1937, and 1938.

Two hundred and six million dollars is a tremendous sum of money and will buy a whole lot of traveling. In fact, this sum exceeds by far the cost of sending the American Expeditionary Forces to France during the World War.

It exceeds by $89,000,000 the travel expense for the fiscal years of 1931, 1932, and 1933 combined. And when we get through paying the probable deficiencies for travel expense next year, the amount spent will undoubtedly be more than twice the sum spent for travel in any comparable 3-year period in the Nation's history.

TRAVEL IN THE ANCIENT DAYS

With the advancement of early civilization the necessity for travel increased. The crude trails through the forests and over the mountains eventually became well-defined roads. Along these ancient highways, thieves and robbers plied their trade. But from the necessity of things, travel constantly increased and in the course of time crude signs came to be erected along the principal highways to direct the traveler in safety from place to place and to keep the stranger from wandering from the beaten path. Mr. Speaker, as in the ancient days, common sense and social usage have erected guide posts to chart the course of both business and government. These are the very foundations of governments themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the only necessity which today calls for these extravagant expenditures for travel is political necessity. In the mad scramble to extend the frontiers of social justice the New Dealers have chosen to ignore all reasonable direction and have sought out new and undiscovered pathways to travel. They now find themselves and the Nation in the dismal swamp of debt, surrounded on all sides by signs which point to danger. They have traveled and traveled and will keep on traveling. They know not which way to turn, but must wallow in the mire of their misery until rescue or relief comes. The galloping hounds of waste, who led the mad chase to overtake prosperity for the forgotten man, now hear the baying of the Communist wolf pack closing in as they scent their prey. Mr. Speaker, the thieves and robbers of old no longer ply their arts along the ancient highways, but an examination of the expenditures which have been made in the first 3 years under the guise of travel expense leads me to believe that a new order has developed which is more artful and more efficient in wringing money from the people for travel purposes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has the gentleman forgotten that the W. P. A. spent $500,000,000 constructing swimming pools along those highways?

Mr. KNUTSON. If they did, they did not use the swimming pools for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, as we inspect the handiwork of the intellectual giants who conceived all these bureaus and agencies of waste, I wonder if there is a single Member of this House who would be so naive as to inquire why we should longer continue this travel waste? Think of it—$206,000,000 for travel expense alone, not counting the untold millions spent for the purchase and the upkeep of thousands of automobiles, not counting the additional millions spent for the transportation of things. No wonder the railroad companies and the steamship lines are enjoying a period of prosperity. It is quite understandable now.

WHO SPENT THE MONEY?

Who spent all this money, you ask? Was it spent by clerks and stenographers? Was it spent by charwomen and janitors? Was it spent by watchmen and laborers? Was it spent for useful purposes in governmental service or was a large part of the money wasted? The possibilities in these questions are intriguing. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a consolidated table which has been prepared for me showing the total expenditures of all departments and agencies of the Government for travel alone for the fiscal year 1936 was $76,669,506. For 1937 they were $77,101,006, and the Budget estimates for this fiscal year, 1938, are $52,445,003, making a total of $206,215,515.

TABLE 1.—*Condensed statement yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938, compiled from the Budget for 1938, and listed by departments*

	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
Legislative establishment, Members of Congress, etc.	$225,750	$226,150	$224,983
Executive Office and independent establishments	4,249,980	24,391,496	28,158,332
Independent offices	3,831,305	4,914,404	5,418,766
Veterans' Administration	1,552,500	1,535,431	1,540,067
General public-works program	1,329,571	860,856	597,775
Department of Agriculture	6,767,934	7,701,702	7,702,141
Farm Credit Administration	1,532,921	2,070,841	1,653,619
Department of Commerce	808,909	824,960	1,142,148
Department of the Interior	1,711,308	2,021,270	1,714,011
Department of Justice	4,646,632	4,396,070	4,100,122
Department of Labor	1,279,130	2,186,223	1,718,414
Navy Department	6,606,800	5,639,033	4,821,408
Department of State	623,112	618,663	399,803
Treasury Department	5,217,642	7,063,869	5,751,178
War Department	6,546,909	7,264,109	6,742,768
Post Office Department	5,514,600	5,385,929	4,983,661
Totals, all departments	52,445,003	77,101,006	76,669,506
Grand total, 3 years, spent and to be spent, $206,215,515.			

This amount, Mr. Speaker, will not cover the total expenditures for travel, because many departments have not segregated their travel estimates for the 1938 Budget, and they will in all probability have to be taken care of in the deficiency appropriations in the next session of this Congress.

The table which I have just introduced for the record, shows the travel expense of the legislative establishment and all the Members of the Congress amounts to $224,983 for 1936, $226,150 for 1937, and for the current fiscal year the Budget estimate is for $225,750. Less than three-quarters of a million dollars in all for 3 years.

CONTRASTS

By contrast the travel expense of the executive offices and the independent agencies and establishments was $28,158,332 in 1936, $24,391,496 in 1937, and the request for 1938 is $4,249,980. Here alone is a total of more than $56,000,000, and rest assured there will be deficiency requests for at least $20,000,000 more before we get through paying these travel expenses next year.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. THURSTON. The gentleman's picturesque language referring to the galloping hounds of waste is interesting. Did these persons confine their expeditions and explorations to the continent upon which we reside or did they travel all over the world?

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, they have been all over the world. I have a book here called "Soil Conservation" which is really a very interesting document. It is a sort of a travelogue. We sent a man named Laudermilk over to China to study the sand rivers of China. I do not know how many he took with him. Then there is a subject called "Maintaining English Soils in Good Heart." I do not know what relation good heart has to soil fertility. There is another chapter, "Fifty Years' Experience With Soil Conservation in Japan."

Mr. THURSTON. Did they measure the waterfall of the Indo regions?

Mr. KNUTSON. There is an article here on the Punjab Plains. There is also an article showing the rainfall in Java and Sumatra. Over there they have a rainfall of some 270 inches a year.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. Can the gentleman give us any reason why they should measure the rainfall in the countries to which he has referred, and how that relates to the United States?

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not know. You know, once upon a time the earth slipped a cog or two on its axis. Alaska used to be tropical. If prehistoric man had made a survey of the Polar region at the time Alaska was a tropical country, he might have issued bulletins on how to put up and preserve ice. How beneficial that would have been to those who came after the glacial period, I cannot say. It may be they can look into the future and that they know that the dust bowl will some day become a dense jungle. They will want to know at that time how to handle the enormous rainfall that they now believe will be drifting over the Dust Bowl.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is rendering a service to the country by putting in these expenditures for travel. Could the gentleman likewise put in the RECORD the expenditures covered in the propaganda that has been disseminated for New Deal measures by the present administration?

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] did that. He showed that 7,000 carloads of franked mail have been sent out by the New Dealers since they inflicted themselves upon the American people.

Mr. FISH. The other day I asked the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] if any of the money appropriated for the dedication of the cemeteries abroad during the coming August would be used for broadcasting in this country. The gentleman replied there would not be any money used for that purpose, but I see by the papers that the President will speak on an international hook-up. Does the gentleman know whether that will be paid for by the Government?

Mr. KNUTSON. They have a way of jimmying free talks out of the broadcasting companies. I do not think we will pay for it.

STARTLING EXPENDITURES

Among the most startling expenditures of these independent agencies, offices, and establishments, I refer briefly to two items of travel expense in connection with Emergency Conservation Work. These items are expenditures for travel expense of $14,557,911 in 1936 and $13,958,000 in 1937. This is a large sum to spend traveling around in search of emergency conservation work. Since there are no Budget estimates in this bracket for 1938, we are, I presume, to suppose that there is no longer this emergency which calls for travel, that everyone has found work after spending more than twenty-eight millions in travel expense. So, my friends, if any of you have constituents who are out of work, you might suggest that they travel for relief.

RESETTLEMENT BY TRAVEL

As a close runner-up in the spending of money for travel expense, the Resettlement Administration is next in line for mention. In the fiscal year 1936 the Resettlement Administration spent $6,241,868, and in 1937 they spent $4,407,219 more of the taxpayers' money for travel expenses. This money, like most of the other expenditures of the more than 200 experiments being conducted by the Resettlement Administration, is gone with the wind and can only be repaid in part by the taxes of the unwary individuals who will vote to continue this waste in the future.

OTHER HEAVY SPENDERS FOR TRAVEL

Among the other heavy spenders for travel expense, the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works used up $1,908,747 for this purpose in 1936, $1,505,729 in 1937, and are asking for an additional $600,000 of the taxpayers' money in 1938 for more travel expense.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation spent for travel expense in 1936 $1,762,358, in 1937 $1,750,000 even, and in 1938 they are asking the Congress to appropriate as much as $1,900,000. Where will they stop?

STRANGE FACTS BOB UP

Mr. Speaker as we delve into these travel expenses, many strange facts bob up. For example the Farm Credit Administration has spent so much in travel that it ought to be called a travel bureau. In 1936 their travel expense was $1,653,619. In 1937 they spent $2,070,841 in travel expense. Consider these facts well. Although their new mortgage loans in 1936 were 58.1 percent lower than in 1935 and 85.5 percent lower than in 1934 their travel expense is getting larger each year. More than one-half their total congressional appropriation was spent last year for travel expense. The $2,070,841 is quite a large sum when one considers that last year they made only 65,281 mortgage loans to 44,942 individuals. This represents an expenditure for travel of more than $46 for each loan made to an individual. When we consider this huge expenditure on the part of the Farm Credit Administration, and think of the many offices they have in various parts of the country, no Member of this House need look further to justify his vote in overriding the Presidential veto last Tuesday. If we are making a present to the farmers of America, by making low-interest rates available to them, we have been making a hundred times greater present to these travelers of the Farm Credit Administration. If they would cut down this travel expense, here would be an excellent place to commence the economies the President has asked for.

FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

Next among the agencies I wish to mention as voracious travelers, is the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation. This is a nonprofit agency set up to buy and distribute surplus commodities to those persons in need of relief. Behind this central objective, there is also the maintenance of prices by the removal of surpluses which possibly might lower the return in the domestic markets. Now, we ought not to be alarmed about our surplus commodities as long as we are importing millions of dollars of foodstuffs from other countries. However, I am somewhat worried and also more than puzzled about some of the strange facts I find by comparing the Budget estimates for 1938 with the balance sheet of the Corporation as published in the annual report for the calendar year of 1936.

Mr. BIERMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BIERMANN. Has the gentleman ever considered that before these loans are made the property has to be appraised and that after the loans have been made and during the entire term of the loan they have to be serviced and that cannot be done except by trained men from these banks?

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman must bear in mind that the figures I gave do not include servicing. That is another item altogether, with which I am not concerned today. I am talking only about traveling expenses.

Mr. BIERMANN. The men that service these loans certainly have some traveling expenses.

Mr. KNUTSON. That goes into another column under another item.

Mr. BIERMANN. I think the gentleman better investigate that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am merely concerned with what is paid out for railroad transportation.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman knows, of course, that appraisals of property upon which the home-loan banks propose to extend loans are made largely by local appraisers appointed by that organization?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. The original appraisal is made by the local association, which is being rapidly wiped out under the New Deal. That is, the local association is being wiped out.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. We are all very much interested in what the gentleman is saying. However, may I call his attention to the fact that the other day we passed a farm tenancy bill which provides for about ten times as much travel. The bill even included the purchase of airplanes so that the agents of this new agency may get about more rapidly.

Mr. KNUTSON. If they are going in for airplanes, I hope they will all embark on a trip around the world at the equator.

According to the Budget, the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation spent $19,853 in travel expense in 1936. They spent $40,305 in 1937, but there are no estimates scheduled for 1938. So, turning to page 6 of the annual report, made to whom I do not know, but signed by Mr. J. W. Tapp, president, we find among the listed liabilities of this Corporation the following:

Current accounts payable: Transportation vouchers	$526,928.67
Accrued liabilities: Transportation charges for which vouchers have not been received	161,653.93

Here we have two items of transportation amounting to $681,581.60.

How much of this unpaid liability is travel expense?

This Corporation is spending nearly half a million dollars a year for personal services, and surely some of their many employees could have itemized these transportation liabilities for the record.

This is but a simple example of how the taxpayers' money is being spent, with no possible means for a check-up by the Members of Congress, who are charged with the responsibility of safeguarding the public purse.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to introduce for the RECORD a table showing the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture, segregated by bureaus and agencies, for travel expense for the 3-year period under consideration.

TABLE 2.—*Showing expenditures for travel of the Department of Agriculture distributed by offices and bureaus*

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
Secretary's office and departmental	$298,022	$341,999	$375,711
Weather Bureau	59,690	48,715	26,138
Bureau of Animal Industry	370,810	381,410	2,223,564
Bureau of Dairy Industry	12,700	9,800	10,094
Bureau of Plant Industry	188,615	179,755	198,150
Forest Service	814,847	1,009,088	951,489
Bureau of Chemistry and Soils	93,982	101,748	85,265
Bureau of Entomology, etc	236,418	576,356	664,393
Bureau of Biological Survey	245,065	323,906	297,387
Bureau of Public Roads	170,000	255,000	320,944
Bureau of Agricultural Engineering	27,630	35,554	29,502
Bureau of Agricultural Economics	566,883	631,214	388,702
Bureau of Home Economics	1,900	6,900	2,531
Enforcement of Commodity Exchange Act	18,200	4,000	4,659
Food and Drug Administration	127,077	126,877	115,314
Soil Conservation Service	890,934	1,153,869	911,103
Miscellaneous expenditures	2,645,161	2,515,511	1,097,165
Total by years, Department of Agriculture	6,767,934	7,701,702	7,702,141

As we go over this table we find the expenditures of Mr. Secretary Wallace's department tops the travel expenditures of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Post Office Department. The travel expense in 1936 was $7,702,141. In 1937 it was $7,701,702.

Probably the President has told them they would have to cut down a little on the Budget request for 1938.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman mentioned the item of travel expense for these fellows. The question now is, do we have to get them back? Is this a return ticket or just one way?

Mr. KNUTSON. I hope they have just a one-way ticket.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not think that would be fair, does he?

Mr. KNUTSON. It would be better for the taxpayers.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. I do not think the gentleman means that, or means that those who are doing the traveling for this agency should fly airplanes by the Equator route, because the gentleman knows that most of the employees of this particular agency belong to the gentleman's own party.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, I am not approaching this from a political angle, and I hope the gentleman will not try to inject any politics into it.

The Budget request for 1938 is $6,767,934. There must be a lot of traveling going on in the Department of Agriculture, or else some great group is touring the world at the taxpayers' expense. From the contents of the latest gem of literature they have put out on soil conservation, I see they have been scouring the hinterlands of China, the Punjab plains of India, the veldt of South Africa, the islands of Java and Sumatra, and several other remote places to find out how they do things there. They have made studies where the rainfall is as much as 270 inches a year, and undoubtedly they will use these studies to determine just what ought to be done to rectify conditions in the Dust Bowl area of our own Great Plains. While these gems of literature are being prepared, the Soil Conservation Service had run up a travel expense for 1936 of $911,105. By 1937 they were able to increase the travel expense to $1,153,869. For 1938 they ask another $890,934 of the taxpayers' money for more travel expense.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

Another interesting item in this never-ending travel expense in the Department of Agriculture was incurred by the Bureau of Animal Industry, for the purpose of eliminating diseased livestock. In 1936 the travel expense for this particular purpose amounted to $1,894,766. Now, someone must have raised Cain about this waste, for in 1937 we find the same travel expense included in the miscellaneous items of expense and amounting to only $1,380,610. However, along with this expenditure we find a further expenditure for the same purpose made in 1936 amounting to $207,934. So in 1936 the actual travel expense in the elimination of diseased cattle was not $1,894,766 but actually $2,192,700. What the expense will be in 1938 no one can estimate, but it is safe to predict that the $1,565,410 requested will not suffice unless we get wholeheartedly behind the President's suggestion of a week or so ago that there be immediate economies in these travel and printing expenses.

The slogan of the Department of Agriculture must be "See America and See the World."

We ought to serve notice on Mr. Wallace that his traveling crew and their expenses will be subjected to the severest scrutiny the next time he comes before the Appropriations Committee asking for funds. Now is the time to put an end to these world ramblings and vacation journeys. These galloping hounds of spending must be brought to bay or we will be bankrupt.

EXPENSES OF COMMERCE AND STATE DEPARTMENTS MODERATE

Mr. Speaker, when we consider the entire travel expense of the Department of State is far less than some of the New Deal agencies, and when we compare these travel expenses with those of the Department of Commerce, for example, we wonder just how all this money could have been spent, and there would still have been anybody around to do the actual administrative work connected with these agencies.

Personally, I believe the Departments of Commerce and State are to be highly commended for the great restraint and the economies they have practiced in the face of the horrible example which has been set before them.

Now, we are getting down to "Honest Harold's" department, the Department of the Interior. The Department of the Interior has also run up some new travel-expense records in the last 3 years.

TABLE 3.—*Showing travel expenses for Department of the Interior distributed by offices, commissions, and bureaus*

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
Office of Secretary	$211,780	$219,019	$218,905
Commission of Fine Arts	2,400	2,400	1,916
Petroleum Administration		20,000	48,856
National Bituminous Coal Commission		3,900	4,510
General Land Office	103,000	207,000	109,523
Bureau of Indian Affairs	714,990	624,560	548,257
Bureau of Reclamation	44,275	120,280	64,481
Geological Survey	349,323	433,809	371,978
Bureau of Mines	121,060	116,310	109,771
National Park Service	50,096	56,851	58,491
Office of Education	63,360	98,247	89,505
Government in the Territories	31,372	106,244	77,856
St. Elizabeths Hospital	1,000	1,500	276
Columbia Institute for Deaf	100	100	84
Howard University	15,500	11,000	9,584
Freedmens Hospital	50	50	15
Totals by years, Department of the Interior	1,711,308	2,021,270	1,714,011

In 1936 the travel expense was $1,718,414. In 1937 it ran up to $2,186,270. Next year they are asking for $1,711,308. These odd figures must be arrived at in some mystic manner. Perhaps an analysis of the expenditures for travel by the Bureau of Indian Affairs will throw some light on this grave travel matter.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

In 1936 the travel expense of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior was $548,257. In 1937 the expense had grown to $624,560. Next year the Budget estimates are for $714,000. Part of this travel expense was incurred in organizing Indian corporations. The theme song of the Interior Department, as well as the rest of the New Deal, is "Organize." Well, they tried to organize the Indians into corporations. So far they have organized the Makah Indian Tribe of the Makah Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation in New Mexico, the North Cheyenne Tribe of the Tongue River Reservation in Montana, the Manchester Band of Pomo Indians in California, the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of the Pyramid Lake Reservation in Nevada, and the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribes of the Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation in the same State.

Besides this work they have written constitutions and bylaws for the following tribes:

The Kickapoo Tribe of Kansas.

The Walker River Paiute Tribe of Nevada.

The Yavapai-Apache Indian Community of Arizona.

The Ute Indian Tribe of Utah.

The Quechan Tribe of Fort Yuma Reservation, Calif.

They may have some other organization work under way.

Now, this whole work of organizing and writing constitutions and bylaws for the Indians took a great amount of traveling. In fact, it required $57,465 for travel expense in 1936, $59,420 in 1937, and the Budget estimate for 1938 is $59,520.

Now and then we see a few Indians around Washington, come to see the Great White Father and get the justice which is due them. But this item of travel expense seems absurd when we consider that there are fewer than 350,000 Indians in the United States and Alaska, including the 150,000 members of the Five Civilized Tribes, who no longer need be herded around like sheep. This obvious waste for travel expense may be justified by some of the Members of Congress, but before justification is attempted let me refer the Members to page 394 of the Budget for 1938, and there they will find listed among the items of expense for 1937 the sum of $460,000 for the maintenance of automobiles for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and an additional item of $190,000 for the purchase of new automobiles.

The President wonders where he can turn to cut down some of the expenses of this Government. Why do not some of you folks go down and tell him?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SNELL. Before the gentleman leaves the subject of the Department of the Interior, can the gentleman tell me whether or not it is a fact that "Honest Harold" has living quarters in the large new Interior Building, with a sumptuous state dining room and everything that goes with it?

Mr. KNUTSON. I understand he has living quarters down there that are so magnificent that photographers are not permitted to come in and take pictures; I presume because it would not have a very good effect on the voters in 1938.

Mr. SNELL. Who has authorized that expenditure?

Mr. KNUTSON. I presume he took it out of P. W. A. I do not recall that in any appropriation bill we authorized the installation of electric stoves, steam kitchens, elaborate chinaware and silverware, linen, and I do not know what all. I understand it is furnished like a Turkish harem.

Mr. SNELL. If that is so, it is certainly more elaborate than anything which has ever been done in any department building in Washington up to this time, and I think the people of this country ought to know it.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think if Members of Congress were not so indifferent to their sworn duties they would look into this: but they have not seen fit to do so. The Committee on Appropriations should look into this.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McFARLANE. I wonder if the gentleman has looked into any of the many loopholes the Committee on Ways and Means has put into our tax laws, through which about as much revenue is escaping as we are collecting through taxation?

Mr. KNUTSON. I may say to the gentleman that the present tax law was passed by the gentleman's own party. He shoud refer his inquiry to the chairman and the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. McFARLANE. I am not referring to the last tax bill in particular, but am referring to the revenue bills since the Wilson administration. Most of the revenue bills that have been passed since the Wilson administration, as the gentleman knows, through the three administrations of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover——

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not going to permit any politics to come into this discussion.

Mr. McFARLANE. The gentleman is not talking anything but politics.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. May I call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to the fact that the members of the Committee on Ways and Means have no greater facilities for discovering loopholes in tax laws than has the gentleman from Texas. The members of the Committee on Ways and Means do not see the income-tax returns, which are submitted to the Treasury Department. The only people who see these returns are the administrative officials in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. If the members of the Committee on Ways and Means do not have the information for which the gentleman asks, it is because the officials in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, in the gentleman's own party, have failed so to inform the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. McFARLANE. I would be pleased to answer the gentleman if I had the time.

Mr. KNUTSON. In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I add that in going over all the thousands of items of travel expense for the last 3 years I also find that we have been very generous in our travel expense for attendance at fairs and expositions. Almost every department and bureau has sent representatives to the Texas centennial, the Great Lakes celebration, the California Pacific International Exposition, and other places. These are only small junkets, but they act as a stimuli to other and wider travel adventures.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of this Congress I now insert in the record a complete detailed list of travel expense of all the agencies and departments of the Federal Government for 1936, 1937, and 1938. I trust they will be preserved and

used as a guide to guard against this momentous waste which is going on on every side. I trust that next year we will all get together and cut down the spending, balance the Budget, and dig out as rapidly as we can from beneath the mountain of debt which threatens to overwhelm us.

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

TABLE 4.—*Detailed yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of the various departments, independent offices, and agencies of the Federal Government as taken from the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938*

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
LEGISLATIVE ESTABLISHMENT			
Mileage, President of Senate and Senators	$51,000	$51,000	$51,000
Representatives	171,000	171,000	171,000
Architect of Capitol	100	100	
Botanic Garden	625	625	118
Library of Congress	1,100	1,100	1,100
Contingent expenses	500	500	190
Care and maintenance	25	25	23
Government Printing Office	1,200	1,600	1,361
Superintendent of Documents:			
Texas Centennial Exposition			137
Office of Superintendent	200	200	54
Total, legislative establishment	225,750	226,150	224,983
EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS			
Travel and official entertainment expenses of President	25,000	25,000	25,000
Advisory Committee allotments			154
American Battle Monuments Commission	8,500	8,500	8,698
Payments to United States Foreign Service officers and employees due to appreciation of foreign currencies (loss on travel expense)	1,208	1,571	2,192
Board of Tax Appeals	9,000	10,000	8,917
California Pacific International Exposition		4,177	4,549
Central Statistical Board	2,400	2,300	1,080
Transferred from Public Works Administration			330
Civil Service Commission	73,160	71,860	48,013
Coordinator for Industrial Cooperation		4,800	1,215
Emergency Conservation Work		13,958,000	14,557,911
Texas Centennial Exposition (transferred to Emergency Conservation Work)		300	864
Employees' Compensation Commission	20,000	20,000	21,213
Employees' compensation fund:			
Civil Works	1,500	3,500	778
Emergency Conservation Work	1,500	1,500	212
Emergency Relief Employees Compensation Commission	15,000	15,000	242
Federal Alcohol Control Administration			532
Federal Communications Commission	40,000	34,008	53,011
Special investigations		8,000	56,369
Federal Coordinator of Transportation			20,186
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	439,466	437,766	475,606
Federal Emergency Relief Administration		4,603	227,581
Federal Power Commission	80,000	100,000	25,606
National Recovery Administration			4,833
Electric-rate survey			396
Federal Trade Commission	178,050	148,237	162,404
General Accounting Office (contingent expenses)	115,000	115,000	53,519
George Washington Bicentennial Commission		2,000	2,553
Great Lakes Exposition		10,000	
Interstate Commerce Commission	93,000	93,000	91,593
Regulating accounts	159,164	159,164	158,339
Safety of employees	135,465	135,980	129,170
Signal safety system	7,060	6,765	6,717
Locomotive inspection	108,713	109,772	114,103
Valuation carriers property	30,000	60,000	98,192
Air mail	22,450	19,536	
Motor-transport regulation	225,000	100,000	38,085
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	17,000	17,000	16,085
National Archives	5,000	2,000	1,638
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	1,000	1,000	161
National Emergency Council		35,430	68,970
National Labor Relations Board	75,000	84,000	68,141
National Mediation Board	28,538	28,538	23,011
Arbitration Boards	3,500	3,500	100
Emergency Boards, Railway Labor Act	7,500	7,500	625
National Railroad Adjustment Board	7,000	8,500	3,163
National Recovery Administration			138,041
National Resources Committee		100,000	84,370
Northwest Territories Celebration Commission		5,612	
Prison Industries Reorganization Administration		12,000	6,939
Protection Oil Interests, Naval Reserves	3,000	3,000	1,758
Railroad Administration		60	113
Railroad Retirement Board	95,000	35,291	2,630
Resettlement Administration (administrative) 4		4,407,219	6,241,668
Projects		190,585	106,986
Texas Centennial Exposition			180
Great Lakes Exposition			320
Rural Electrification Administration	170,000	70,000	
Emergency relief		38,364	38,173
Great Lakes Exposition		875	125
Securities and Exchange Commission	225,000	225,000	135,793
Smithsonian Institution	40	40	8
American Ethnology, field work	100	100	677

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—Continued

TABLE 4.—*Detailed yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of the various departments, independent offices, and agencies of the Federal Government as taken from the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938*—Con.

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS—continued			
Astrophysical Observatory	$1,030	$1,030	$848
National Museum (preservation of collections)	1,500	1,500	1,700
National Art Gallery	200	200	208
Texas Centennial Exposition	2,063	2,063	335
Great Lakes Exposition		60	
Social Security Board	1,890,110	516,600	44,892
Same (wage records)		539,393	
Tariff Commission	25,000	50,000	37,546
U. S. Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission	7,000	7,000	
U. S. Harvard University Tercentennial Commission		600	
U. S. Maritime Commission	100,000	44,000	
U. S. Texas Centennial Commission		12,500	4,955
Works Progress Administration		2,271,070	4,728,010
Total, Executive Office and independent establishments	4,249,980	24,391,496	28,158,332
Independent offices:			
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	210,000	210,000	82,640
Savings and loan promotion			71,903
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	1,900,000	1,750,000	1,762,358
Federal Housing Administration	781,905	978,320	1,135,962
Great Lakes Exposition		100	189
Texas Centennial Exposition		400	254
Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation		40,305	19,853
Export-Import Bank of Washington		1,550	1,065
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	329,400	388,000	412,801
Electric Farm and Home Authority		14,000	14,125
Commodity Credit Corporation		10,000	16,078
Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works	600,000	1,505,729	1,908,747
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	10,000	16,000	2,791
Total, independent offices	3,831,305	4,914,404	5,418,766
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION			
Travel expenses	1,552,500	1,518,000	1,535,673
Emergency relief (Veterans' Administration)		1,200	1,204
Administrative expenses, Adjusted Compensation Act		15,016	2,416
Texas Centennial Exposition		1,225	774
Total, Veterans' Administration	1,552,500	1,535,431	1,540,067
GENERAL PUBLIC-WORKS PROGRAM			
Tennessee Valley Authority fund	188,378	143,968	152,887
Tennessee Valley Authority Texas Centennial Exposition		102	949
Tennessee Valley Authority Great Lakes Exposition		618	46
Federal aid highway system (Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Roads)	90,000	90,000	58,500
Department of Interior:			
Reclamation fund	40,000	27,250	
Central Valley project	40,000	26,500	
Boulder Canyon project	2,650	6,950	15,954
All-American Canal	3,000	3,000	
Bureau of Indian Affairs:			
Construction, etc	6,435	4,431	
Roads, Indian reservations	12,000	11,000	10,918
Rehabilitation of buildings	15,000		
Department of State:			
Rio Grande rectification	2,800	2,800	
Lower Rio Grande flood control	2,400	2,400	26
Rio Grande canalization	640	450	
War Department:			
Improvement, existing river and harbor works	300,000	300,000	100,000
Flood control, administrative	245,667		
Flood control, Mississippi and tributaries	380,601	241,387	258,495
Total, general public-works program	1,329,571	860,856	597,775
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
Miscellaneous expenses, travel	24,000	23,000	10,499
Agricultural Adjustment Administration:			
Office of Secretary			4,430
Conservation and use, land resources	25,000	25,000	
Payments Division, office of Secretary		6,600	7,272
Office of Solicitor, conservation and use of lands	7,500	7,500	
Payments for Agricultural Adjustment Administration Department		2,500	
N. I. R. A., wildlife refuges		10,800	6,541
Agricultural Adjustment Administration, office of Solicitor	10,000	10,000	14,529
Emergency Relief, Agricultural Adjustment Administration		14,830	27,763
Office of information	625	625	1,040
Library, Department of Agriculture	100	100	18
Office of Experiment Stations:			
Administration grants to States	7,000	7,000	6,316
Experiment stations:			
Hawaii	100	300	532
Puerto Rico	1,850	1,500	110

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—Continued

TABLE 4.—*Detailed yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of the various departments, independent offices, and agencies of the Federal Government as taken from the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938*—Con.

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—continued			
Office of Experiment Stations—Continued.			
Agricultural Adjustment Administration, liver fluke eradication, Hawaii		$1,000	$862
For rat abatement, Hawaii	$330	3,300	1,355
Investigation division of above 2 adventures		500	255
Payments for Agricultural Adjustment Administration adjustments		4,560	1,475
Development livestock feed, Hawaii	10	100	5
Development tropical fruits, Hawaii		6,000	581
Promotion poultry industry, Hawaii	100	500	77
Breeding tropical plants, Puerto Rico	50	500	2,621
Special research fund: Personal service, administrative	71,240	40,736	13,459
Extension Service, administrative	3,000	3,500	4,480
Farmers' cooperative demonstrations	68,916	54,000	60,035
Technical assistants, Washington office	2,000	2,000	2,000
Technical advice, etc., to State extension forces			78,316
Special assistants to State extension forces, Cotton Act, 1934			33,001
Special assistants, cattle purchase			3,000
Completion, commodity programs		7,000	22,041
Special assistants, administering cotton price-adjustment plan			15,000
Payment of obligations incurred by State extension forces			26,055
Special assistants, conservation and land-use program	72,200	87,600	25,000
Motion pictures	1,100	1,250	474
Agricultural exhibits at fairs	1,500	1,680	3,101
California Pacific International Exposition		2,000	870
Texas Centennial Exposition		6,000	1,166
Great Lakes Exposition		2,985	
Division of Exhibits, Sixth World Poultry Congress		4,435	
Cooperative farm forestry	1,498	1,698	1,432
Subtotal, Secretary's office, etc.	298,022	341,999	375,711
Weather Bureau:			
Administrative	1,000	500	762
General Weather Service	36,090	27,715	13,247
Aerology	22,600	20,000	12,129
Emergency relief long range forecasts		500	
Subtotal	59,690	48,715	26,138
Bureau of Animal Industry:			
Administrative	1,125	1,125	1,379
Animal husbandry	22,500	22,500	21,202
Diseases of animals	13,750	13,750	12,688
Eradicating tuberculosis	108,450	109,800	103,263
Eradicating cattle ticks	53,000	52,750	54,198
Eradicating dourine	11,840	11,840	10,274
Inspection and quarantine	37,600	39,100	40,561
Meat inspection	40,750	40,750	40,145
Virus-Serum-Toxin Act	6,200	6,200	4,732
Marketing agreements respecting hog cholera virus and serum	8,480	8,480	
Packers and Stockyards Act	67,115	67,115	40,211
Elimination, diseased livestock, etc.			1,894,766
Sixth World's Poultry Congress		8,000	
Emergency Relief eradication liver flukes			173
Subtotal	370,810	381,410	2,223,564
Bureau of Dairy Industry:			
Administrative	800	800	568
Dairy investigations	11,900	9,000	9,526
Subtotal	12,700	9,800	10,094
Bureau of Plant Industry:			
Administrative	1,200	1,200	1,092
Arlington Farm	4	4	4
Botany investigations	5,980	4,980	5,290
Cereal crops and diseases	26,000	25,500	31,000
Cotton and fiber crop diseases	20,000	20,000	20,062
Drug and related plants	2,250	2,250	1,035
Dry land agriculture	3,360	4,260	5,151
Forage crops and diseases	7,045	7,045	14,411
Forest pathology	34,754	30,819	31,697
Fruit and vegetable diseases	27,500	25,500	31,800
Genetics and biophysics	1,260	1,260	660
Mycology and disease survey	2,200	2,200	1,690
Nematology	1,875	1,350	1,284
Plant exploration and introduction	20,000	20,000	14,187
Plant nutrition	15	15	15
Rubber and other tropical plants	1,088	1,088	724
Seed investigations	4,800	3,000	1,799
Soil fertility investigations	9,200	9,200	9,211
Soil microbiology investigations	500	500	216
Sugar plant investigations	13,418	13,418	16,418
Tobacco investigations	3,066	3,066	6,740
Western irrigation agriculture	2,200	2,200	2,329
Smelter fume injury investigation	900	900	1,009
Spray residue investigations			326
Subtotal	188,615	179,775	198,150

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—Continued

TABLE 4.—*Detailed yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of the various departments, independent offices, and agencies of the Federal Government as taken from the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938*—Con.

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—continued			
Forest Service:			
Administrative	$22,801	$21,129	$12,914
National Forest Administration	519,775	492,675	365,938
Aerial fire control			10
Sanitation and fire prevention			97
Planting on national forests			697
Reconnaisance national forests			920
Improvements national forests			160
Fighting forest fires	1,400	1,400	18,761
Forest research	33,250	29,657	26,449
Range investigations	15,896	14,355	12,080
Forest Products Laboratory	18,000	17,763	14,252
Forest survey	14,000	9,683	21,613
For financing expenditures			2,620
Forest economics	6,500	4,558	5,234
Forest influences:			
Shelterbelt		3,500	
Investigations	9,000	7,512	
Soil-erosion investigations			7,462
Financing expenditures of same			324
Forest fire cooperation	18,000	17,750	10,534
Acquisition lands national forests	55,095	55,095	
Cooperative acquisition, State forests	16,000		
Cooperative work, Forest Service	40,000	40,000	31,341
Control tree-destroying insects			1,124
Emergency Conservation Work			113
Miscellaneous administrative expenses		3,551	26,300
Miscellaneous improvement national forests		26,000	291,644
Administrative expenditures, Emergency Relief Act 1938		5,750	
Development camping grounds		28,200	
Conservation forest resources		148,000	
Surveys, examinations and investigations		19,000	
Range conservation program	40,130	45,130	
Working fund, War, flood control Mississippi River and tributaries		18,380	902
Subtotal	814,847	1,009,088	951,489
Bureau of Chemistry and Soils:			
Administrative, departmental	2,400	2,400	2,261
Agriculture, chemical investigations	15,500	15,500	15,618
Smelter fumes investigations (State of Washington)	500	500	490
Industrial utilization farm products	7,000	4,000	2,296
Agricultural, fire explosive dusts	2,500	2,000	1,878
Naval stores investigation	2,500	2,500	2,715
Soil survey	59,782	59,782	48,059
Puerto Rico		366	6,709
Hawaii		7,300	1,693
Working fund, Mississippi River and tributary soil classification		3,600	
Soil, chemistry, and physical investigations	2,600	2,600	2,314
Fertilizer investigations	1,200	1,200	1,232
Subtotal	93,982	101,748	85,265
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:			
General administrative	2,040	2,540	2,939
Emergency relief		6,000	5,577
Fruits, insects	22,625	19,682	15,382
Japanese-beetle control	20,400	20,100	20,059
Mexican fruit-fly control	5,420	4,400	4,317
Citrus canker eradication	600	600	524
Eradication and control, insects, etc.		13,588	11,503
Phony peach, etc., eradication	12,125	7,623	4,292
Eradication injurious insects		28,350	97,050
Peach mosaic control		12,585	4,819
Date-scale control			968
Forest insects	19,910	7,860	9,919
Gypsy and brown-tail moth control	12,495	12,495	12,642
Gypsy moth control		6,000	8,590
Brown-tail moth control		1,500	1,000
Blister-rust control	15,800	8,400	8,993
White-pine blister-rust control			3,085
Eradication, control, etc., injurious insects (blister rust control)		106,000	105,000
Dutch-elm disease eradication	3,500	3,500	3,487
Eradication, control, etc., injurious insects (Dutch elm control)		15,700	22,300
Truck crop, garden insects	19,525	17,825	16,987
Cereal and forage insects	29,550	29,550	29,380
European corn borer control	2,150	2,150	2,188
Survey			15,509
Barberry eradication	15,300	15,300	15,236
Black stem rust control			8,485
Barberry eradication (control pests, etc.)		80,620	66,000
Cotton insects	5,334	5,334	5,400
Pink boll-worm control	14,146	12,500	12,388
Wild cotton eradication		444	1,500
Thurberia weevil control	9	9	9
Bee culture	4,775	4,775	3,619
Insects affecting man and animals	4,500	3,500	3,215
Insect pest survey	440	40	116
Foreign parasites	715	500	500
Control investigations	2,300	1,500	1,522
Insecticide and fungicide investigations	3,200	3,200	3,175
Transit inspections	2,245	1,825	1,624
Foreign plant quarantines	13,700	10,000	10,841
Certification of exports	3,434	3,434	1,684

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—Continued

TABLE 4.—*Detailed yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of the various departments, independent offices, and agencies of the Federal Government as taken from the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938*—Con.

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—continued			
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Continued.			
Chinch bug control			$1,146
Screwworm control		$94,900	99,779
West India fruitfly and blackfly			329
Grasshopper control		780	890
Fruitfly control (Hawaii)		9,246	15,834
Insect pest survey (Puerto Rico)		2,000	4,591
Subtotal	$236,418	576,356	664,393
Bureau of Biological Survey:			
Administrative	4,175	4,175	2,806
Food habits, birds and animals	6,910	6,010	6,138
Production fur-bearing animals	2,588	2,668	2,399
Biological investigations	10,664	10,094	10,032
Control predatory animals, rodents	75,100	75,100	75,123
Protection migratory birds	67,000	63,862	54,583
Enforcement Alaska game law	17,648	17,648	10,384
Maintenance reservations	10,000	8,000	7,097
Upper Mississippi Refuge		1,143	627
Migratory bird conservation refuges	8,000	8,000	6,319
Migratory bird conservation fund	28,000	35,043	36,078
National Industrial Recovery Act wildlife refuges	15,000	74,000	54,679
Flood control wildlife refuges		6,000	
Emergency Relief allotments		8,863	27,035
Developing water-fowl refuges, North Dakota		500	4,087
Flood control Mississippi River and tributaries		2,800	
Subtotal	245,065	323,906	297,387
Bureau of Public Roads:			
Construction of highways	30,000	80,000	166,026
Emergency construction			283
Supervision miscellaneous road projects		15,000	7,051
Elimination grade crossings	140,000	160,000	147,584
Subtotal	170,000	255,000	320,944
Bureau of Agricultural Engineering:			
Administrative	27,550	23,800	23,814
Waterways treaty investigations	80	80	99
Land appraisal work		324	2,694
Mississippi River and tributaries		10,000	
River and harbor works		350	
Rio Grande joint investigations		1,000	2,895
Subtotal	27,630	35,554	29,502
Bureau of Agricultural Economics:			
Administrative	1,650	1,650	1,434
Farm management and practice	23,475	23,475	20,585
Arbitration, smelter fumes controversy	343	343	343
Valuations, flood-control area		4,100	
Marketing and distribution, farm products	27,414	25,418	24,164
Crop and livestock estimates	31,890	31,890	31,529
Foreign competition studies	26,550	26,550	30,381
Market inspection, farm products	36,492	27,991	31,834
Hay inspection, etc	250	250	337
Tobacco Inspection Act	20,000	20,000	
Market-news service	19,672	18,755	19,091
Perishable agricultural commodities	14,750	14,750	10,524
Standard Container Act	2,550	2,550	2,568
Peanut stocks and standards	300		
Tobacco stocks and standards	1,000	1,000	1,403
Grade and staple statutes (cotton)	16,640	16,640	15,146
U. S. Cotton Futures Act	37,786	35,886	30,858
U. S. Grain Standards Act	12,640	10,240	8,720
U. S. Warehouse Act	71,235	71,080	65,398
Establishing wool standards	1,500	1,500	1,905
Statistical work for Agricultural Adjustment Administration	7,966	9,366	31,034
Statistical work, adjustment program	212,780	212,780	12,794
Statistical work for Agricultural Adjustment Administration			22,595
Purchasing and distribution			1,615
Agricultural Adjustment Administration programs			24,444
Survey farm mortgages, etc		75,000	
Subtotal	566,883	631,214	388,702
Bureau of Home Economics:			
Administrative	1,000	1,000	810
Investigations	900	900	868
Study of dry-milk uses			853
Consumer purchases, study		5,000	
Subtotal	1,900	6,900	2,531
Enforcement of Commodity Exchange Act	18,200	4,000	4,659
Food and Drug Administration:			
Administration	607	607	633
Field representatives	113,200	103,000	102,211
Enforcement of Tea Import Act	945	945	945
Naval Stores Act	3,100	3,100	3,087
Insecticide Act enforcement	6,900	6,900	6,933

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—Continued

TABLE 4.—*Detailed yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of the various departments, independent offices, and agencies of the Federal Government as taken from the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938*—Con.

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—continued			
Food and Drug Administration—Con.			
Milk Importation Act enforcement	$425	$425	$175
Enforcement of Caustic Poison Act	1,200	1,200	1,330
Filled Milk Act enforcement	700	700	
Subtotal	127,077	126,877	115,314
Soil Conservation Service:			
Administrative	30,000	19,562	
Soil and moisture conservation	135,107	127,618	3,216
Erosion investigations			7,874
Demonstrations and information	725,827	736,786	116,134
Plant reserve stations			41,009
Erosion survey, Puerto Rico		19,170	1,006
Erosion control demonstrations		823	11,652
Emergency work from Public Works Administration		18,671	77,007
Erosion control nurseries		1,873	1,368
More administrative expense		54,332	200,505
National program from Federal Emergency Relief Administration		51,895	451,332
Flood control from relief		123,139	
Subtotal	890,934	1,153,869	911,103
Miscellaneous:			
Elimination of diseased cattle	1,565,410	1,380,610	207,934
Agriculture Adjustment Administration:			
Export and domestic consumption of domestic foods	110,575		16,242
Cotton price adjustment		19,200	3,061
Conservation and use of land resources	768,284	768,284	202,580
Payment for adjustments		62,800	122,659
Payments under the tobacco, cotton, potato acts		1,500	8,037
Purchase and sale of seed		900	2,059
Salaries and expenses	187,792	272,317	258,600
Tobacco compacts	13,100	9,900	
Advances to			213,308
General expenses			17,668
Advances to Department under Tobacco Act			14,227
Administration of Cotton Act			23,795
Administration expense in connection with histories of codes			6,995
Subtotal	2,645,161	2,515,511	1,097,165
Total, Department of Agriculture	6,767,934	7,701,702	7,702,141
FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION			
(Appropriations 1937, $4,065,480; this looks like a travel bureau)			
Farm Credit Administration:			
Administrative	1,482,921	1,970,841	1,623,267
Field	50,000	100,000	30,062
Texas Centennial Exposition			290
Total	1,532,921	2,070,841	1,653,619
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
(Appropriations, 1937, $35,524,670)			
Secretary's office:			
Contingent and miscellaneous fund	2,813	2,658	5,270
Accident prevention conference		5,000	
Bureau of Air Commerce:			
Maintenance of facilities	176,300	163,700	196,310
Aircraft in commerce	120,000	108,564	71,775
N. I. R. A., Bureau of Air Commerce		1,000	25,036
Public Works Administration, Bureau of Air Commerce		1,000	49,175
Working fund, Air Corps			5,566
Federal Emergency Relief Act, Bureau of Air Commerce		59,155	59,863
Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce:			
Promoting commerce in—			
Europe, etc	18,370	18,370	20,172
Latin America	8,720	8,720	9,440
Far East	7,530	7,530	6,852
Africa	1,985	1,985	3,391
District and cooperative office service	13,225	13,225	10,750
Enforcement China Trade Act	50	50	26
Export industries	6,500	6,500	11,381
Domestic Commerce	6,700	6,700	6,229
Compiling foreign trade statistics	1,160	1,160	1,221
Lists of foreign buyers	500	500	547
Investigation foreign trade restrictions	600	600	549
Transportation of families of officers and employees of bureau	19,000	19,000	18,191
Operation foreign trade zones	1,180	1,180	4,277
Industrial economics	17,300		
Emergency Relief clerical projects		286	266
Payments to employees abroad due to appreciation of foreign moneys	3,550	3,685	3,370
Bureau of the Census:			
Administrative personnel	109,770	39,560	29,907
Census of agriculture		459	841
Social Security Act			88
Emergency Relief assistance, white collar		74,276	279,124
Working fund, Federal Emergency Relief Administration		41,815	59,200
Special statistical work			31

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—Continued

TABLE 4.—*Detailed yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of the various departments, independent offices, and agencies of the Federal Government as taken from the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938*—Con.

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—continued			
Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation:			
Field service	$145,103	$99,963	$99,963
National Bureau of Standards:			
Administrative	1,000	1,000	954
Testing service, field	13,500	13,500	12,607
Research development	4,500	4,500	5,507
Commercial standards	3,000	3,000	3,056
Investigation building materials	2,000		
Miscellaneous researches	3,000	3,000	3,678
Federal Emergency Relief Administration, white-collar projects		800	691
Coast and Geodetic Survey:			
Personal services, field	5,000	5,000	4,847
N. I. R. A., same			42
Pacific coastal surveys	5,000	5,000	8,842
N. I. R. A., field services		20	119
Field party expenses	650	650	645
Compilation of Coast Pilot	750	750	199
Magnetic and seismological work	1,500	1,566	1,929
N. I. R. A., coast survey		550	72
Federal boundary, State surveys	800	800	4,957
N. I. R. A., field work		30	3,204
Miscellaneous objects	275	1,700	73
Repairs of vessels	200	200	
General expenses	415	415	373
Aeronautical charts	2,500	500	
Public Works Administration, field service aerial			1,138
Working fund:			
Soil Conservation Service		3,100	720
Public Works Administration emergency relief		900	
Topographic survey			35
Bureau of Fisheries:			
Personal services, field (including fish cars)	39,480	34,480	34,480
Maintenance of vessels	628	628	628
Inquiry respecting food fish	19,810	12,160	13,200
N. I. R. A. respecting above item		850	935
Working fund			357
Statistics on fishing industries	16,465	10,970	12,490
Protecting seal, salmon fisheries (Alaska)	23,125	23,125	23,125
Enforcement black bass law	1,350	1,535	1,535
Upper Mississippi River Fish Refuge	110	110	110
Cooperative Marketing Act	1,145	1,145	778
Shell fish investigation		2,700	6,191
Administering whaling treaties	1,350		
Patent Office: Miscellaneous travel expense	1,000	1,000	592
U. S. Shipping Board Bureau:			
Administrative		446	2,938
Texas Centennial Exposition		127	10,233
Great Lakes Exposition		2,062	
N. I. R. A., personal services			2,347
Total, Department of Commerce	808,909	824,960	1,142,438
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
(Total appropriations 1937, $79,054,501—from Budget, 1938)			
Office of the Secretary:			
Division of Investigation	76,780	74,560	73,359
Division of Grazing	125,000	100,000	110,064
Contingent expenses	10,000	10,000	9,535
Emergency relief, administrative		28,499	19,248
Texas Centennial Exposition		3,500	2,582
Great Lakes Exposition		1,600	
California-Pacific International Exposition		860	4,117
Subtotal	211,780	219,019	218,905
Commission of Fine Arts: Administrative	2,400	2,400	1,916
Petroleum Administration:			
Administration		20,000	35,556
Public Works Administration allotment—Labor Policy Board			13,290
Subtotal		20,000	48,856
National Bituminous Coal Commission:			
Administrative		3,600	3,202
Emergency relief			846
Consumers' Counsel		300	462
Subtotal		3,900	4,510
General Land Office:			
General expenses	4,000	4,000	3,165
Surveying public lands	96,500	85,000	105,527
N. I. R. A. allotment		116,000	
Contingent expenses, land offices	2,500	2,000	834
Subtotal	103,000	207,000	109,526
Bureau of Indian Affairs:			
Administrative, Indian Service	31,600	25,600	23,506
Purchase and transport supplies	2,000	2,000	1,842
Maintaining law and order on reservations	15,000	15,100	14,475
Agency buildings, rentals, repairs	2,500	800	205

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—Continued

TABLE 4.—*Detailed yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of the various departments, independent offices, and agencies of the Federal Government as taken from the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938*—Con.

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—continued			
Bureau of Indian Affairs—Continued.			
N. I. R. A. Indian allotments		$15,000	$8,500
Organizing Indian corporations	$59,520	59,420	57,465
Acquisition of lands for Indians	20,050	15,000	7,900
Administration, Indian forests	13,500	13,000	11,830
Sale of timber	1,000	1,000	602
Suppressing forest fires	250	500	
Obtaining employment for Indians	6,500	7,125	5,061
Agriculture and stock raising	30,000	25,000	24,747
Industry among Indians			380
Industrial assistance (tribal funds)	1,000	1,000	47
Revolving fund for loans	25,000	15,500	4,939
Development arts and crafts	13,000	11,500	
Purchase of horses (Apaches)			240
Development water supply	1,500	1,500	923
Irrigation and drainage	5,380	5,000	5,083
N. I. R. A. allotment, Indians (San Carlos project)	1,000	800	736
Colorado River Reservation	150	100	107
Fort Hall irrigation system	140	140	163
Fort Belknap Reservation	150	150	19
Fort Peck Reservation	50	50	23
Flathead Reservation	200	200	78
Crow Reservation	100	50	10
Hog Back project	50	50	25
Fruitland irrigation project			161
Irrigation Uintah Reservation	500	250	441
Wapato irrigation system	100	100	
Wind River irrigation system	50	50	
Support Indian schools	110,000	100,000	75,245
Tribal funds	1,000	2,000	1,822
Improvement, lease school buildings	6,000	1,800	1,447
Indian boarding schools:			
Phoenix, Ariz	600	750	736
Riverside, Calif	3,000	3,000	2,965
Haskell Institute	6,000	6,000	5,407
Pipestone, Minn	1,000	800	331
Indian boarding schools:			
Carson City, Nev	2,000	2,000	1,604
Albuquerque, N. Mex	2,500	2,500	3,153
Santa Fe, N. Mex	2,000	2,000	1,966
Bismarck, N. Dak		700	465
Wahpeton, N. Dak	750	750	726
Chillocco, Okla	1,500	1,200	1,179
Sequoyah Orphan School	600	600	578
Carter Seminiary	200	200	206
Euchee, Okla	100	100	122
Eufaula, Okla	150	150	138
Jones Academy, Oklahoma	300	300	256
Wheelock Academy, Oklahoma	100	100	82
Chemawa, Oreg	5,000	4,000	3,994
Flandreau, S. Dak	2,000	2,000	2,178
Pierre, S. Dak	650	650	611
Administrative travel			1,967
Indian schools, Five Civilized Tribes	4,500	4,500	4,088
Education of natives, Alaska	22,500	19,500	19,250
Conservation of health	83,250	78,000	80,277
Specific hospitals	13,850	12,175	9,300
Support hospitals, Chippewas (tribal)		100	2,117
Medical relief of natives (Alaska)	34,850	22,650	21,048
Administration, Indian property	90,000	75,000	74,997
(Tribal funds) Colorado River			192
Fort Apache Indians	400	400	378
San Carlos	200	425	418
Mission Indians			308
Fort Hall Indians		25	14
Red Lake Indians		1,000	971
Consolidated Chippewas			324
Flat Heads		700	
Cherokees	200	200	28
Klamaths	4,500	4,000	
Cheyenne River		1,000	1,064
Puyallup Indians		100	77
Keshena	500	500	308
Chippewas, Minnesota		1,900	1,924
Expenses, tribal officers, Five Civilized Tribes	4,000	4,000	2,575
Support, Osage Agency	1,500	1,500	1,570
Expenses, tribal councils	71,000	41,300	42,997
Trust accounts	5,000	5,000	4,908
Proceeds of labor	3,000	3,000	2,438
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs [1]	714,990	624,560	548,257
Bureau of Reclamation:			
Special fund, administrative	43,025	23,200	12,020
Colorado River-front work, etc	200	200	
National Industrial Recovery Administration, reclamation		27,930	23,339
Parker-Gila project		4,750	1,273
Boulder Canyon project			4,489
All-American Canal project			1,387
Public Works Administration, allotment, All-American Canal			193

[1] According to Census statistics there are approximately 325,000 Indians in the continental United States, including 105,000 of the Five Civilized Tribes and there are about 25,000 additional Indians in Alaska. See p. 394 Budget for $460,000 expended for auto maintenance, plus $190,000 cost of new automobiles.

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—Continued

TABLE 4.—*Detailed yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of the various departments, independent offices, and agencies of the Federal Government as taken from the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938*—Con.

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—continued			
Bureau of Reclamation—Continued.			
United States-Mexico International Boundary Commission:			
National Industrial Recovery Administration		$500	$265
Public Works Administration		200	
Working fund	$50	100	23
Federal Emergency Relief Administration:			
Reclamation, irrigation, etc		56,900	15,627
All-American Canal		500	719
Reclamation, grants to States		5,000	3,456
Working fund interior (Tennessee Valley Authority fund)			907
Contributed fund:			
Colorado River project			512
Parker Dam	1,000	1,000	271
Subtotal	44,275	120,280	64,481
Geological Survey:			
Administrative	82,910	89,750	60,911
Topographic survey, Puerto Rico			359
Topographic surveys, United States and Alaska		50,200	75,082
Geologic surveys, United States	53,300	54,000	43,630
Mineral resource surveys, etc			769
Mineral resources of Alaska	6,000	5,960	11,072
Gaging streams	168,690	175,440	139,130
Rehabilitation measurement stations			88
Underground water surveys		50	101
Measurement stations, Colorado and Mississippi Rivers			752
Stream flow measurement stations, etc			15
Measurement stations, Rio Grande, etc		300	644
Flood survey river stages		11,000	3,039
N. I. R. A., National Resources Committee		1,612	2,640
Classification of lands	6,000	5,900	5,580
Preparation of illustrations	3	3	3
Geologic and topographic maps	200	160	365
Mineral leasing enforcement	32,220	37,934	24,917
Safeguarding mine openings, etc			1,192
Controlling outcrop fires			210
Plugging abandoned oil gas wells		1,500	1,479
Subtotal	349,323	433,809	371,978
Bureau of Mines:			
Administative, field service	58,550	52,550	52,153
Testing fuel, field service	6,600	5,600	3,980
Mineral mining investigations	22,230	20,730	26,618
Oil and gas investigations	16,800	20,800	14,310
Expenses mining experiment stations	6,980	6,980	5,653
Economics of Mineral Industries	9,050	8,450	6,443
Helium production	500	800	353
Payments to employees abroad	350	400	261
Subtotal	121,060	116,310	109,711
National Park Service:			
Administrative	15,000	15,000	9,891
Acadia National Park	900	900	565
Bryce Canyon National Park	200	200	132
Carlsbad Caverns National Park	500	500	161
Crater Lake National Park	590	590	855
General Grant National Park	200	200	131
Glacier National Park	1,319	1,144	952
Grand Canyon National Park	1,445	1,445	1,322
Grant Teton National Park	900	800	136
Great Smoky Mountain National Park	1,170	970	1,540
Hawaii National Park	730	690	855
Hot Springs National Park	300	300	620
Lasson Volcanic National Park	457	457	957
Mesa Verde National Park	940	400	1,066
Mount McKinley National Park	650	650	233
Mount Ranier National Park	1,385	1,385	1,692
Platte National Park	200	200	
Rocky Mountain National Park	650	600	1,332
Sequoia National Park	1,100	1,060	2,123
Shenandoah National Park	500	500	62
Wind Cave National Park	200	50	62
Yellowstone National Park	2,000	1,800	1,686
Yosemite National Park	1,250	1,200	1,572
Zion National Park	350	350	521
National monuments, administrative	3,905	3,855	2,628
National historical parks, etc	250	250	459
National military parks, etc	2,400	2,300	1,725
Boulder Canyon project	300	100	
Emergency reconstruction, etc			68
Forest protection—fire prevention	2,000	2,000	1,877
Historic sites and buildings	3,500	3,460	
Investigation, water rights, etc	2,000	2,000	
Salaries, District of Columbia	200	200	101
Salaries outside District of Columbia	1,595	1,595	1,621
National capital parks	200	200	238
N. I. R. A.:			
Roads and trails projects		6,000	6,281
Physical improvements		1,000	15,027
Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Jefferson Expansion Memorial		2,500	
Subtotal	50,096	56,851	58,491

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—Continued

TABLE 4.—*Detailed yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of the various departments, independent offices, and agencies of the Federal Government as taken from the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938*—Con.

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—continued			
Office of Education:			
Administrative	$13,300	$17,300	$11,231
Surveys of libraries	800	2,000	
Federal Emergency Relief Administration:			
Grants for white collar projects		11,405	17,501
Research in universities		3,305	3,870
Vocational education, Negroes		5,944	7,627
Educational radio programs		3,073	1,927
Civic education through forums		9,600	3,082
Vocational education	35,220	35,220	33,197
Vocational rehabilitation	13,640	10,000	10,822
Cooperative vocational rehabilitation	400	400	248
Subtotal	63,360	98,247	89,505
Government in the Territories:			
Administrative	1,000	1,000	521
Legislative expenses, Alaska		9,600	
Reindeer service, Alaska	7,000	10,800	5,654
Care of insane, Alaska	1,650	1,650	1,321
Roads, bridges, trails, Alaska	5,000	3,000	5,017
Wagon roads, Alaska	2,000	2,000	2,299
Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Alaska Road Commission		100	4,162
Trust accounts	800	800	799
Contingent expenses, Hawaii	950	1,250	775
Legislative expenses, Hawaii		2,000	
Temporary government, Virgin Islands	2,000	2,000	3,474
Vocational school, Virgin Islands	400	400	868
Auditing local deficits in St. Thomas and St. John	2,000	2,000	2,214
Municipality St. Croix	2,000	2,000	2,311
N. I. R. A.:			
Grants, Virgin Islands			4
Grants			10
Federal Emergency Relief Administration:			
Grants to States, Virgin Islands			3
Virgin Islands Co		2,000	
Puerto Rico hurricane relief	5,572	3,622	1,949
Puerto Rico Reconstruction, Federal Emergency Relief Administration		54,155	46,475
Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Puerto Rico, reconstruction		5,525	
Equatorial and South Sea Islands	1,000	2,342	
Subtotal	31,372	106,244	77,856
St. Elizabeths Hospital, administrative	1,000	1,500	276
Columbia Institution for the Deaf	100	100	84
Howard University, administrative and general	15,500	11,000	9,584
Freedmen's Hospital, general expenses	50	50	15
Total, Department of Interior	1,711,308	2,021,270	1,714,011
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
(Appropriation, 1937, $39,753,933)			
Office of Attorney General:			
Contingent expenses	48,300	48,300	44,123
Federal Bureau of Investigation	916,550	903,140	600,500
Miscellaneous objects	8,000	8,000	6,000
Defending suits against United States	14,000	14,000	11,756
Taxes and Penalties Unit	16,990	16,990	16,790
Enforcement-antitrust law, etc	27,100	25,000	18,187
Examination judicial offices	35,300	29,000	
Bureau of Prisons	41,320	38,080	31,913
Veterans' insurance litigation	45,000	41,000	43,858
Expense, Northern Pacific Ry., etc		12,438	239
Federal Emergency Relief Administration: Justice, administrative expense		46,870	38,880
Agricultural Adjustment Administration—Salaries and expenses			5,714
Preparation of rules			1,845
Great Lakes Exposition			32
Supreme Court, expenses, miscellaneous	750	750	570
Do		3,000	4,733
Expenses, circuit and district judges, etc	93,000	85,000	85,462
Contingent expenses:			
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	125	125	112
United States Customs Court	9,000	9,000	7,500
Court of Claims	112	112	112
Salaries and expenses, Commissioners, Court of Claims	5,360	4,200	4,021
United States Court for China	3,225	3,225	3,716
Salaries and fees, marshals	1,152,600	971,540	1,160,757
Salaries and expenses, district attorneys	185,000	185,000	149,507
Special assistant attorneys	45,000	45,000	39,718
Special clerks of United States courts	63,000	59,500	59,632
Fees and expenses, conciliation commissioners	5,000	5,000	7,850
Jurors and witnesses	1,510,000	1,450,000	1,405,082
Miscellaneous travel expenses	40,000	40,000	45,313
Penal and correctional institutions:			
Leavenworth Penitentiary	25,000	25,000	22,499
Leavenworth annex	16,000	16,000	14,807
Atlanta Penitentiary	25,000	25,000	23,734
McNeil Island Penitentiary	7,800	7,800	7,607
Northeastern Penitentiary	23,000	22,000	22,367

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—Continued

TABLE 4.—*Detailed yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of the various departments, independent offices, and agencies of the Federal Government as taken from the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938*—Con.

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—continued			
Penal and correctional institutions—Contd.			
Alcatraz Island Penitentiary	$4,500	$4,500	$4,087
Alderson, W. Va	9,000	9,000	8,652
Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio	21,000	21,000	20,663
Southwestern Reformatory	12,000	12,000	10,174
Hospital for Defective Delinquents	10,000	10,000	8,992
Federal jails	17,100	17,100	16,056
Prison camps	29,000	28,000	22,773
Federal reformatory camp, Virginia	7,000	7,000	6,832
Training School for Boys, District of Columbia	400	400	218
Probation system, United States courts	173,100	145,000	115,280
Support of United States prisoners	2,000	2,000	1,467
Total, Department of Justice	4,646,632	4,396,070	4,100,122
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
(Appropriations, 1937, $21,844,700; travel expense, 1937, $2,186,223)			
Office of the Secretary:			
Promotion of health, safety, employment	35,480	16,720	14,076
Contingent fund, car tokens	400	400	200
Commissioners of conciliation	112,090	112,090	99,228
International labor, Geneva, Switzerland	1,400	2,850	686
Division Public Contracts	34,180		
Federal Emergency Relief Administration:			
Administrative expenses		3,700	5,204
Field expenses			5,082
White-collar projects		8,500	1,868
Bureau of Labor statistics:			
Administrative	95,900	95,900	105,671
Investigation of living costs			23,109
Federal Emergency Relief Administration, white-collar projects		40,000	
Working fund from Employment Service			42
Immigration and Naturalization Service:			
Administrative	680,955	680,955	553,766
Border patrols	24,150	24,150	30,354
Transporting Filipinos home		79,018	19,084
Children's Bureau:			
Administrative	36,500	36,500	38,799
Maternal and child welfare	93,400	65,000	28,595
Women's Bureau: Administrative	16,645	16,645	18,088
U. S. Employment Service:			
Administrative	148,030	136,750	138,737
Federal Emergency Relief Administration:			
White-collar projects		200	2,897
Employment service		864,000	613,737
U. S. Housing Corporation:			
Administrative		300	295
Bituminous Coal Labor Board			421
Textile Labor Relations Board			16,485
National Steel Labor Relations Board			235
Camden Board of Arbitration			65
California-Pacific International Exposition		800	585
Great Lakes Exposition		606	244
Texas Centennial Exposition		1,139	861
Total, Department of Labor	1,279,130	2,186,223	1,718,414
NAVY DEPARTMENT			
(Appropriation, 1937, $529,819,632)			
Office of Secretary:			
Miscellaneous expenses	107,200	104,700	109,382
Contingent fund	3,500	3,500	435
Bureau of Navigation:			
Reserve Officers' Training Corps	6,912	6,912	6,301
Organizing Naval Reserves	401,069	222,783	148,669
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts:			
Pay, subsistence, transportation	5,467,726	4,785,395	4,080,542
Trust accounts, from fines	16,500	15,000	9,225
Marine Corps:			
Pay of Marine Corps	173,707	159,599	173,313
General expenses	20,532	20,532	18,159
Transport of troops and applicants for enlistment	350,500	280,500	230,865
Marine Corps Reserve	59,004	39,962	26,679
Marine Band travel expenses:			
Arkansas Centennial			10,936
Confederate Reunion			6,752
Contingent expenses, Navy Department:			
Streetcar fares	150	150	150
Total, Navy Department	6,606,800	5,639,033	4,821,408
DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
(Appropriation, 1937, $15,163,550)			
Office of the Secretary:			
Contingent expenses	6,075	6,075	1,055
Passport agencies	500	500	422
Editing territorial papers	325		
Promotion of foreign trade		2,000	

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—Continued

TABLE 4.—*Detailed yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of the various departments, independent offices, and agencies of the Federal Government as taken from the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938*—Con.

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
DEPARTMENT OF STATE—continued			
Office of the Secretary—Continued.			
Transportation, Foreign Service officers	$339,000	$303,700	$217,349
Contingent expenses, Foreign Service mission	155,663	155,633	101,538
Contributions, etc., for travel	31,366	31,366	17,604
Radio Consulting Commission (Rumania)		10,266	
International Boundary Commission (United States-Mexico)	3,500	3,500	3,191
Rio Grande survey			204
Federal Emergency Relief Administration:			
Boundary Commission			2,103
Flood control, Rio Grande			974
Investigations to Federal zone		1,080	
Flood control, Nogales, Ariz		52	128
Canadian boundary disputes	3,180	3,180	3,035
All other miscellaneous expenditures for travel expense, bulked	83,503	101,311	52,200
Total, State Department	623,112	618,663	399,803
TREASURY DEPARTMENT			
Office of the Secretary:			
Administrative, Gold, Silver Purchase Acts	8,300	8,450	5,188
	1,200	2,000	1,069
Division of Research	1,000	350	228
Comptroller's Office			189
Internal Revenue Bureau	5,850	5,850	1,600
Secret Service Division			1,836
Bureau of Mint	250	250	266
Adjusted Compensation Payment Act		3,600	1,709
Division of Disbursements		500	1,709
Secret Service Division		3,100	
Agricultural Adjustment Administration:			
Salaries and expenses transferred		1,500	88,019
Division of Disbursement		1,500	2,108
Office of the Treasurer of United States			
Agricultural Adjustment Administration:			
Bureau of Internal Revenue			85,911
Bureau of Customs		2,115	3,332
Federal Emergency Relief Administration, administrative expenses		1,173,351	840,282
Office of Chief Clerk and Superintendent:			
Miscellaneous and contingent expenses	10,500	10,500	3,925
Office of Commissioner of Accounts:			
Disbursement Division	7,500	7,500	3,877
Advances to Agricultural Adjustment Administration			2,204
Working fund disbursements			28
Department of Agriculture, disbursed for		400	450
Contingent expenses, public moneys	315	276	319
Public Debt Service:			
Administrative	150	150	132
Distinctive paper research	250	450	45
Office of Chief Clerk	27,500	15,500	6,529
Bureau of Customs: Collecting revenues	355,800	335,000	335,000
Bureau of the Budget: Administrative	4,500	4,500	403
Bureau of Internal Revenue:			
Collecting of revenue	3,657,355	3,341,280	2,978,881
Administrative expense, Revenue Act of 1936		916,000	
Advances to Agricultural Adjustment Administration			186,950
Cotton Act of 1934, expenses			67,998
Tobacco Act, June 1934			14,500
Agricultural Adjustment Administration advances, 1936			375
Federal Emergency Relief Administration employees in Department		108,367	147,451
Enforcement title III prohibition	1,000	1,000	
Federal Alcohol Administration: Administrative	70,000	62,624	13,957
Bureau of Narcotics: Field expenses	114,381	105,500	110,788
Coast Guard: Administrative and field	320,000	320,000	244,631
Bureau of Engraving and Printing: Administrative	350	350	385
Secret Service Division:			
Field services	77,425	77,425	69,477
Civil Works Program			28,917
Public Health Service:			
Special expenses	21,270	21,000	21,318
Maintenance of hospitals	59,325	59,325	60,825
Service to penal institutions	3,375	3,375	3,883
Quarantine service	9,996	9,996	12,839
Preventing spread of epidemics	24,251	24,251	24,165
Interstate quarantine service	14,980	14,880	12,875
Control biological products	2,720	1,800	3,000
Venereal disease control	2,885	2,940	3,723
Mental Hygiene Division	25,000	25,000	14,398
Narcotic farms	250	250	58
Investigations	164,870	150,070	50,335
Studies, rural sanitation			133
Assistance to white-collar workers		25,000	52,628
Federal Emergency Relief Administration, rural sanitation work			18,417
Bureau of the Mint	3,300	3,300	1,631
Procurement Division:			
Administrative, field staff	220,000	220,000	217,585

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—Continued

TABLE 4.—*Detailed yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of the various departments, independent offices, and agencies of the Federal Government as taken from the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938*—Con.

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
TREASURY DEPARTMENT—continued			
Procurement Division—Continued.			
Federal Emergency Relief Administration, relief staff		$1,500	$1,137
Supply Division	$1,500	1,500	1,350
General supply fund (operating)	294	294	210
Total, Treasury Department	5,217,642	7,063,869	5,751,178
WAR DEPARTMENT			
Office of the Secretary of War: Contingent expense	750	750	600
Military activities: Contingencies of the Army	2,500	2,500	2,500
General Staff Corps: Special field exercises (National Guard)	3,529	10,539	96,300
Finance Department: Travel of the Army	2,445,850	2,758,027	2,584,250
Quartermaster Corps: Emergency Relief, administrative		2,500	8,885
Air Corps:			
Administrative, field	150,376	102,166	87,209
N. I. R. A.			5,212
Medical Department: From Veterans' Administration	500	500	231
Corps of Engineers: Administrative		300	
Ordnance Department: Service and supplies	70,000		
Seacoast defenses:			
N. I. R. A.:			
Fort Monroe, Va			1
Hawaii			207
National Guard:			
Expenses:			
Camps, etc	610,000	650,000	678,117
General expense	4,000	4,000	4,500
Travel warrant officers, etc	248,500	248,500	222,048
N. I. R. A., for National Guard			1,314
Organized Reserves:			
Administrative	744,621	699,094	579,144
Citizens' military training:			
General	300,340	350,340	357,311
Auxiliary expenses	662,840	590,370	566,657
National Board for Rifle Practice: Administrative	230,730	230,730	168,537
U. S. High Commissioner, Philippines:			
General	4,000	4,000	8,000
N. I. R. A.:			
Insular affairs			50
Territories, etc			415
Corps of Engineers, Rivers and Harbors:			
Administrative	816,455	733,734	645,072
Emergency construction			12
N. I. R. A., travel expense			83,647
Public Works Administration, travel expense			56,320
Federal Emergency Relief Administration, flood control		53,302	282,193
N. I. R. A. Corps of Engineers			378
Federal Emergency Relief Administration, administrative		1,400	23,553
Federal Power Commission	3,500	4,000	7,712
Federal Emergency Relief Administration:			
Flood control, etc		35,000	
Flood control (non-Federal)		15,000	
White-collar projects		487,500	
N. I. R. A., flood control			36,594
Act July 21, 1932, construction		385	480
Emergency fund, Mississippi River	25,709	9,687	10,562
Flood control:			
Sacramento River	15,685	20,820	13,651
Lowell Creek, Alaska	120	400	280
Corps of Engineers, Rivers and Harbors:			
Flood control:			
Salmon River, Alaska	120	120	
Missouri River		1,420	
Protective, Lake of Woods, Minn		605	1,060
Interoceanic Canal	300	300	192
Public Works Administration, reclamation, Virgin Islands			889
Trust accounts:			
Contributed			397
Mississippi River	2,337	1,140	481
United States Soldiers' Home:			
Texas Centennial		283	5,748
Great Lakes Exposition		620	781
The Panama Canal:			
Operations, etc	156,160	193,110	152,508
Offices in United States	27,057	27,057	27,120
Sanitation, Canal Zone	14,845	14,845	14,712
Civil government, Canal Zone	5,850	5,850	5,795
Postal fund, Canal Zone	235	215	143
Total, War Department	6,546,909	7,264,109	6,742,768

TRAVELING EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—Continued

TABLE 4.—*Detailed yearly traveling expenses for 1936, 1937, and 1938 of the various departments, independent offices, and agencies of the Federal Government as taken from the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938*—Con.

Distribution	Estimated, 1938	Estimated, 1937	Actual, 1936
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT			
(Gross excess of appropriations over revenue, 1937, $65,584,589)			
Office of Postmaster General:			
Contingent expenses	$1,500	$1,500	$1,499
Field service	3,000	5,000	2,817
Texas Centennial Exposition			2,275
California Pacific International Exposition		353	298
Office of Chief Inspector: Traveling and miscellaneous	601,500	521,000	465,207
Office, First Assistant Postmaster General:			
Miscellaneous items	13,000	12,500	12,298
Carfare and bicycle allowance	1,325,000	1,250,000	1,177,658
Working funds for Social Security Board		25,000	
Office Second Assistant Postmaster General:			
Railroad transportation and mail messenger service (cost ascertainment)	2,200	2,000	1,729
Space Basis Act	3,500	3,500	
Summary	5,700	5,700	1,729
Railway postal clerks, travel	3,450,000	3,450,000	3,238,679
Railway Mail Service, traveling expenses	60,000	60,000	43,664
Foreign mail transportation	3,500	10,000	1,866
Merchant Marine Act		5,800	6,133
Contract Air Mail Service	7,200	5,060	4,335
Special audit expense for above	6,000		
Office Fourth Assistant Postmaster General:			
Administrative	23,000	20,700	15,605
Vehicle service	6,000	4,316	5,393
Public buildings	500	500	76
Operating and supplies	2,000	2,000	1,700
Furniture for public buildings	1,000	1,000	700
Total, Post Office Department	5,514,600	5,385,929	4,983,661

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois and Mr. SHAFER of Michigan asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

THE PRESENT AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of discussing in a general way the agricultural situation in our country today. I am fearful that very few of us realize the seriousness of the situation.

About the only agricultural program we have today is under what is known as the Soil Conservation Act. I am not opposing the Soil Conservation Act. I think it has accomplished and will accomplish great things for the farmers of America, but I do not believe that the Soil Conservation Act will solve the farm problem in this country. We passed that act, assuming that if we would subsidize the farmers to take out of production soil-depleting crops and plant that acreage to soil-conserving or soil-rebuilding crops, we would, in a measure, be able to regulate production and to keep production and consumption more or less in line. The theory is all right, but how is it working?

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Not right now.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. It is just along the line of what the gentleman is going to explain.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. Under the Triple A program, 40,000,000 acres of cotton, wheat, and corn lands were taken out of cultivation.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. That act was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court and the Soil Conservation Act was passed as a stop gap or to take the place of the former act. Under the Soil Conservation Act, as the gentleman knows, the authority is in the Department and so they took out of production 30,000,000 acres of cotton, wheat, and corn lands. Now, we are going to have an increased crop this year of the various commodities. How did these cotton and tobacco farmers use their land that was taken out of the program or where does the extra crop come from?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I do not know that I can accurately answer that question, but probably I can shed some light upon it. I know what has happened. I know that in spite of the fact we paid the cotton farmers last year, under the Soil Conservation Act, something over $86,000,000 to reduce the cotton acreage and to plant that acreage in soil-conserving and soil-rebuilding crops, today we find that in 1937 we have over 3,000,000 additional acres in cotton and we are going to produce between two and three additional million bales of cotton. In other words, the estimate of the Department is that the cotton crop this year in acreage is some 3,000,000 acres more than 1936, in baleage between two and three million bales more than 1936, and that it will be the largest crop we have produced in America since 1931–32, when the cotton price level was 5.7 cents a pound.

Now, what is going to happen if we remain inactive and fail to enact legislation at this session that will keep production and consumption in line? You know what is going to happen, I know what is going to happen, and the farmers of America are going to be asking us this question, if we go home without passing legislation that will give the Secretary the right to declare quotas and curtail production when necessary—what we have been doing up here for 8 or 9 months knowing that the lightning was going to strike. Why did we not put up a lightning rod?

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Let me finish this statement and then I will be pleased to yield.

Take wheat, and in spite of the fact we paid the wheat farmers $63,000,000 in 1936 to reduce the wheat acreage and to plant that acreage to soil-conserving and soil-rebuilding crops, what are the facts?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman care to yield for a question?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Just for a brief question.

Mr. SNELL. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that they were paid about $86,000,000 to take land out of cotton production and notwithstanding that fact there were two or three million more bales of cotton raised this year than heretofore?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes; they spent $89,000,000 last year to reduce the cotton acreage.

Mr. SNELL. Is there any way of explaining that?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I will come to that a little later on, if the gentleman will let me continue my statement.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will permit me to correct a statement he has made. I am sure the gentleman does not want to tell the House that acreage has been increased, but that production has been increased.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I mean to say that there has been planted to cotton, according to the report, over 2,000,000 additional acres, and I have had these figures checked by the Department of Agriculture.

Now, with respect to wheat, we paid, as I have said, the wheat farmers $63,000,000 in 1936 under the Soil Conservation Act to reduce the wheat acreage, in order to bring the production in line with consumption plus our exports, and what has happened? The 1937 wheat acreage has gone up over the 1936 acreage, how many acres? It has gone up from 74,000,000 to 80,000,000 acres, or 6,000,000 additional acres in wheat.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Wait until I get through with my statement.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. I just want to correct the gentleman's figures.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. These figures are correct or the Department is wrong, one or the other.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. The actual figures are that last year the acreage was about 46,000,000 and this year 57,000,000.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. No; in 1936 the wheat acreage was 74,000,000 acres. This year the wheat acreage is 80,000,000 acres, an increase of 6,000,000 acres.

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota. Ten million.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Six million is what the Department says, and in bushels there will be an increase this year over the production last year amounting to 256,000,000 bushels of wheat, and we are going to produce, according to the estimates this year, the largest wheat crop we have ever produced in America since 1931–32, when the price level of wheat was 39.1 cents per bushel. What is going to happen to the wheat farmer unless we set up machinery to hold production in line with consumption? That is not all. Take corn. What is happening to the corn growers? In spite of the fact that we paid the corn growers of America under the Soil Conservation Act $77,000,000 last year to reduce their corn acreage and plant that acreage in soil-conserving and soil-rebuilding crops, we find that the acreage of corn has gone up this year around 3,000,000 additional acres, and our corn yield in bushels is going up from about 1,529,000,000 to something over 2,572,000,000 bushels. This is the largest corn crop we have produced since 1932–33, when corn only averaged 31.9 cents per bushel.

Let us take tobacco. What is happening to tobacco? We paid the tobacco growers $15,000,000 last year under the Soil Conservation Act to reduce the tobacco acreage and to plant same to soil-conserving and rebuilding crops, and what has happened? We find that the tobacco acreage has gone up around 250,000 to 300,000 acres, and in poundage the estimate is that we will produce this year some 268,000,000 more pounds of tobacco than we did in 1936. The estimate for the 1937 tobacco crop shows that we will produce the largest crop produced since 1931–32, when the average price per pound was 8.2 cents.

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

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman has compared the 1937 acreage with 1936. Will the gentleman give us the figures comparing 1937 with 1932 before the reduction program was put in effect?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I think I can give the gentleman those figures. As to tobacco, we are now producing the largest crop of tobacco that we have produced in America since 1932–33.

Mr. BOILEAU. In acreage or yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. In yield, and in acreage, at which time the level of tobacco went down to 8.2 cents a pound.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman state to the House whether he thinks the acreage by his statement today is greater than in 1932 with reference to cotton and wheat, before this program went into effect? Take corn, cotton, tobacco, and wheat. I am talking about the acreage.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. All right. I am talking about acreage. In 1932 the cotton acreage was 36,000,000 and it is around that today, but in 1932 you had 5-cent cotton, and that is just what you are going to have again in 1938 if you do not set up the necessary machinery to hold the production

of cotton in line with your domestic consumption plus export. We may as well face the facts.

While I am on the soil-conservation program, let me remind you of the fact that I am in favor of it, but I think some changes should be made in it. I think I represent one of the best agricultural districts in America. I do not believe you will find better land in this country than the bluegrass soil in my district. We have conserved our land down there for years and years, and yet because we have conserved our land and taken care of it under the Soil Conservation Act we are being penalized, and the farmer who has wasted his land year in and year out is being paid an enormous subsidy to do the very thing that we are being penalized for having done over the years. I had the Department take my district, a tobacco district, a grazing district—we raise some corn and wheat and other crops—and with respect to benefits received, compare it with cotton, wheat, and corn districts of similar size and population. What I wanted to find out is how my district fared when compared with other districts. Here is what I found:

My district last year received $313,000 in benefit payments. The farmers in a similar wheat district were paid $1,075,000 in benefit payments, the farmers in a similar corn district $2,900,000 in benefit payments, and the farmers in a similar cotton district $3,159,000 in benefit payments. It is not exactly right to penalize the farmer who has been conserving his soil throughout the years and give the man who has been wearing out his soil an undue advantage.

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

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What does the gentleman say about the dairy farmer in the northeastern part of the United States, who has not received a single dollar along that line and has to pay an increased amount for the corn that they have bought from the districts that have received the benefit payments?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I think we should work out some way to equalize these payments as near as possible among the different types of farmers.

Mr. SNELL. That is what I think should be done.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Another thing, I think that under the Soil Conservation Act the large landowner is getting the advantage over the small landowner. I believe we should have graduated payments under the Soil Conservation Act. I think that should be written into the law.

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

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. Relative to the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], I do not know what has been done in his section; but there have been some payments under the Soil Conservation Act to the dairy farmers. As a matter of fact, the Soil Conservation Act is the only one of these various acts that has given any assistance to the dairy farmer.

Mr. SNELL. Oh, there have been a few, but they are so small that you would not even put them down on paper.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. You have been getting some payments on the grassland; probably 25 cents an acre.

Mr. SNELL. Very small.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And you have been getting perhaps a few other small payments.

Now, another thing, under the Soil Conservation Act, I had the Department take a 500-acre farm in my district, an average farm down there, and figure up how much in benefit payments my farmer would receive; then go down South and take a 500-acre cotton farm. I wanted to know.

Well, I have the answer. If it is wrong, I have been wrongly advised by the Department of Agriculture. My farmer gets $190 and the cotton farmer gets $1,520. But that is not all. My farmer's overhead expenses have not been decreased one penny, but if the cotton farmer cuts his cotton acreage 30 or 35 percent, as the Department has been asking him to do, he reduces his farm expense at least one-quarter, if his cotton crop is cut one-third, which would be two or three hundred dollars, to say the least. As a practical proposition he is getting about $2,000 and my farmer is getting $190.

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

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield for just a short question.

Mr. SOUTH. I do not know what part of the South these figures would cover. I come from a cotton State and a cotton district, and I will say to the gentleman that certainly the benefits received by the farmers in my section do not equal $300 for 100 acres, as the figures which the gentleman has given seem to show.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Oh, if you reduce your cotton crop there is no question about what you get. You get $9 an acre. You get 5 cents a pound, based on an average yield of 180 pounds per acre.

Mr. SOUTH. But the gentleman is not assuming that every farmer gets the same?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is the general average, 180 pounds per acre, and at 5 cents a pound that gives you an average of $9 per acre. That is the way it figures out. Now, we know these facts. We know what is ahead of us. What are we going to do? What can the Secretary of Agriculture do under the present law to stabilize farm prices and to bring consumption and production into line? Not a thing in the world, because under the Soil Conservation Act, while we presumed that these benefit payments would, in a measure, regulate production we find that they do not do it. In spite of the fact that last year we turned over to the farmers under the Soil Conservation Act $395,000,000, we are going to produce an enormous surplus in all major farm crops—in wheat, in corn, in cotton, in rice, and in tobacco. And what is going to happen when that day comes? How are we going to handle those surpluses that will pile up? You know and I know that the surplus, when thrown upon the market, sets the price that the American farmer will get for his entire crop.

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

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. MASSINGALE. The gentleman has been making a most interesting talk, I think, at least from my standpoint, and I think he has hit right at the trouble. Now as a substitute for this program of production control under which we have been operating, just in general, what is the gentleman's idea of the kind of legislation this Congress ought to pass?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I will tell the gentleman. I am not wedded to any particular bill. I introduced a bill (H. R. 7577) which was worked out by the farm group. That bill embodies the essential principles recommended by the committee that worked on it for quite a while; and it is signed by representatives of all the leading farm organizations in America, including the Farmers Union, including the Grange, and including the Farm Bureau Federation, and many of the leading farmers of America. The bill provides for an ever-normal granary in order to provide against the day of scarcity and take care of the consumer, and I think any farm bill should contain an ever-normal-granary provision. It attempts, as far as possible, to give the farmer a parity price. He is entitled to that. It gives the Secretary of Agriculture the right to declare marketing quotas when he finds there is going to be a surplus, over a certain percent, dumped upon the market. I think any farm bill, while I say I am not wedded to any particular bill, should contain those essential things.

I know that production control and marketing control is repulsive to many of us; we hate to think of them; but I want to know how you are going to regulate the farming industry in America without vesting in the Secretary of Agriculture some kind of control that will bring production in line with our domestic consumption plus exports?

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Make it 10 minutes; we want to ask the gentleman some questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Colorado). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question. I think he was erroneously informed when he stated that the Farmers' Union was one of the sponsors of this bureau bill. I believe the gentleman is in error in that respect; in fact, I am quite sure of it.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I think I can clear that up. No; I do not have a copy of the report, but I think that the gentleman will find that the original report filed by the committee appointed by the President contains the name of the Farmers' Union representative.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I am quite sure it does not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 10 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FLANNAGAN. For a short question.

Mr. KLEBERG. I would remind the gentleman that his time was extended to permit some of us to interrogate him. I would like to go a little more deeply into this thing, for I am very much interested in it, as the gentleman knows from our association together on the committee.

Will the gentleman tell the House, with reference to this particular bill, of the bookkeeping functions which the farmers will be called upon to undertake and the penalties they will face for failure to comply with the bookkeeping requirements? Will the gentleman give us some idea with reference to corn, wheat, and other major commodities as to the administrative costs of this bill and, inasmuch as the gentleman has suggested that cotton gets more out of the bill than the district which he represents, in the main, will he not tell us the proportion that corn would get nationally out of this bill by comparison with the other major commodities?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that I am not wedded to any bill. What I am trying to get over to the House is the thought that we are faced with a real problem and that it is up to this Congress, before it adjourns, to enact a general farm program that will protect the farmers of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. KLEBERG. One more question. The gentleman knows of my interest inasmuch as we have worked together harmoniously on the committee. Does the gentleman feel any alarm based on the actual facts with reference to cotton prices; for instance, does he believe that the figures that he has given the House with reference to increased production, figures of the Department of Agriculture, take into consideration the peculiar things that accompany every one of these crop prognostications, the conditions of the weather, the time incident to the realization of the enormous increase that the gentleman has mentioned? I see no terrible alarm right now.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I may say this to the gentleman with reference to cotton, that the figures I have given are not only the Department's figures but they are the figures of the trade, the trade estimates.

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

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Was the gentleman on the committee when the so-called soil-erosion law was enacted?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I was.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Was not the purpose of that act to restrict production of the crops named?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. We thought that by paying the farmer a subsidy to reduce his acreage of soil-depleting crops, such as corn, cotton, wheat, and tobacco, replacing them with soil-conserving or soil-rebuilding crops, that we would in a measure develop control of production and get it in line with consumption plus exports.

Mr. HOFFMAN. By control the gentleman means reduction.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Reduction; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did it work that way or not?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It does not seem to work that way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How does it work, the other way?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I have told the committee the facts.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what I thought, but I wanted to be sure.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. We are going to have surpluses in all the major farm crops, wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, and rice.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then, in spite of all the thought we put on it, it just does not work when it comes to trying it out.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I think it has accomplished a great deal of good, and I think that our crops this year would be a great deal larger than they are estimated to be if we had not had the soil-conservation program in force. I think it has held a check line, but it is not a sufficient check to keep production and consumption in line. If we do not get production and consumption in line, the farmer is gone, and the tenant bill that we passed the other day to rehabilitate the so-called tenant farmer is not worth the paper it is written on. What is the use of trying to help the tenant farmer when we permit overproduction to run wild and hammer the price of farm products down below the cost of production? Under such a policy you know he cannot pay his way out. We must enact legislation that will give the farmer something above the cost of production. He is entitled to parity, I think, but if we do not give him something above cost of production we will have more instead of less tenants in America. That is the situation.

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

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. I would like to point out that the gentleman referred to conditions in 1932 for purposes of comparison; but that is not exactly correct, for since 1932 we have had an increase in population to some extent, and this would require larger crops. In addition to that, the purchasing power of the American people is considerably higher today, so that they are able to buy more of a particular commodity. Even though we have the same quantity, it would not necessarily mean we have the same surplus.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is true. The gentleman is correct in that statement; but, based upon the Department's estimate of domestic consumption, plus our exports, we are going to have an enormous surplus in all major farm crops.

Mr. BOILEAU. But will the surplus be as large?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The question is, What will happen to the American farmer? Are we going to stand idly by, knowing this evil day is coming, without taking action at this session of Congress to vest in the Secretary of Agriculture some way of maintaining farm prices? We know what happened under the old Farm Board. We made loans on cotton, wheat, and corn without any control over the production of those products. That was the fallacy of the old Farm Board legislation. We agreed to lend the farmers so much on wheat, corn, and so forth, but we had no control over production.

What happened? When prices, due to overproduction, fell below the loan levels the farmer converted his loan into a sale. The plan failed because there was no control over production.

Mr. Speaker, the Government cannot keep on buying surplus crops and taking them off the market. No government can afford to make loans on farm crops unless machinery is set up to control production and hold it in line with consumption, plus our exports.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is the remedy?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I think we ought to have some kind of control program. As I said before, as much as some of us hate to think we have to go to that, and as distasteful as it is to many of us, I do not see any hope for agriculture in this country unless there is vested in the Secretary of Agriculture some form of control over production or over marketing in order to keep production and consumption in line. We will have to come to production control sooner or later.

Mr. VOORHIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS. I am in hearty agreement with the gentleman's position that we need some farm legislation and I am glad to hear him say he is not particularly wedded to any one piece of legislation. I would like to know what the gentleman's opinion is as to the importance of the control which the middleman and the speculator exercises over the prices of staple farm commodities and whether the gentleman does not believe that is one of the most serious elements in the situation and one that needs most to be dealt with?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Of course, the speculators have always lived off the farmers. There is no question about that in my mind. In lots of instances where the price of farm products has gone up, the sad part of the story is the farmers did not get the benefit of the increase in price, but, on the contrary, some speculator reaped the reward.

Mr. KELLER. Why do we not stop that?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. In time it will be stopped.

Mr. VOORHIS. The major problem being that farm prices are high when the farmer does not have a crop to sell and they are beaten down when he does have a crop to sell?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And when the price goes up he has not anything to sell.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The argument suggested by the gentleman from California, of course, has been here for years and years. It was here when we had the Farm Board question up for consideration. It was here when we had the equalization fee up for consideration and when we had the debenture plan up. Nothing new has been suggested that has not been before the Congress for years and years and yet we have not been able to work anything out. Does not the gentleman believe before we get through we will have to get back somewhere near the principle involved in the old equalization fee matter or the export debenture plan?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. We have to work out something. Now, the gentleman states we have not gotten anywhere.

Mr. MICHENER. We have just been talking.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. All right. I know this, and the gentleman cannot wipe it out, the farmer's income back in 1933 was something over $3,000,000,000. That is all he got for the products of the soil. I know that under the Roosevelt administration they are expecting to get something over $9,000,000,000 this year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman referred to the Roosevelt administration and the income of the farmers at the present time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I did that because the gentleman said nothing had been accomplished. In my opinion, the old A. A. A., constitutional or unconstitutional, did more for the American farmers than any piece of legislation ever enacted.

Mr. MICHENER. If we are to continue to pay subsidies, and I am not objecting, yes; but if we take away the subsidies paid by the Government and if we take away the additional purchasing power, the farmer is worse off today than he was in 1933. Every farm organization will tell you that. If it is just a question of paying subsidies, if we are going to take money out of the consumer's pocket and put it in the pocket of the farmer and call that prosperity for the farmer, that is one thing. I am not objecting. I am just saying that by reason of that we do not want to consider the thing as anywhere near solved.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I am willing to vote today to take every subsidy away that we pay the farmer if you will take away the tariff laws that protect industry. I will do that. Put them on the same equality. But as long as you are subsidizing industry in this country you have to subsidize the farmer to put him on an equality with industry.

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

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BIERMANN. The utmost a subsidy can amount to this year is a half billion dollars, and the farmers' income, as the gentleman states, is about $6,000,000,000 more than it was the last year, I hope the final year, of Republican control.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. It does not compare with the increase in labor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. In answer to the gentleman from Michigan, does the gentleman know that the only legislation which has ever been passed that was beneficial to the farmer was passed by this administration? The gentleman will further agree with me that such legislation raised the price of tobacco from 9 cents a pound to 27 cents a pound, the price of corn from 26 cents a bushel to $1.15 a bushel, and the price of wheat from 45 cents a bushel to $1.20 a bushel.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is all true. And may I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that my farmers are still grateful to him for the Kerr bill, which saved the tobacco growers in my district. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. McFARLANE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include various excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DICTATORSHIP IN AMERICA?

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, because of the lateness of the hour I ask the indulgence of the Members in order that I may try to hurry through my remarks. If I may be permitted to proceed without interruption, at the completion of my remarks I shall be pleased to yield for any questions.

Radio news commentators, editorial writers employed on the large metropolitan daily newspapers, and others who control the molding of public opinion in our country have lately been alleging that we have a dictator in control of our Government.

By subtle insinuation they have, I regret to say, tried to turn public opinion against the one President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who, since his election in 1932, has consistently and persistently, openly and honestly, sought to better the living conditions of the one-third of our people, the workers and farmers, who, prior to the inauguration of President Roosevelt, did not know what it was to have a friend in the White House.

THE REAL DICTATORSHIP

Speaking of dictators, it is my purpose to demonstrate that today in America it is not the elected President of the United States who can be looked upon as a dictator. We have dictatorships, but the dictators do not reside in the White House, nor were the dictators ever elected to any office by the American people.

We have dictatorships in America, when 300 or less persons have an absolute monopoly in the molding of public opinion through undisputed control of radio stations, newspapers, and motion pictures, as will be shown in these remarks.

DANGERS THROUGH MONOPOLY CONTROL OF PROPAGANDA INSTRUMENTS: RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, TELEVISION, NEWSPAPERS

The power of the radio monopolists is well set forth in the report of the National Resources Committee recently issued by President Roosevelt, from which I quote:

How great is the power in the control of mass communications, especially when helped by modern inventions, has been made clear recently in countries that have had social revolutions and which have promptly, in a very short period, brought extraordinary changes in the expressed beliefs and actions of vast populations. These have been led to accept whole ideologies contrary to their former beliefs, and to accept as the new gospel what many outsiders would think ridiculous.

The three chains comprising the radio monopolies which are dependent for their continued operation on patent licenses which are controlled by the American Telephone & Telegraph monopoly and the Radio Corporation of America, also extend their monopoly in the moulding of public opinion through their connections with motion-picture companies and through their domination of some 200 or more large newspapers in America who own radio broadcasting stations.

Up to June 1, 1937, some 200 of the largest licensed radio broadcasting stations were controlled by newspapers, and, in some 135 cases, the radio station alone controlled, in their respective communities, both the radio stations and the newspapers. Is that monopoly? Is that dictatorship?

With rare exceptions, all of these newspaper-owned radio stations are programmed by one or the other of the three chains comprising the radio monopolies, which, in substance, means that the radio monopolists control what goes in the newspapers and over these newspaper-owned radio stations as well as that which goes over the other radio stations which they themselves own or control.

INGRATITUDE ON PART OF VESTED WEALTH

When President Roosevelt took office, most of the industrialists, most of the banks, the railroads, and the other vested interests were near bankruptcy. They had all admitted their inability to provide employment for the workers, safety for money deposited in their banks, and a decent market for the product of American farms.

President Roosevelt and the Congress went to their aid realizing that saving of the invested wealth was in the public interest and helpful to all of our people. However, instead of receiving any gratitude from those we kept out of the bankruptcy courts, by his rare courage and high statesmanship, as well as the confidence which he inspired from the common people, those we helped now seek to bite the hands that literally fed them.

Having considerable knowledge of the monopoly which exists in radio broadcasting, the looseness, to be charitable, which prevails in the Communications Commission and, having worked with our late lamented colleague, "Billy" Connery, I have waited patiently for the Rules Committee to report out the radio-investigation resolution presented to the House by "Billy" Connery, last January. It now appears that in addition to the control which the radio monopolists have in the molding of public opinion among the American people they seemingly are not without influence right here in the Congress of the United States.

CONSPIRACY TO LOOT THE INVESTING PUBLIC

During the Hoover Administration the Radio Corporation of America stock, which had never paid a dividend, was manipulated from $5 a share to $520 a share resulting in the looting of millions of innocent investors. "Never again" moaned the public and "never again" echoed the Government.

We created the Securities and Exchange Commission to protect the public against stock frauds and rackets.

Lo and behold, a few days ago I came across what has all the appearance of a gigantic conspiracy on the part of officials of the Columbia Broadcasting System and the officials of the New York Stock Exchange, with the apparent acquiescence of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to loot the American investing public to the extent of some fifty or more millions of dollars.

The stockholders of the Columbia Broadcasting System, as near as I can ascertain from the consolidated balance sheets, filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission and the New York Stock Exchange, show an actual cash investment of less than $1,600,000. They further show that Columbia Broadcasting System has total assets of some $12,000,000, which includes a claim of some two and one-quarter millions of dollars for good will, whatever that means, when we must also realize that the licenses on which they are dependent for operation are issued for periods of only 6 months. Against these total assets they have outstanding obligations of almost $5,000,000 which leaves a net value of some five and one-half millions of dollars.

Since December 26, 1931, this company has paid in cash dividends $7,864,998, on this cash investment of less than $1,600,000. Yet this system now seeks from the Securities and Exchange Commission a certificate which will authorize the listing of some 1,192,970 shares of stock on the New York Stock Exchange and the sale to the public of a substantial portion of this stock at prices which are far in excess of their values.

At the present time, according to the daily press, the stock of this radio monopoly is traded in—whether wash sales or not I do not know—on the over-the-counter list at New York on a total valuation of some $58,000,000.

Undoubtedly, the public will be permitted to invest possibly $30,000,000 or more for a minority interest in this enterprise, which has a total cash investment of less than $1,600,000. If this is not stock racketeering, what is it?

All the afternoon papers carry headlines that Governor Lehman is fighting the President's court plan. Lehman Bros. are reputed to be the bankers for the Columbia Broadcasting System, molders of public opinion in this country. Governor Lehman and this set-up are asking Senator WAGNER to change his position and vote against the President's court proposal.

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

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield for a question.

Mr. SOUTH. If the Governor had come out for the plan, does not the gentleman believe the papers would have carried it in the headlines just the same?

Mr. McFARLANE. Probably over in the want-ad section, where they usually carry a thing when it suits their interests better to do so.

Mr. SOUTH. Does the gentleman mean that for a serious answer?

Mr. McFARLANE. I mean that for a serious answer, because I have seen it happen time and again that the special interests usually carry in the want-ad sections the things they do not want generally publicized. The things they are driving to put over they put on the front page in headlines. I have seen it happen for 20 years.

Mr. SOUTH. The gentleman knows the papers have carried both sides of this controversy, and that men who have come out for the plan have been given wide publicity if they were of such public standing as to merit it. The gentleman cannot be sincere when he states that if Governor Lehman had come out for the President's court plan the newspapers would not have headlined it.

Mr. McFARLANE. May I say in answer to the gentleman that I have noticed daily, as I am sure the gentleman has, to show the policy of the press, both here and elsewhere, that today 85 percent of the same plutocratic crowd which fought this administration in the last campaign is fighting them now and trying to sabotage their program. Almost daily they come out editorially bushwhacking the President on his court plan. I know, and the gentleman knows, they hope to run out from under all the rest of the President's legislative program, and are using the court fight as a smoke screen. Frank Gannett, one of the leaders in the court fight, let the cat out of the bag in such a statement recently.

Mr. SOUTH. A lot of other prominent people are doing it, and a lot of people who are against the court plan are not plutocrats.

Mr. McFARLANE. There are lots of good, honest Members of Congress and others who just cannot see the light, I grant that.

Last week I addressed an inquiry to the officials of the Securities and Exchange Commission as to whether or not such apparent fraudulent activities were within the law and up to the present time I have not received any answer. It is possible that through some loophole in the law the American people are not securing that protection from stock racketeering which the Congress intended, and assumed it

had provided when the Securities and Exchange Commission was enacted.

TAX EVASION—LOOPHOLES

The Tax Avoidance Committee now looking into loopholes they largely placed in our tax laws have listed the president of Columbia Broadcasting System as one of the tax dodgers. In the light of the financial pyramid just illustrated, I here now request the Tax Avoidance Committee to ascertain from the Treasury Department the taxes paid by the radio monopolists such as Sarnoff, Paley, Crosley, and those associated with them.

RADIO STOCK SELLING RACKET

Is the selling of stock in a radio station, which is dependent for its very life on a 6 months' license from a governmental authority and without which license the station has nothing but junk value a racket?

No less an authority than the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission has so stated, openly, to the members of the House Appropriations Committee, that stock selling in radio stations was a racket.

Testifying before the House Appropriations Committee, Chairman Prall said:

Another thing that is quite serious is the possibility of a racket following this thing in the way of stock issues. They are beginning to get wise now to the fact that they might, by a stock issue, still retain control of their stations and sell enough stock to not only pay the cost of the station but some profit in addition to that.

We are conducting now through the legal department sort of an investigation of that subject because there are some stations that are issuing stock at this time. Now, just how much they can issue before they get into the value of the license given them by the Government, for which they pay nothing, is a question.

INSULT TO BILLY CONNERY

And yet these radio pirates, through one of their paid apologists, in an issue of Broadcasting July 15, have the audacity to impugn the good name of our late colleague, Billy Connery, when they said:

The Connery resolution, which from the start had all the earmarks of a headline-hunting, sensation-seeking fishing expedition by a select committee.

ARE UNSUSPECTING INVESTORS DEPENDENT UPON THE CONGRESS FOR PROTECTION?

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is well within the bounds of reason to say that unless this body accepts the unchallenged statements of the Chairman of the Communications Commission and enacts legislation, if such is needed, which will, in reality, protect the American people from stock-selling rackets and the radio monopoly, then every Member of this House, as well as this administration, is equally guilty if we later find that an unsuspecting public has been defrauded and looted by these stock racketeers through our negligence or through the willingness of some to listen to the soft voice of those who represent these monopolists and racketeers.

FRAUDULENT PRACTICES OF F. C. C.

However guilty as we may find ourselves to be, let me direct the attention of the House to the imposition and fraud practiced upon the Congress by the Communications Commission.

In order to promote science and to encourage inventors, we authorized the Federal Communications Commission to issue experimental licenses to radio stations. Several of these licenses have been issued, and I dare say that none of the holders of any of these licenses can show wherein any experiments worthy of the name have been carried on. There are several citations of such frauds which might be called to the attention of the House, but I will be content with directing your attention to what is naturally the most outstanding.

A manufacturer in Cincinnati, Crosley by name, having a better knowledge of how to secure concessions apparently than some of his competitors, or because he was not directly tied to one of the two dominant radio monopolies, was permitted to obtain from the Federal Communications Commission an experimental license to use a total of some 500,000 watts power, the largest station in America. Nine-tenths of this power was experimental, so, therefore, I understand, he immediately raised the price of his radio advertising time some 50 percent and has continued to collect handsome commercial profits on the basis of experimentation for these 39 months.

I wonder sometimes whether men secure such unusual concessions because of their innate ability or because they are good-looking or because they have ways of getting things done. Just why, I think it fair to ask, has this unusual concession been handed out and continued in the hands of one of the some 700 radio licenses?

TRAFFICKING IN RADIO LICENSES

In addition there is another racket now flourishing in the broadcasting field. This concerns itself with the trafficking in radio stations. A license for a radio frequency is just that, and does not signify ownership, but only permission to use such frequency for 6 months. Despite this the trafficking in radio stations whose real value is the frequency for which it has a license, for which they pay the Government nothing and which is subject to renewal every 6 months, has reached what are apparently absurd proportions the import of which it is the duty of Congress to determine. Although the list of cases is legion a few will suffice to bring home the point.

The Western Broadcasting Co., which owned station KNX in Los Angeles, the recipient of a broadcasting license from the F. C. C., sold this frequency to the Columbia Broadcasting System. The facts in this sale are amazing. The station having a claimed value of stock transferred, including physical and intangible values amounting to $236,520, was purchased by Columbia for $1,250,000.

In his testimony before the Appropriations Committee, Commissioner Prall stated:

I know of a case where within 6 months a corporation able to pay offered $3,000,000 for one station.

Can it be that the broadcasting interests have been assured that the F. C. C. will renew these licenses indefinitely? It is the duty of Congress to determine the facts underlying this brokerage in Government radio licenses for which they pay the Government nothing.

TEAPOT DOME OR RAPING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

But the buccaneering practice by these monopolists against the public does not stop there. Permit me to read from a recent article published in The Nation, by Paul Ward. I quote the following:

Only recently certain members of the F. C. C. moved to take away from the Navy two out of five short-wave frequencies allotted this Government by international agreement and turned them over to Columbia for private exploitation, just as the naval oil reserves were turned over to Fall, Doheny, and the rest in the Teapot Dome case, a cry of "Teapot Dome again" within the Commission itself broke up the play for the time being.

MONOPOLY CONDITIONS HANDED DOWN FROM HOOVER REGIME

This monopoly is by no means a reflection upon the present administration. A congressional investigation will in no way cast any reflection upon it. Instead, these monopolies were inherited from the Hoover administration.

WAS FEDERAL COURT DEBAUCHED TO INSURE CONTINUED RADIO MONOPOLY?

A reopening of the Government's case against the radio monopoly, either on the part of the Attorney General's Department or on the part of the Congress, through a proper investigation as well as an inquiry as to how these economic royalists, R. C. A., N. B. C., Columbia, and Mutual secured monopolistic control of radio stations. These monopolies now control all 40 clear channels, all radio stations of over 1,000 watts operating at night, and 93 percent of the power used for the transmission of radio broadcasting and does, from my studies, show a colossal fraud perpetrated upon the American people, and I would be surprised if we did not find that this monopoly was created and still exists through bribery practiced in circles supposedly above reproach.

Why was the brother of the clerk of the United States Federal court at Wilmington retained by the radio monopoly just before the consent decree was agreed to?

Why did the Government counsel in charge of this case and in charge of antitrust prosecutions so suddenly resign after this consent decree was entered into?

While I believe the American people can justly criticize the Congress for allowing the continuation of this radio

monopoly which has been severely flayed on the floor of both Houses of the Congress during the present year without any action on the part of Congress, let me direct your attention to the influence of this monopoly while the Hoover administration was in power.

After great hullabaloo and the spending of vast sums of the taxpayers' moneys the Hoover administration brought an action in the Federal Court in Delaware to break up the then apparent radio monopoly.

The Government showed how this monopoly, fostered by General Electric and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., purchased the American Marconi Co. and how, whenever necessary, they shared their monopoly with others, provided that such others were strong potential competitors. They took in the British, the French, the Germans, and such Americans as were necessary, all of the time securing for the Radio Corporation of America the absolute monopoly in the United States of radio reception from all over the world as well as radio transmission in the United States and from the United States to all other parts of the world. A monopoly, incidentally, which the Federal Communications Commission has perpetuated in a recent decision preventing a competitor of R. C. A. from establishing service to Oslo, Norway.

COMMUNICATIONS MONOPOLY—AL CAPONE AND BIG BUSINESS

This brings us to the supposed dissolution of the Radio Trust as agreed to in the consent decree in 1932. The Government in its antitrust action against R. C. A., General Electric, A. T. & T. Co., Westinghouse, et al., contended that these parties had divided up the electrical industries into exclusive fields and agreed not to compete with each other. The evidence was overwhelming, although it was actually unnecessary to go very much further than the cross-licensing agreement entered into by the defendants. The radio-set manufacture field was reserved to R. C. A., the transoceanic radiotelephone field and the monopoly for their broadcasting was given exclusively to the A. T. & T. This agreement provided that they would not compete with each other, but instead would act in concert to loot the public. One is driven to the odious comparison with Al Capone, who divided up Chicago, and who once remarked that his activities were really "big business without a top hat."

WAS R. C. A. CONSENT DECREE A SELL-OUT?

The Hoover administration, however, sold out the American people when it permitted the guilty parties to enter into a consent decree the mysteriousness of which has never lifted. The only difference, it appears, exists largely in the consent decree, but not in fact. R. C. A. still has a monopoly on the rights to radio set manufacture and A. T. & T. still has a monopoly of the wires for chain broadcasting, R. C. A. still has exclusive agreements with various foreign communication monopolies, and A. T. & T. still has a monopoly of transoceanic radio telephony. The recent F. C. C. special telephone investigation has this to say in substance about the conditions after this consent decree:

F. C. C. DECLARES MONOPOLY STILL IN FORCE BUT TAKES NO ACTION

The chief criticism has been that these agreements have fostered monopolies in a number of fields foreign to the primary field of the telephone company by effectuating a pooling of the thousands of patents owned by the parties by dividing between the parties the many fields in which patents have application and by throwing into the path of others desiring to engage in these fields the obstacles presented by the combined patent and financial resources of the telephone company, the Western Electric Co., the General Electric Co., the Radio Corporation, and the Westinghouse Co.

As counsel to the House special committee investigating the cross-licensing and pooling of patents, I found the violations to be even more flagrant.

The effect of this so-called dissolution consent decree was to insure the continued looting of the American people and the continued monopoly of the molding of public opinion by these monopolists with the sanction of the Hoover administration.

NO HONOR AMONG RADIO PIRATES

However, even among these pirates there is no honor. It appears that subsequent to the consent decree the A. T. & T. monopoly was extending itself to such an extent that it even poached upon the monopolistic position of R. C. A., its erstwhile partner in plunder.

The sound motion-picture industries was a case in point. A. T. & T. negotiated an exclusive license with seven of the eight largest motion-picture producers. R. C. A. was able to negotiate only one.

R. C. A., furious of violation of their agreement to divide up the field, filed a bill of complaint, charging antitrust violation by A. T. & T. The complaint, however, was never filed in any court but was used as a blackjack against the A. T. & T. As a result of this threat by R. C. A. to invoke the law against the telephone company, the latter capitulated to R. C. A. and agreed to give the "swag" more even division among the two monopolies. But the public had an interest in this antitrust violation. Who was to protect their interests? As far as I can ascertain, since the consent decree of November 21, 1932, no action has been taken by the Government against these monopolies, despite the fact that the Government has a direct interest in all antitrust litigation. These facts have been clearly presented by the recent special telephone investigation.

Mr. Speaker, in opening my remarks I emphasized the existence in America of dictatorship, not on the part of elected officials, the President, or the Congress, but on the part of those who control the molding of public opinion and those who control our cross-licensing and patent-pooling agreements, which in substance are controlled by about a dozen people in New York City.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McFARLANE. These cross-license and patent-pooling agreements are monopolized by the American Telegraph & Telephone Co. and Radio Corporation of America, which, in turn, control radio broadcasting, motion pictures, and, to a great extent, the public press.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S NATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE FIND MONOPOLY CONTROL OF TELEVISION A NATIONAL MENACE

In the newspapers of July 18 the report of the National Resources Committee was made public by President Roosevelt. I call your attention to page 21 of the New York Times, the headings of which are self-explanatory:

"Calls television propaganda peril", "Report warns of power to widen avenues for spread of insidious ideas"; and on the next column is the heading "Predicts papers printed in homes; Resources Committee says new inventions presage vast communications changes."

With the control of the molding of public opinion amply demonstrated to be in the hands of vested wealth, it is my belief the Congress can well be accused of cowardice, if we do not meet the challenge laid down to us.

WILL CONGRESS ACT?

The Congress has pending before us in the House and the Senate resolutions seeking an investigation of this radio monopoly to indicate how widespread is the demand for this investigation. I quote one of many editorials written insisting that Congress investigate this radio monopoly:

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS HELPFUL—SCRIPPS-HOWARD EDITORIAL

No other money which the Government spends, we believe, yields greater returns, dollar for dollar, than does the money expended for congressional investigations.

True, some of these inquiries are turned into witch hunts to punish political enemies and used unconscionably to invade the privacy of law-abiding individuals. But, on the whole, investigations such as the one which saved the Teapot Dome, the Pecora inquiry that pointed the way to wiser banking and securities laws, and the La Follette hearing which is publicizing and putting a curb on civil liberties violations are definitely worth while.

Charges have been made that the F. C. C. is awarding broadcasting franchises on a political basis; that a broadcasting monopoly is being developed; that a vested right is being created in the frenquencies allotted; that certain parts of the country are being favored over other sections; that censorship has restricted freedom of the air, and that too much time on radio programs is

given over to advertising and too little to educational and cultural features. All these charges have been made, and more.

They should be proved or disproved. The policy-making branch of our Government should search out the truth and correct whatever abuses are found.

In closing, let me direct the attention of the House to the insulting attitude of the kept magazine of the radio monopoly toward the House and our late Colleague, Billy Connery. This magazine Broadcasting, in its issue of July 15, page 44, in its editorial entitled "The White Resolution", first insults the honesty and good faith of our late colleague, Billy Connery, when they accuse him of headline hunting, sensation seeking, and a fishing expedition by a select House committee. This odious and insulting, at least to House Members, editorial closes with this advice to the Congress:

SHALL RADIO MONOPOLY PICK ITS INVESTING COMMITTEE?—INSULT TO HOUSE

Let there be an investigation along the lines proposed in the White resolution. We are confident that the result will quiet for another decade the tongue wagging of the radio baiters.

Mr. Speaker, will the Members of this House and will this administration continue to stand idly by while the American people are in danger of being looted of millions of dollars by this radio practice by continued exploitation in the way of exorbitant prices for what should be a necessity of life and continue to permit this small group of exploiters to mold public opinion amongst our people to suit their own selfish interests?

The public is somewhat conversant with the apparent scandalous happenings existing in the radio and communications fields. The Nation, Variety, the Washington News, the syndicated column Washington Merry-Go-Round, Billboard, among other publications, have all somewhat ventilated the smelly conditions existent.

The dictators, which I mentioned earlier in my speech, are now trying to get Congress to adjourn so that legislation on judicial reform, wages and hours, farm aid, and departmental reorganization, which they so violently oppose in their press and radio, may be sidetracked. These men are the unelected, unofficial dictators of America. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question as a matter of information?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I can see the gentleman must have devoted a great deal of time and study to this subject and have performed a great deal of research work. The gentleman mentioned a station at Los Angeles. What was the name of that station?

Mr. McFARLANE. KNX, I believe.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Is the gentleman sure about his statement? I do not recall that the gentleman gave the name of the station.

Mr. McFARLANE. Yes; I gave the name of the station. It is in the RECORD. I took the figures from the records, so I know the figures are accurate, as well as the other statements I have made.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I just want to say this. We have this appalling situation before us: Resolutions to investigate this great communications field have been pending before this House since early in the session, and no action has been taken by the Rules Committee. I can think of nothing that is of more importance pending before the Congress than such an investigation to clear up the entire communications field, to the end that we see what it is that is so all-powerful that it is continuing to control and mold public opinion in this country to suit their own selfish interests, and I hope we will soon have some action by the Rules Committee to give this House an opportunity to vote upon this important question.

Mr. BOLAND of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND of Pennsylvania. Do I understand from the gentleman's remarks that Congress was advised by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission of the situation he is referring to as now existing?

Mr. McFARLANE. I quoted from Chairman Prall's remarks, and I will say to the gentleman, and, perhaps, the gentleman did not exactly hear the quotation, but my statements in that regard were taken from Chairman Prall's own statement to the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BOLAND of Pennsylvania. I heard the quotation, and while I may be wrong, I took it that the quotation advised the Congress of the situation that the gentleman is talking about and referring to as a serious one. Am I right in that respect?

Mr. McFARLANE. Yes, sir. The situation that Chairman Prall was talking about was a stock-selling racket that is rapidly developing in the radio field, and he feels it is a racket and something that should be stopped. Incidentally other members of the Communications Commission have asked for an investigation by Congress.

Mr. BOLAND of Pennsylvania. Which is one of the grounds of the gentleman's argument.

Mr. McFARLANE. Correct.

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

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Earlier in the gentleman's well-prepared remarks he told us that public opinion or public sentiment in the country had turned against the President, and the gentleman severely castegated the press and the radio commentators for this change in public sentiment. I was very careful to listen to the words, because they were written and the statement was well worded and could not be misunderstood. In that connection, does the gentleman have in mind that the President of the United States gets a national hook-up without charge on all radios if and when he asks for it, and that he has assumed to accept that proposition and in fireside chats and otherwise has done more to propagandize his theories and his administration policies by this method than was ever attempted by any President or any American citizen in all time?

Mr. McFARLANE. In answer to the gentleman I will say that the President has used the national hook-up in radio far less than the vested interests. The fact he has been more effective is because he has carried home to the great masses of our people fundamental facts and truths that are unanswerable, and, of course, this is a little bit hard on those of the opposition; but it is well known that the opposition has used much more radio time than has the President.

Mr. MICHENER. But right there, if that be true, it is not because of the fact that others have been given time, because they have to pay for it. The President has had such time and does now have such time as he wants without charge and can go to the country at any time.

Mr. McFARLANE. In answer to the gentleman's statement in that regard, I may say I do not know what the facts are, but I do know the number of speeches placed in the RECORD, for instance, on the Court proposition by those in opposition to the Court proposal are far greater and the speeches far more voluminous than those that have been made over the radio in favor of it.

Mr. MICHENER. Why is the gentleman, then, condemning the radio and the press—that is, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. McFARLANE. I am talking about radio speeches placed in the RECORD.

Mr. MICHENER. I think the gentleman should give this matter consideration.

Mr. McFARLANE. I am talking about things being spread by the plutocratic press and radio commentators of the country at this time, and I think that is being turned out by that group. [Applause.]

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

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution relating to the employment of personnel and expenditures made by the Charles Carroll of Carrollton Bicentenary Commission; to the Committee on the Library.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CHANDLER, for 4 legislative days, on account of important business.

To Mrs. NORTON, for the remainder of the week, on account of death in family.

To Mr. FORAND, for 3 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. FLEGER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOLAND of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 20, 1937, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, July 20, 1937, at 10:30 a. m. to continue hearings on H. R. 7365.

A hearing will be conducted by Subcommittee No. I, Tuesday, July 20, 1937, at 10 a. m., on bills relating to custodial employees.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Naval Affairs will hold full committee meeting Tuesday, July 20, 1937, at 10:30 a. m., on H. R. 7560, to authorize alterations and repairs on certain naval vessels, and for other purposes. Very important.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Research Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Thursday, July 22, 1937. Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 1536, H. R. 5531, H. R. 7001, and H. R. 7643, research bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

725. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 14, 1937, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Lake Charles Deep Water Channel, La., and Lake Charles Ship Channel, La., from Lake Charles to the Gulf of Mexico east of mouth of Calcasieu River, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935, and review of reports on Calcasieu River and Pass, La., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted May 6, 1935 (H. Doc. No. 299); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with four illustrations.

726. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a proposed draft of a bill to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

727. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and approved by the Governor of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

728. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1938 amounting to $194,538, and a deficiency estimate for the fiscal year 1935 amounting to $12,570, in all $207,108, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 300); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

729. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, for the Department of Agriculture for carrying out the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937, amounting to $1,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 301); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

730. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, aggregating $812,000, of which $535,000 is required to provide facilities for construction of battleships at the New York and Philadelphia Navy Yards, $275,000 for replacement of a paint and oil storage building destroyed by fire on May 25, 1937, at the Mare Island Navy Yard, and $2,000 to erect a memorial to the officers and men of the United States Navy who lost their lives as the result of a boiler explosion (H. Doc. No. 302); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

731. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year 1938 (H. Doc. No. 303); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. PETTENGILL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7711. A bill to amend the act approved June 19, 1934, entitled the "Communications Act of 1934"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MEAD: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 3149. A bill for the relief of the postal employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 1259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILDEBRANDT: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 6167. A bill to provide a surcharge on certain air mail carried in Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 1260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SACKS: Committee on Insular Affairs. H. R. 1485. A bill to amend section 40 of the act of March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Insular Affairs. H. R. 1486. A bill to amend section 30 of the act of March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1262). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GREEVER: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1047. An act to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to construct, equip, maintain, and operate on Farm Island, S. Dak., certain amusement and recreational facilities; to charge for the use thereof; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1129. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept from the State of Utah title to a certain State-owned section of land and to patent other land to the State in lieu thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1216. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of Montana to be used for the purposes of a public park and recreational

site; without amendment (Rept. No. 1265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GREEVER: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1266. An act to authorize the city of Chamberlain, S. Dak., to construct, equip, and maintain tourist cabins on American Island, S. Dak., to operate and maintain a tourist camp and certain amusement and recreational facilities on such island; to make charges in connection therewith; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL of Washington: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1696. An act to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Snoqualmie National Forest, in the State of Washington; without amendment (Rept. No. 1267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 2026. An act to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Fort Donelson National Military Park in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURCH: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 7879. A bill to provide additional compensation to star-route carriers for necessary increased mileage, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7022. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILDEBRANDT: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 7873. A bill providing for the transportation of the mails on certain commercially operated aircraft, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 7896. A bill granting pensions to certain soldiers of the Civil War; without amendment (Rept. No. 1254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 7897. A bill granting increase of pensions to certain widows and former widows of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War; without amendment (Rept. No. 1255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 7898. A bill granting pensions to certain widows and former widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War; with amendment (Rept. No. 1256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 7899. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain helpless and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War; without amendment (Rept. No. 1257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 7905. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain widows, former widows, and dependent children of soldiers of the Civil War; without amendment (Rept. No. 1270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALESHIRE: A bill (H. R. 7900) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Little Miami River and the watershed thereof, in the State of Ohio, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. GWYNNE: A bill (H. R. 7901) to amend section 81 of the Judicial Code to provide for a Waterloo division of the northern district of Iowa, and to provide for the establishment of an office of the clerk of the court at Waterloo, Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NORTON (by request): A bill (H. R. 7902), to regulate proceedings in adoption in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LUDLOW (by request): A bill (H. R. 7903) to provide retirement annuities for certain former employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PALMISANO (by request): A bill (H. R. 7904) relative to salaries of librarians in the public schools of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 7906) to amend title IV of the Revenue Act of 1932 to impose an excise tax upon the importation of menthol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 7907) to grant recognition to distinguished military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGLESIAS: A bill (H. R. 7908) to extend the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 7909) to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933, to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McGROARTY (by request): A bill (H. R. 7910) to enable the Secretary of War to pay the amount awarded to the Malabo fire claimants by the joint commission under article 6 of the treaty of November 18, 1903, between the United States and Panama; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 7911) to provide adequate compensation for dependents of agents and inspectors of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 7912) to reduce the contributions of States and local communities for the construction of flood-control projects, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 7913) to amend the Food and Drug Act of June 30, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VOORHIS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 448) to make available to the Federal Government the facilities of the Council of State Governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOYER: A bill (H. R. 7914) to authorize the presentation to John A. Leventis of a Distinguished Service Medal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 7915) for the relief of Mrs. C. G. Eidnes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 7916) for the relief of L. S. Myers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H. R. 7917) for the relief of Tom Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7918) for the relief of James A. Harris; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GWYNNE: A bill (H. R. 7919) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Rector; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMNECK: A bill (H. R. 7920) for the relief of Christine Yerges Conaway; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 7921) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Wachter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLARD: A bill (H. R. 7922) for the relief of Gordon George Blass; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'LEARY: A bill (H. R. 7923) for the relief of Josef Tominovich; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RIGNEY: A bill (H. R. 7924) for the relief of George J. Turney; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SECREST: A bill (H. R. 7925) granting a pension to Georgia Hupp Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7926) granting an increase of pension to Blanche S. Keyes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 7927) for the relief of Bertha Thompson Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 7928) for the relief of the firm of Cotonificio Bustese, S. A.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2952. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of the American Forestry Association in regard to conservation legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2953. Also, petition of the Seattle Community Fund, endorsing Senate Joint Resolution No. 85 for an appropriation to study the social and economic needs of laborers migrating across the State lines; to the Committee on Labor.

2954. Also, petition of the National Federation of Federal Employees, United States Army Supply Base, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging legislation be enacted giving all employees a minimum salary of $1,500 in the laboring class and $1,700 minimum in the clerical class with an automatic increase of $100 per year for 4 years; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2955. Also, petition of the Independent Steel and Iron Producers, endorsing the Schwellenbach-Koppleman bill, which provides means of controlling scrap export; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2956. Also, petition of the Interstate Airways Committee, of Washington, D. C., urging adoption of the McCarran-Lea bill to place the air transport industry under Federal regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2957. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolutions of the California Baby Chick Association, relative to special poultry bureau, excise tax, national animal theft, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2958. By Mr. QUINN: Resolution of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Union, of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging passage of the Wagner-Steagall housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2959. Also, resolution of the Department of Pennsylvania, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, urging passage of House bill 2904, Philippine travel pay bill, also resolution urging favorable action on House bill 6384; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2960. By Mr. SANDERS: Resolution of the Texas Bar Association, protesting the enactment of any legislation limiting or restricting the rights of husband and wife with reference to community property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2961. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the New Orleans Association of Commerce, New Orleans, concerning protection of rights of employers and employees; to the Committee on Labor.

2962. Also, petition of the Kerrs Legal Research Bureau, Los Angeles, Calif., with reference to the judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2963. Also, petition of the East Bay Union of Machinists, Local 1304, with reference to carrying out the present Works Progress Administration program without any cuts in personnel; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 20, 1937

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, being called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Richard A. Cartmell, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, the high and mighty Ruler of the universe, who art ever more ready to hear than we to pray: We would seek this day to stand in the light of Thy pure and unsearchable wisdom. Thou hast promised that Thou wilt send Thy Holy Spirit among us to lead us into all truth and that where two or three are gathered together in Thy name Thou wilt grant their request. Mindful of this, Thy gracious promise, O Father, in these times, fraught with such deep perplexity, we beseech Thee for Thy special guidance to save us from all false choices, and that in Thy light we may see light and in Thy straight path we may not stumble. Through Him who lighteth every man that cometh into the world, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 15, and Friday, July 16, 1937, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

SERMON BY REV. H. BASCOM WATTS AT THE FUNERAL OF SENATOR ROBINSON

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the very beautiful tribute paid to our late departed colleague and leader, Senator ROBINSON, by the Reverend H. Bascom Watts, delivered at the funeral services at Little Rock, Ark., on last Sunday afternoon.

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

SENATOR JOSEPH TAYLOR ROBINSON

Here we pay our tribute of respect to a great representative American—JOSEPH TAYLOR ROBINSON. I shall not speak comprehensively of his work as a public official. That has been adequately reviewed in the national press and by his admiring colleagues in official life; and what word of eulogy could I speak that would be sufficient? It is proper only that I should seek to be the medium for expressing the deep affection and high esteem in which he was held by the people of the State of Arkansas.

Half a dozen years short of the threescore and ten of the Psalmist, yet few others in the history of our Nation's life have lived so tremendously and with such a varied career as this eminent statesman. We are a little too close to him now to do justice to him. Some of us admired him so enthusiastically that our praise may sound a bit strident and may thus lose its force. Time will properly adjust his fame. I think that adjustment will assign him a very high place in American history.

In the decades from about 1810 to 1850 there were three dominating personalities in American legislative life—Webster, Clay, and Calhoun. Possibly it may be too early to put Senator ROBINSON in a category with them, and I am sure he would have been the last to have claimed any such distinction. But when a history of the Congress and the crucial issues before it in the last three decades is scientifically presented by careful students of the period, it cannot omit him from rank with the foremost.

However, I am not thinking of him so much as a statesman, or even a great man, but as a personality. When you saw Senator ROBINSON you saw a remarkable personality. The test of personality is the human interest in the daily incidents, reactions, and manners of the man. How did he smile; why did he frown; what were his tricks of gesture and speech; in what spirit did he meet the troubles and trials of everyday life? Some men are aloof and austere—only their doctrines interest us. They are mere doctrinaires. Human contact with them detracts from their influence. No mere "glad-hander" was Senator ROBINSON, but neither was he aloof nor austere. His life, political, domestic, personal, was singularly open and so vitally human that he inspired in men associated with him genuine affection and unfeigned confidence.

Among tall mountains it is hard to measure peaks. There is too much of ROBINSON, too many vividly related phases of his unusual personality, to discuss at length his great career as legislator, advocate, Congressman, Governor, United States Senator, leader of his party, representative of his Government at distinguished international tribunals, citizen, friend, husband. Certain