By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 11252) to authorize an increase in the limits of cost of certain naval vessels; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 11284) to define the status of retired officers of the Regular Army who have been or may be detailed as professors and assistant professors of military science and tactics at educational institutions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYTRE: A bill (H. R. 11255) to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge approaches, and extensions or additions thereto, by the city of St. Louis, within the States of Illinois and Missouri; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 315) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: Resolution (H. Res. 390) for the appointment of a committee of five Members of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House to investigate a series of articles in the Liberty Magazine entitled "The Woodrow Wilson I Knew," by Mary Allen Huibert; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALAMANZA: A bill (H. R. 11256) granting a pension to Torbert R. Welsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 11267) granting a pension to Winnie Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 11298) granting a pension to Frank Shiddall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11288) granting a pension to Laura E. Franklin; to Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 11261) authorizing the President of the United States to restore Gummer Harold McCutcheon, United States Navy, retired, to the active list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11292) for the relief of John W. Osborn, of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. Dyer: A bill (H. R. 11293) for the relief of Wilfie Hutchinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. Hickey: A bill (H. R. 11294) granting a pension to A. S. Brownell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 11295) for the relief of Kate T. Riley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 11296) for the relief of Carl C. Back, California, and legal guardian of Guinther Carl Back; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11297) granting a pension to Cora O. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. Morgan: A bill (H. R. 11298) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ellen Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11299) granting a pension to Julius H. Piatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11300) granting a pension to Charles E. Rider; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROACH: A bill (H. R. 11301) granting a pension to Alamanza Korson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11302) granting an increase of pension to Mary Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 11303) granting an increase of pension to Melia A. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 11304) granting a pension to James Lloyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. Wason: A bill (H. R. 11305) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Bock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11306) granting a pension to Charles H. Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 11307) granting a pension to Lewis C. Sparkman; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. EAKER (by request): Petition of the members of Temple Class of Methodist Episcopal Church, Yakima, Wash., favoring the distribution of literature by Congress to all schools and colleges and the incorporation of instruction in the curricula; also from the Ladies' Aid, of Rhodes, Iowa; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DAVEY: Petition of citizens of Lorrain County, Ohio, against the passage of Senate bill 3218; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of the Massachusetts Federation of Churches, urging Congress to repeal the Japanese exclusion clause of the immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of D. Eddy & Sons Co., Boston, Mass., recommending congressional action looking toward the development of a national policy of flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of citizens of Jamaica, U. S., protesting against proposed legislation (S. 3218) for the compulsory observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEACH: Petition of residents of Attleboro, Mass., opposed to the passage of the Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGEE of New York: Petition of members of the Seventh Day Adventist Church, of Syracuse, N. Y., opposed to Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island: Petition of residents of Pawtucket and vicinity, protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the Judiciary.


By Mr. RAKER: Petition of W. H. Wharton, chairman Arthur McArthur Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Minnesota, urging support of House bill 5094; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: Petition of Joseph L. Neil Camp, United Confederate Veterans, Nashville, Ark., indorsing bill introduced by Representative John N. Tillman, known as the cotton tax refund measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Mondav, January 5, 1925

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we love to call Thee by that name. Though Thou art the great and mighty God who inhabiteth eternity, the last time we called Thee "Father" was closely in happy relationship and Thou dost want us to call ourselves the children of such a Father. Accept our thanks for all the mercies received. Grant us Thy grace through this day, and may it be a day hallowed by the associations of yesterday and a day in which duty shall be well done. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday last when, on request of Mr. Jones of Washington and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

INVESTIGATION OF NORTHERN PACIFIC LAND GRANTS

The President pro tempore. The Chair announces the appointment of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Carway] as a member of the committee on the part of the Senate under the provisions of section 3 of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 297) directing the Secretary of the Interior to withhold his approval of the adjustment of the Northern Pacific land grants, and for other purposes, the appointment of the Senator from Arkansas being in the stead of Mr. Adams, who has ceased to be a member of this body.

Senator from Texas

Mr. MAYFIELD presented the certificate of the Governor of the State of Texas, certifying to the election of Morris Sher...
Mr. BROOKHART presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Van Buren County, in the State of Iowa, enumerating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I present a telegram from the American Science Monitor relative to postal rates, which I ask to have treated as in the nature of a petition, printed in the Record, and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., January 1, 1925.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

In its present form the postal bill, which would reduce postage on most newspapers, would increase domestic postage on the Christian Science Monitor from $95,000 a year to $230,000 a year, an increase of over 150 per cent. The Monitor is issued by the Christian Science Publishing Society, an unincorporated trusteeship auxiliary to the Christian Science Mother Church. The Monitor is published at a loss. It produced net earnings, they would accrue to the church, not to any individual. Under existing law Monitor is exempt from zone rates because maintained in interest of religious organization and not for private profit. Zone system would be particularly burdensome to Monitor because its circulation is not a local but nation-wide. An amendment consisting of section 1164 of war revenue law would meet this situation. We request your cooperation in securing this amendment.

The CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PUBLISHING SOCIETY.

Mr. NORBECK presented the memorial of G. E. Loomis and 34 other citizens of Colton, S. Dak., enumerating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DILL presented two memorials, numerously signed, by sundry citizens in the State of Washington, enumerating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSON of California presented sundry memorials, numerously signed, by citizens of Bakersfield, San Jose, Santa Clara, Sacramento, San Martin, Hanford, Shafter, and Los Angeles, all in the State of California, and of Fallon, Nev., enumerating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF THE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3750) to amend in certain particulars the so-called Kelly bill, June 3, 1916, reported, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 842) thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3811) for the relief of Augustus Nipple, submitted an adverse report thereon.

COURTS IN IOWA

Mr. CUMMINS. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 3792) to amend section 81 of the Judicial Code, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

I will briefly explain the character of the bill. It merely proposes changes in the rules for holding courts in certain divisions of the southern district of Iowa. It was prepared carefully by the judge of that court, whom many Senators know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Oonk in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes that the fifth paragraph of section 81 of the Judicial Code be amended to read as follows:

Terms of the district court for the eastern division shall be held at...
Mr. CUMMINS. I further report from the Committee on the Judiciary favorably without amendment the bill (S. 3733) to establish the Washington Hospital for Foundlings, and to enable it to accept the devise and bequest contained in the will of Randolph T. Warwick. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill. It is simply designed to enlarge the powers of the Washington Hospital for Foundlings, a corporation organized by the act of Congress approved April 22, 1870, so as to enable the hospital to accept a bequest of $500,000 attempted to be given to it by the will of Mr. Warwick.

The bill has received the unanimous approval of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I am sure there can be no objection to it on the part of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as In Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to amend the act incorporating the Washington Hospital for Foundlings in the city of Washington, approved April 22, 1870, and amended March 8, 1908, by inserting in lieu of section 5 of that act of incorporation the following clause:

Sec. 5. The object of this association is to found in the city of Washington a hospital for the reception and support of destitute and friendless children, and for the erection and maintenance of a memorial building to be known as the Helen L. and Mary E. Warwick Memorial, for the care and treatment of foundlings and for the care and treatment of women afflicted with cancer; and that said association be, and the same is hereby, authorized and empowered to receive, accept, and hold the bequest and devise contained in the will of Randolph T. Warwick, deceased, of the District of Columbia.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNUARY OF THE BATTLE OF LexiGon AND CONCORD

Mr. WAHREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably without amendment the Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 226) establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, pursuant to the appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes.

The joint resolution, which has passed the House of Representatives, provides for steps to be taken to enable the Government of the United States to participate in the celebration in commemoration of the anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord. It makes no appropriation, but merely provides that there may be a small amount appropriated hereafter. As the time is quite near for the celebration of the anniversary of that battle, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question. The Senate has stated that the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 226) carries, as an appropriation, but merely authorizes an appropriation. In what amount does it authorize an appropriation?

Mr. WARREN. It authorizes an appropriation of $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the expenses of the commission in connection with the celebration. The joint resolution also provides that there may be an additional $10,000 appropriated, which would make $15,000 in the aggregate, to enable the United States to take part in the celebration; but the joint resolution really only carries the authority to appropriate and makes no appropriation.

Mr. ROBINSON. The total appropriation contemplated is $15,000.

Mr. WAHREN. That is correct.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Lexington-Concord Sesquicentennial Commission, consisting of 11 commissioners, as follows: Three persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, four Senators by the President of the Senate, and four Members of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

Sec. 2. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to be expended by the commission for actual and necessary traveling expenses and subsistence while discharging its official duties outside the Districts of Columbia.

Sec. 3. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to be utilized in the discretion of the commission for the appropriate participation on the part of the United States in the celebration and observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord to be commemorated on or about April 19 and 20, 1925.

Sec. 4. That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to issue a special series of postage stamps, in such denominations and of such designs as he may determine, commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord and of the one hundred and fifth anniversary of the Battle of Concord, and of the other major events of the Revolutionary War as he may deem appropriate.

Sec. 5. That in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord there shall be coined at the mints of the United States silver 50-cent pieces to the number of $50,000, such 50-cent pieces to be of the standard Troy weight, as coined at the mints of the United States, and for the prevention of counterfeit or for any other purpose, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the same herein authorized: Provided, That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for this coinage.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (S. 8333) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, the shipping act, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (S. 3837) for the purchase of land adjoining Fort Bliss, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD: A bill (S. 3838) to authorize the President, in certain cases, to modify visa requirements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LADD: A bill (S. 3839) to repeal the act approved January 27, 1922, providing for change of entry, and for other purposes; and for the purchase of land in the United States to restore to the public domain lands reserved by public proclamation as national monuments, and validating any such restorations herebefore so made by Executive order; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. FRAZIER: A bill (S. 3841) to amend and supplement the packers and stockyards act, 1912; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (S. 3842) granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Harris (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORBECK: A bill (S. 3845) to authorize the creation of a national memorial in the Harney National Forest; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.
By Mr. JOHNSON of California:
A bill (S. 3844) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ritchie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILL:
A bill (S. 3845) granting a pension to Mary Holst; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COPELAND:
A bill (S. 3846) for the relief of the Snare & Triest Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURSUM:
A bill (S. 3847) granting a pension to John Griffin; and
A bill (S. 3848) granting a pension to Arthur S. Goodell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:
A bill (S. 3849) for the relief of J. W. Braxton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:
A bill (S. 3850) for the relief of Mark J. White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:
A bill (S. 3851) granting a pension to Harry Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELKINS:
A bill (S. 3852) granting a pension to Lucy A. Rowles; to the Committee on Pensions.

BILLS RECOMMENDED

On motion of Mr. OVERMAN, the bill (S. 292) to incorporate the American Bar Association and the bill (S. 2215) to incorporate the American War Mothers, were recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL SALARIES

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I present an amendment to the bill (S. 3674) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes. I ask that the amendment may be printed and lie on the table. In connection with the amendment, I ask that there may be printed in the Record a letter from the National Editorial Association dated January 3, 1925, and addressed to me.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION,
Wareham, Mass., January 4, 1925.

HON. DAVID L. WALSH,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: The clause in the pending post office revenue bill which places an additional advertising tax on newspapers to pay postal employees' increased salaries is unjust and burdensome, especially as applied to weekly (local) newspapers. In papers of that class the advertising is merely incidental in copies sent out of the immediate locality, which they are published and has no value to the advertisers whose trade is entirely local. Such copies as we send out of the locality are for their news content wholly, the distant subscribers being in no wise interested in the advertising. Local papers should not be classed with magazines and papers having a nation-wide circulation.

A fair proposition would be to exempt all local weeklies of less than 5,000 circulation from any increase in the advertising tax which is now being unjustly paid.

Trusting that the matter will receive your careful consideration, I remain,

L. C. HALL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be printed and lie on the table.

The amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On page 38 of Senate bill 3674, line 24, after the word "advertisements," insert the following: "and all local weekly publications of less than 5,000 circulation."

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10684) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANSDELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9072) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

PACIFIC COMMISSARY CO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2357) for the relief of the Pacific Commissary Co., which was, on page 1, line 7, to strike out "$51,947.87" and insert "$8,561.59."

Mr. CAPPER. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment, ask for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CAPPER, Mr. STANFIELD, and Mr. BAYARD conferees on the part of the Senate.

SWERY BEASLY GLISSON

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 648) for the relief of Janice Beasley Glisson, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ELEVATION OF GUNS ON AMERICAN BATTLESHIPS

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that it may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 290) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, requested to furnish to the Senate full information regarding protests received from any power against the elevation of the guns on the battleships of the United States.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I desire to state in connection with the resolution which I have just submitted that I tried to obtain the information for which it calls from the Secretary of the Navy but was unsuccessful. However, when I brought the matter up in the Naval Affairs Committee, and stated that I had done so, there was a newspaper report the next day, which apparently emanated from the White House, that there had been protests of a certain power against the elevation of the guns of our battleships, but that that matter would not be taken up until Congress had legislated on the subject. To my mind, it is most important—and I feel that Members of the Senate will so consider it—that we should have this information as to what protests have been made, and what protests have been made against the elevation of guns on American battleships. Those protests consist; so I feel that the Senate may determine whether or not there is any treaty violation before we should pass upon legislation for the elevation of the guns of our battleships. I ask that the resolution may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, in reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island, let me say that the House Committee on Naval Affairs has made a request of the Secretary of State for the same correspondence referred to by the Senator from Rhode Island, and I understand that a reply from the Secretary of State to the House committee will be made to-morrow, or, at any rate, within a few days. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONSTRUCTION OF COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT BY GERMANY

Mr. COPELAND submitted a resolution (S. Res. 291), which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Council of Ambassadors on May 5, 1922, permitted Germany to resume the construction of commercial aircraft, and publicly declared its purpose of revising, within two years, the restriction imposed by its law relative to the definition of commercial aircraft as differentiated from military aircraft; and
Whereas there has been no public announcement of any such revision; and
Whereas the interests of present-day aeronautics demand the fulfillment of such promised revision; Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Executive Department be requested to ascertain from the Council of Ambassadors its present attitude toward such
Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Record the Associated Press dispatch of Saturday last with reference to trade between the United States and Russia, and also to have printed in connection with that dispatch a letter from Mr. Joseph Newburger, one of the most prominent cotton dealers, of Memphis, Tenn., touching the subject matter of our trade with Russia.

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

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Saturday, January 3, 1921]

UNITED STATES TRADE WITH RUSSIA, 50 PER CENT GREATER THAN IN EARLIEST DAYS, TOTALS $49,000,000

(By the Associated Press)

New York, January 3.—The United States did 50 per cent more business with Soviet Russia in 1924 without official recognition than with czarist Russia before the war, according to claims made by Soviet representatives here to-day.

The Soviet's three principal trading companies here footed up their ledgers for the 12 months ending December 31 last to report a trade turnover through their hands between the two countries of $29,416,147. They then added 10 per cent to cover transactions presumably concluded in Moscow, Berlin, London, and other European centers, making an estimated total of $69,757,761. This exceeded by $23,257,761 the pre-war turnover in Russian-American trade of about $46,500,000.

The present turnover of $69,757,761 represented actual exports from the United States to Russia of $32,982,589 and imports of $30,755,192, leaving an estimated balance in favor of this country of about $14,985,551, according to the books.

The three concerns are the All-Russian Textile Syndicate (inc.), the Amotory Corporation, and Centrsovus (inc.).

Official items of exports from the United States. According to the figures of All-Russian Textile Syndicate (inc.), its chief handler, the amount shipped was 208,485 bales, valued at $42,706,000. A fleet of 29 vessels was chartered to transport these cargoes to Murmansk. Remittances of money were reported received here from Moscow via England. Bankers and brokers in London were said to collect a fee for acting as go-between for the two countries.

Farms, the principal item of imports from Russia, were estimated at more than $8,600,000.

The Soviet Union had drawn up a plan by which Russia's cotton crop was to have caught up with the demand for staple by its textile industry some time in 1928. The cotton mills, however, it now is reported officially, have expended too rapidly for these calculations.

NEWBURGEO COTTON CO. (INC.),
Memphis, Tenn., November 17, 1923.

Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Mr. DEAR SIR:—It is with great pleasure that I read in the papers that you intend to push the recognition of Russia. Your idea is laudable. It matters not what a government they have. It is no question of ours. They comprise one-sixth of the globe; they are valuable in trading with America, and I believe the association of our people with the Russians will bring them to realize exactly what Lenin's was trying to do before his death—induce capital to come to Russia and protect it. I believe the thing that will destroy communist ideas is for the whole world to recognize Russia, start trading with them, break down the barrier of passports, go into Russia, and meet the people.

I visited Russia 25 years ago. I was in Russia just before the war, and I made a visit there last summer. I herewith enclose you copy of my interview in Commerce and Finance.

The South is deeply interested because Russia will buy from us, if diplomatic relations can be established through recognition. 500,000 bales of cotton, representing $400,000,000. They will also purchase farm machinery, railway appliances, and other manufactured products to the extent of $200,000,000, and export to us platinum and several other products indigenous to Russia.

Taking the broad view of the situation, I can't understand how one can fail to be touched by the recognition of Russia. If you can not do anything further you should at least start the trade agreement. This I was in Russia several leading men expressed to me their earnest desire to get around and discuss problems over a table. I have always said machinery and appliances and other manufactured products to the extent of $200,000,000, and export to us platinum and several other products indigenous to Russia.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH NEWBURGER.
Mr. ASHURST. On April 2 of this year I introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor be hereby directed to transmit to the Senate a statement furnishing complete information as to the number of nationals of Mexico admitted into the United States during the past 12 months.

The Senate on June 5, 1924, agreed to this resolution. The Secretary of the Senate advises me, however, that the Secretary of Labor has made no response to the resolution to which the Senate agreed.

Believing that possibly the copy of this resolution which was transmitted to the Secretary of Labor might have been lost in the mails between here and the Department of Labor, which is more than a mile away, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Labor on December 27 last, as follows:

December 27, 1924.

To the honorable the Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On April 2, 1924, I introduced the resolution, copy of which is herewith inclosed. Later the Senate struck off the preamble to the resolution and adopted the same in accordance with lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, on page 2 thereof; but the Senate of the Secretary advises me that your department has made no response to the Senate's resolution. In furnishing me the information the Senate desires, you would supply me with the information at the earliest possible date, and I suppose as soon as the information is compiled you will send the same to the Senate.

With esteem, respectfully yours,
HENRY F. ASHURST.

Mr. President, the resolution was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. It was unanimously agreed to on the 6th of June, and Senators will perceive that it relates to an important subject.

It charges that large numbers of aliens, persons unauthorized to come into the United States, are being smuggled annually by the hundreds, possibly by the thousands, into the country. The Senate, while we are supposed to have an immigration law we have, in truth, a funnel, a conduit through which hundreds, yes, thousands, of unauthorized persons are poured annually into the United States.

Grave as that question is, another important question has been raised. May the head of one of the departments of Government, when the Senate formally calls for information, disregard the resolution of the Senate? I pass by the failure on the part of the Secretary to reply to my letter; of that I make no particular complaint. But should the Senate in silence pass over the subject? I therefore move that the Secretary of Labor be respectfully requested, if not, incompatible with the public interest, to furnish to the Senate the information requested by the Senate resolution which was passed on June 5, 1924.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the resolution of the Senator from Arizona was passed June 5, two days before the Senate adjourned. On the day the Senate reconvened, December 1, we had the annual report of the Commissioner General of Immigration sent to us by the President, and that gave the information the Senator's resolution asked for, stating that 87,948 Mexicans came into the United States during the fiscal year.

I am sure the Secretary of Labor has not meant to ignore the resolution. I believe he felt that the annual report about which I speak gave the information, although I know he would be very glad to send it to me in the form of a reply to my letter.

Mr. ASHURST. The reply of the Senator from Pennsylvania is a sensible reply. It does not appear to me, however, that an annual report is an answer to a resolution of the Senate. We know that the department sends in each year its report. If the resolutions which we introduce and pass may be considered to be answered and replied to in the reports submitted annually, then of course the Secretary of Labor is justified in taking the same position. This is the first time in my service of 13 years that a Cabinet officer disregarded such a matter and refused to reply directly. I wish a direct reply in addition to what has been said in the annual report.

The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Reed) is a valuable acquisition to the Senate. He votes his judgment, and no lack, no whip from the White House, will make him cringe. He has never voted against his views. I know he has not been speaking as the official defender of the administration or as the official defender of the Secretary of Labor, because he has the courage to vote against them when he sees fit. I believe that when the Senate passes a resolution, especially upon a subject so important, the departments ought not to tell us that we must be content with the information contained in their annual reports.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I agree with the Senator that the Senate is entitled to a direct response. I agree, if the Senate had remained in session, that to have deferred an answer until the filing of the annual report I would not have spoken as a courtesy to the Senate; in fact, it would have been a discourtesy.

Of course, so far as the Secretary's reply to the Senator's letter is concerned, I am not aware that the letter referred to had been addressed to the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I may not have any objection ultimately to the printing of the material as a document. I take it, however, that the Secretary has not had an opportunity to examine these papers himself.

Mr. BROOKHART. Equally.

Mr. WILLIS. And the Senator does not: ver that in his opinion the matter ought to be printed as a document. I suggest, if it be agreeable to the Senator, that he permit it to be referred to the committee with which it is of course considered that the committee will give it consideration, and if it is thought desirable we can have it printed afterwards as a document.

Mr. BROOKHART. Very well; that is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Jones of Washington in the chair): Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa that the matter be referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions? Without objection, it is so ordered.

WITHDRAWAL OF WATERS FROM LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the decree of the Supreme Court in the case of the Sanitary District of Chicago against the United States.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Supreme Court of the United States
(No. 101—October term, 1924)


Mr. Justice Holmes delivered the opinion of the court.

There being no objection, it is ordered that a bill in equity to enjoin the United States to the Sanitary District of Chicago, a corporation of Illinois, from diverting water from Lake Michigan in excess of 250,000 cubic feet per minute;
the withdrawal of that amount having been authorized by the Secretary of War. It is alleged that the withdrawal of more, viz., from 460,000 to 500,000 cubic feet per minute, would be necessary for the purposes of the defense of and will involve the lowering of the levels of the waters of Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, Lake St. Clair, Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, Sault Ste. Marie, St. Marys River, St. Clair River, Detroit River, Niagara River, St. Lawrence River, and all the harbors, etc., which are connected with the lakes, all of which are alleged to be waters of the United States, and will thus create an obstruction to the navigable capacity of said waters; and that it will alter and modify the condition and capacity of the above named and their ports, etc., connected with them. The prohibition of such alterations and obstructions in the act of March 2, 1869, chapter 425, section 19, 20 Statutes, 1121, 1151, is set out at length and relied upon, but the frame of the bill does not exclude a reliance upon more general principles if they will serve the purpose to manifest it.

The withdrawal practiced and threatened is through an artificial channel that takes the place of the Chicago River, formerly a little stream flowing into Lake Michigan, and of a part of its branches. The channel instead of adding water to the lake has been given an opposite incline, takes its water from the lake, flows into the Des Plaines River, which empties into the Illinois River, which in its turn empties into the Mississippi. The channel is at least 25 feet deep and at least 102 feet wide, and while its interest to the defendant is primarily as a means to dispose of the sewage of Chicago, Missouri, Illinois, U. S. 496, it has been an object of attention to the United States as opening water communication between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi and the Mississippi Basin.

The answer shows that the defendant is proceeding under a State act of May 29, 1868, by which it was provided that a channel should be made of size sufficient to take care of the sewage and drainage of Chicago, and of the population of Lake county, and require, with the capacity to maintain an ultimate flow of not less than 600,000 cubic feet per minute and a continuous flow of not less than 20,000 cubic feet for each 100,000 of the population within the sanitary district. It does not appear that the defendant has shown that he has from 400,000 to 600,000 cubic feet per minute, but as it alleges the great evils that would ensue if the flow were limited to the amount fixed by the Secretary of War or to any amount materially less than that required by the State act of May 29, 1868, it is not necessary to go into the conditions to be good for the channel. The act of 1868 has been an object of attention to the United States, and when it is called to the attention of the defendant, to adjust the two interests, to avoid the infection of their source of drinking water in Lake Michigan, and to bring this proceeding and no statute is needed to say that this power is superior to that of the State of Illinois; the State cannot estop itself by grant or conveyance, from the exercise of the police power. (Texas & New Orleans R. Co. v. Miller, 221 U. S. 468, 414; Atlantic Coast Line R. Co. v. Goldsboro, 223 U. S. 300, 225 U. S. 241, 244.) It would seem a strong thing to say that the United States is subject to narrower restrictions in matters of national and international concern. At least it is true that no such result would be reached if a strict construction of any State law's act would avoid this. The act was made and illustrated in a case where it was held that an order of the Secretary of War under the act of March 3, 1899, chapter 453, the same act in question here, directing an alteration in a bridge must be set aside without compensation, although the bridge had been built in strict accord with the act of Congress declaring that if so built it should be a lawful structure. (Louisville Bridge Co. v. United States, 149 U. S. 417; Greenleaf Johnson Lumber Co. v. Garrison, 257 U. S. 209.) It only remains to consider what the United States has done. It will be as well to bear in mind that when considering that this suit is not for the purpose of doing away with the channel, which the United States, we have no doubt, would be most unwilling to see closed, but solely for the purpose of limiting the amount of water to be taken through the channel from Lake Michigan.

The defendant in the first place refers to two acts of Congress—one of March 30, 1822 (3 Stat. 650), which became Ineffectual because its conditions were not complied with, and of March 10, 1840 (3 Stat. 585, 586, 590, 599), whether hastily or not, in Mississippi, Illinois (250 U. S. 496, 526) that there was no right in which Illinois brought Chicago into the Mississippi watershed. The act granted lands to Illinois in aid of a canal to be opened by the State for the purpose of uniting the waters of the Illinois River with those of Lake Michigan, but if it has any bearing on the present case it certainly rested an irrevocable discretion in the State with regard to the amount of water to be withdrawn from the lake. It did nothing to bring this subject. We repeat that the defendant desires to see the canal maintained and therefore pass by immaterial all evidence of its having fostered the work. Even if it had given the very site and made the channeled by act of Congress it would not have compromised its rights. It may be drawn from Lake Michigan. It seems that a less amount than now passes through the canal would suffice for the connection which the United States has wished to make.

In an appropriation act of March 3, 1899 (ch. 425, sec. 10, 30 Statutes, 1121, 1151), Congress provided:

"That the creation of any obstruction not affirmatively authorized by Congress to the navigable capacity of any of the waters of the United States is hereby prohibited; and no water shall be lawful to excavate or fill, or in any manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any port, waterway, harbor, cape, lake, harbor of refuge, or inclosure within the limits of any breakwater or harbor of refuge; or any navigable water of the United States, unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War.

By section 12 violation of the law is made a misdemeanor and punished, and the removal of prohibited structures may be enforced by injunction of the proper court of the United States in a suit under the direction of the Attorney General. This statute repeatedly has been held to be constitutional as to respect of the power given to the Secretary of War. (Louisville Bridge Co. v. United States, 242 U. S. 406, 424.) It is a broad expression of policy in unmistakable terms, advancing upon the purpose of March 10, 1890 (ch. 607, sec. 10, 26 Statutes 426, 454), which forbade obstruction to the navigable capacity "not authorized by law," and which had been held satisfied regard to a boom across a river by authority from a State. (United States v. Beilingham Boom Co., 176 U. S. 211.) It is neither reason nor opportunity for a construction that would not cover the present case. As now applied it concerns a change in the condition of the Lake Michigan and Chicago River, admitted to be navigable, and if that be necessary, an obstruction to their navigable capacity.
In evidence order to permit a withdrawal would lower the levels of the act of Congress which was superfluous except as a warning—that if at any time in the current of the river there should be an obstruction to navigation or injurious to property he reserved the right to close or modify the discharge, and that the sanitary district must assume all responsibility for damages to property if any obstructive action of the intervention of the locks in Chicago River. On July 11, 1900, improvements in the Chicago River were permitted, with the statement that it did not affect the right of the Secretary to revoke the permit of May 6, 1913, but the permit was increased to the discharge of 200,000 cubic feet per minute. On July 23, 1901, at the applicant's request, he amended the order to permit a flow of 800,000 feet between 4 a.m. and 12 midnight, subject to revocation. On December 5, 1901, again on the application of the applicant, leave was given to discharge not exceeding 250,000 feet per minute during the whole 24 hours, but subject to such modification as the Secretary might think that the public interest required. In September 1903, after which date it was to be reduced again to 250,000 feet, subject to modification as before. On September 11, 1907, and on October 11, 1907, the permit was amended to cut down the discharge to 200,000 cubic feet per minute. It is probable that the population of the sanitary district exceeded 2,500,000 and was increasing rapidly, and that the only method then available for disposing of this population was by discharging water in the Chicago River. On January 5, 1912, Mr. Secretary Stimson expressed the view that if water was to be discharged in the Chicago River, it would be necessary to take the matter up with the State of Michigan and to open a channel through Calumet River—this last refusal by Mr. Secretary Taft on March 14, 1907—on the understanding that the total quantity of water withdrawn from the lake should not exceed that already authorized by the Secretary of War. Finally, on February 5, 1912, the applicant, setting forth that the population of the sanitary district exceeded 2,500,000 and was increasing rapidly, and that the only method then available for disposing of this population was by discharging water in the Chicago River, asked permission to withdraw not exceeding 10,000 cubic feet per second, subject to such restrictions and supervision as might seem proper to the Secretary and to revoke by him. On January 5, 1912, Mr. Secretary Stimson carefully reviewed the situation, including the obvious fact that so large a withdrawal would lower the levels of the Lakes and the overwhelming evidence that it would affect navigation, and held that he was not warranted in excepting the applicant from the prohibitions of Congress on the ground of even pressing sanitary needs. It appears to us that the attempt to found a defense upon the foregoing licenses is too futile to need notice.

States bordering on the Mississippi allowed to file briefs as amici curiae suggest that they were not heard and that rights have not been represented before the Secretary of War. The city of Chicago makes a strong demand that it should be allowed with its own cost to do a hundred million dollars. The interest that the river States have in increasing the artificial flow from Lake Michigan is not a right, but merely a consideration that they may address to Congress, if they see fit, as a matter of the importance of the irrigation of the Illinois and Indiana States, and we have indicated, a large part of the evidence is irrelevant and immaterial to the issues that we have to decide. Probably the danger in which the city of Chicago will be subjected if the decree is carried out is exaggerated, but in any event we are not at liberty to consider here as against the edict of a paramount power. The decree for an injunction as prayed is affirmed, to go into effect in 60 days, without prejudices to any permit that may be issued by the Secretary of War according to law.

Interior Department Appropriations

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business of the Senate to-morrow, and not later than 5 o'clock, the Senate shall take a recess until 8 o'clock, and that the evening session shall be devoted to the consideration of House bill 10620, the Interior Department Appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Order of Business

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The President pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry if he was, by the ruling of the Chair in spite of the reenforcement of the order of the Chair in the consideration of the Senate's amendments, to the Chicago bill, made a request to have the matter adjourned for a few hours, and I was not willing to accept the ruling of the Chair, as the Chair had been closed.

Mr. MOSES. I wish to know if routine morning business on Monday includes the call of the calendar?

The President pro tempore. It does not.

Mr. MOSES. In spite of the fact that it is provided that the calendar must be called?

The President pro tempore. The Chair is attempting carry out and enforce the unanimous-consent agreement with regard to the Muscle Shoals bill and has held that in case of adjournment the routine morning business may be considered, but nothing further.

Mr. MOSES. But, that may I suggest, was not on a Monday. On Monday the calendar must be called, must it not? I am suggesting that the routine morning business on a Monday includes the call of the calendar under Rule VIII.

The President pro tempore. The Chair ruled differently on last Monday.

Mr. MOSES. And the Chair rules in the same way on this Monday?

The President pro tempore. The Chair will rule again. If it becomes necessary.

Mr. MOSES. And in the same manner?

The President pro tempore. Unless otherwise convinced.

Mr. MOSES. President, I am myself firmly convinced that the Chair is in error, but in view of the circumstances I shall take no appeal.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, with respect to the last observation by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, I do not think the conclusion of the Chair's ruling should go unchallenged, because the ruling of the Chair is manifestly not according to the view of the matter that took place.

Rule VIII provides that—

At the conclusion of the morning business for each day, unless upon motion the Senate shall at any time otherwise order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Calendar of Bills and Resolutions, and continue such consideration until 2 o'clock.

The answer to the proposition of the Senator from New Hampshire is that the Senate has otherwise ordered.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I was quite willing to accept the ruling of the Chair in spite of the reinforcement of the Senator from Arkansas.

Leases of Naval Oil Lands

The President pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.
Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, is not one of the objects of routine business resolutions coming over from a preceding day?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has held that resolutions coming over from a previous day are not included in routine business.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire simply to make an announcement concerning a resolution. I refer to the resolution or motion submitted by myself to adopt the report of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys touching the leasing of the naval oil reserves. This, it will be recalled, was the subject of some protracted discussion during the closing hours of the last session, but it was found impossible to dispose of it. In 1899 a revised and somewhat modified resolution was submitted to the assembling of Congress, but the Senator from Missouri [Mr.Speare] asked me if I would not kindly allow it to go over for a few days, until he had an opportunity to prepare a minority report to yield to his request, and intended then to call it up to-day, and so announced to him; but he came to me a few days ago and said that he was obliged to leave the city on account of the illness of his wife, and asked me to allow it to stand over until his return, a matter of 10 days. It will be recalled that when the matter was under consideration at the last session the Senator was earnestly pleading for further time, and was again requesting to be allowed to take further time to prepare a minority report, and now a request is made for further time. Under the circumstances, however, I do not find it possible to refuse the request of the Senator, and therefore I propose to withdraw the motion, and then shall ask that the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the matter.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do.

Mr. BRUCE. Are those the words that the Senator is putting in my mouth?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I had not quite completed the reading.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; but I wanted to comment just a little as the Senator went along, with the permission of the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No, no; I do not want to read the words from to-day.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator very naturally would object.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No, no; not naturally at all. I want to read what I referred to:

"Suppose that the members of those investigating committees had in some instances been just a little more carefully selected than they were, and suppose that those investigations had been conducted in a more impartial, judicial spirit; might not the result then have been different? Might not some real effect on public opinion have been worked?" In my humble opinion these questions can be answered only in the affirmative.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

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

Mr. BRUCE. Are those the words that the Senator from Montana places in my mouth?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I just extract these, which fully justify everything that I said; but they are only illustrative of the entire speech of the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. I am sure the Senator will find no Member of the Senate, after he has read those observations, who shares that opinion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. As to that, we shall see. But, Mr. President, I proceed. Let us assume that the Senator is correct, that these investigations were entered upon and prosecuted solely from political motives and for partisan ends, and, accordingly, that the country did not take them seriously, if, indeed, there was not a recall that proved damaging, and perhaps disastrous.

If the Senator at any time had any sympathy whatever with the investigations, he very successfully concealed it in his remarks, and the reckless which he administered was directed not only against my colleague and myself but against the entire Senate, after he has read those observations, who shares that opinion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. As to that, we shall see. But, Mr. President, I proceed. Let us assume that the Senator is correct, that these investigations were entered upon and prosecuted solely from political motives and for partisan ends, and, accordingly, that the country did not take them seriously, if, indeed, there was not a recall that proved damaging, and perhaps disastrous.

If the Senator at any time had any sympathy whatever with the investigations, he very successfully concealed it in his remarks, and the reckless which he administered was directed not only against my colleague and myself but against the entire Senate, after he has read those observations, who shares that opinion.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

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

Mr. BRUCE. Are those the words that the Senator from Montana places in my mouth?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I just extract these, which fully justify everything that I said; but they are only illustrative of the entire speech of the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. I am sure the Senator will find no Member of the Senate, after he has read those observations, who shares that opinion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. As to that, we shall see. But, Mr. President, I proceed. Let us assume that the Senator is correct, that these investigations were entered upon and prosecuted solely from political motives and for partisan ends, and, accordingly, that the country did not take them seriously, if, indeed, there was not a recall that proved damaging, and perhaps disastrous.

If the Senator at any time had any sympathy whatever with the investigations, he very successfully concealed it in his remarks, and the reckless which he administered was directed not only against my colleague and myself but against the entire Senate, after he has read those observations, who shares that opinion.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

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

Mr. BRUCE. Are those the words that the Senator from Montana places in my mouth?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I just extract these, which fully justify everything that I said; but they are only illustrative of the entire speech of the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. I am sure the Senator will find no Member of the Senate, after he has read those observations, who shares that opinion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. As to that, we shall see. But, Mr. President, I proceed. Let us assume that the Senator is correct, that these investigations were entered upon and prosecuted solely from political motives and for partisan ends, and, accordingly, that the country did not take them seriously, if, indeed, there was not a recall that proved damaging, and perhaps disastrous.

If the Senator at any time had any sympathy whatever with the investigations, he very successfully concealed it in his remarks, and the reckless which he administered was directed not only against my colleague and myself but against the entire Senate, after he has read those observations, who shares that opinion.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

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

Mr. BRUCE. Are those the words that the Senator from Montana places in my mouth?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I just extract these, which fully justify everything that I said; but they are only illustrative of the entire speech of the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. I am sure the Senator will find no Member of the Senate, after he has read those observations, who shares that opinion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. As to that, we shall see. But, Mr. President, I proceed. Let us assume that the Senator is correct, that these investigations were entered upon and prosecuted solely from political motives and for partisan ends, and, accordingly, that the country did not take them seriously, if, indeed, there was not a recall that proved damaging, and perhaps disastrous.

If the Senator at any time had any sympathy whatever with the investigations, he very successfully concealed it in his remarks, and the reckless which he administered was directed not only against my colleague and myself but against the entire Senate, after he has read those observations, who shares that opinion.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

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

Mr. BRUCE. Are those the words that the Senator from Montana places in my mouth?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I just extract these, which fully justify everything that I said; but they are only illustrative of the entire speech of the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. I am sure the Senator will find no Member of the Senate, after he has read those observations, who shares that opinion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. As to that, we shall see. But, Mr. President, I proceed. Let us assume that the Senator is correct, that these investigations were entered upon and prosecuted solely from political motives and for partisan ends, and, accordingly, that the country did not take them seriously, if, indeed, there was not a recall that proved damaging, and perhaps disastrous.

If the Senator at any time had any sympathy whatever with the investigations, he very successfully concealed it in his remarks, and the reckless which he administered was directed not only against my colleague and myself but against the entire Senate, after he has read those observations, who shares that opinion.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

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

Mr. BRUCE. Are those the words that the Senator from Montana places in my mouth?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I just extract these, which fully justify everything that I said; but they are only illustrative of the entire speech of the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. I am sure the Senator will find no Member of the Senate, after he has read those observations, who shares that opinion.
something in the nature of an alliance or an understanding between the Democratic Members of both Houses—at least of the minority. The Senators, so many or less closely associated with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. La Follette]. The result of the last election had hardly been announced when press notices issued from the city of St. Louis to the effect that the Senators from Wisconsin and from North Carolina was to be dissolved at the insistence of certain conservative or so-called "old line" Democrats. I deny that any such alliance or understanding ever existed, and I venture the assertion that the reports to which I refer were unfounded and are referable to the Republican National Committee, the idea now being disseminated by the Senator from Maryland.

What are the facts about the matter? When the Congress reconvened the Republicans in accordance with custom, made nominations for chairs of various committees of the Senate, respectively. The Democratic caucus did likewise. There being no opposition on the Republican side to any of the nominations so made, except as to that for the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, all of the Republican nominees, with the exception of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Cummins], named for that place, were elected by a strict party vote. In the contest which ensued with respect to the chairmanship of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Democrats, including the Senator from Maryland, in accordance with the request of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Smith], the ranking minority member of the committee, the dissident Republicans—

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Certainly.

Mr. BRUCE. Does the Senator mean to say that I ever voted at any time in the selection of the Senator from South Carolina in or outside of a caucus, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That was my recollection. I spoke in my recollection.

Mr. BRUCE. Then the Senator's memory is as bad as in this instance as it was in the former.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland voted, without the knowledge of the Senator from South Carolina, in or outside of a caucus, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That was my recollection. I spoke in my recollection.

Mr. BRUCE. In the first instance; not as the result of any caucus action.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have not said that the Senator voted as the result of any caucus action.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator said in the caucus.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I beg the Senator's pardon; I have not said the caucus made certain nominations. I am speaking about the vote in the Senate. The entire body of Democratic Senators voted for the Senator from South Carolina, and every other Senator, from Maryland. Then the dissident Republicans offered to their associates various candidates, who were unacceptable. They tried a number of other candidates from their own side of the aisle, none of whom were acceptable. Then in the course of the balloting enough Republicans came over and voted for the Senator from South Carolina to accomplish his election; but that was frustrated by the Senator from Maryland going to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Cummins]. But later on enough more Republicans came over to elect the Senator from South Carolina, without any concession whatever from him, without any agreement or any understanding or any compact of any character whatever.

So with the revenue bill when it came before the Senate. Substitute schedules were offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Sterling] the ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance. They were voted for, and my recollection is, upon the Democratic side, and enough Republicans came over to incorporate those substitute schedules in the bill. The whole illustration that I made was just exactly the same with reference to the vote in connection with the investigations. There never was any agreement or anything in the nature of an alliance between the Democrats and anyone from the Republican side.

The Democratic Party, as represented in the Senate during the last session of Congress, held its own course. It accepted votes, as a matter of course, in favor of the measures it supported, without any concession, and I venture to say, if I may be permitted to speak for it, that it will continue to pursue that course. It will not shy away from any measure, I dare say, or from any ideal, because it happens to be favored by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. La Follette] or by any other Senator, Republican or Democrat. I am bold enough to say that it will not follow in the way pointed out either by the votes or the remarks of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. President, to my mind the hope, and the only hope, of the liberal thought of the country is in the Democratic Party. I think the last election must have demonstrated to the enlightened and to the perverse alike that it is futile to look for any other way for relief from the evils which seem to be inseparable from continued Republican supremacy. If the result of that election was to any degree disheartening or disappointing or regrettable, the causes must be looked for elsewhere than in any action or failure to act on the part of the Democratic Members of either House of Congress during the last session.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to say to the Senator from Maryland that there is nothing before the Senate, and until we take one step further debate will not be in order.

Routine morning business is closed, and in accordance with the unanimous consent agreement reached on the 18th of December, 1924, the bill now lays before the Senate the bill (S. 1588) reclassifying the salaries of the postmasters and employees of the postal Service and readjusting their salaries and compensation, and for an equitable distribution of the message of the President returning the bill with his objections to the measure. The pending question is on the appeal taken from the ruling of the Chair on the motion to consider the bill. I think the Senators, I may say that the ruling was that the limitation which by unanimous consent had been put upon the debate relating to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Smith] to House bill 915 did not apply to this bill. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MCKEILLAR. The purpose having been accomplished, as I recall, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the appeal.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to withdraw the appeal from the ruling of the Chair. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the appeal is withdrawn and the order for the yeas and nays canceled.

The question now is upon the motion made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Sterling] to refer the bill and message to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I had addressed the Chair.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not want to interfere with the speech of the Senator, but I gave notice of a motion to amend the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not intend to make a speech. I want to make just a few brief observations.

Mr. HARRISON. I will temporarily withhold calling up my motion to amend.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I have not the slightest intention of making any extended observations in reply to the remarks of the Senator from Montana [Mr. Walsh]. He said nothing that he did not have the right to say, so far as the temper and spirit of what he said is concerned, and I find to-day and for some time past to be quite a different situation from that in which I found myself involved a few days ago. I admit that, but I am just a little curious to know how far this process that seems to have set up in some quarter or other of bis business as a member of the Democratic Party is to go. I find myself now almost in a position calculated to remind me of the words of Shakespeare:

'The little dogs and all,

Try, Blanch, and Sweetheart, see, they bark at me.'

But, as I have said, I am not going to reply to the Senator from Montana in any acrimonious spirit, because apart from falling into several doubtless inadvertent statements of what I said he uttered little at which I can justly take umbrage. But I must say that it almost borders on a little hard that the Senator should imagine that anything that I said a few days ago bore harshly upon him personally, when if he had turned to the record of the discussions that went on at the last session of the Senate he would find that was one of the Democratic Members of this body who paid a
warm cordial tribute to the ability and energy with which he played his part in those investigations.

I have the sincerest respect for the Senator from Montana. He is one of the ablest Members of this body, one of the very ablest, and he will look in vain in my remarks of a few days ago for any statement that I at any time have ever thought that any reproach should attach to him for lack of fairness in connection with Senatorial investigations. On the contrary I think that he bore himself like a true lawyer in the conduct of those investigations so far as he had anything to do with them. He has performed a right when he has said that a legislative investigation is no "kid glove" or "rose water" affair; though those are not his words, but mine. With the tenor of what you said in that connection I entirely agree, but I think something could be unjustly inferred. There was no rancorous resentment behind the statement when he made it, than the acclamation—I hate to use that word—of the Senator that I was not in sympathy with those legislative investigations. Go over the whole record of my connexion with them, and it will be found that my vote was invariably cast under any and all circumstances for their prosecution.

Why, has the Senator from Montana forgotten that after, when they had gone on for some time and the President sent a special message to this body protesting against their continued exertions, and with speaking of the President in the deferential language in which every Senator should speak of the President, I declared that I for one did not know how to set any limit to a legislative investigation into official misconduct, that I had been too long connected with legislative bodies not to know that one of the highest functions that they can perform is the critical, the inquisitorial function, the function which makes of a legislative body a sort of grand inquisitorial body. I have no doubt as to the purpose of the Members of this body on the one side of the Chamber to elect Senator Smirnoff was never communicated to me. I voted for Mr. Bruce. Mr. President, I feel that it was time for me with my convictions, public and party, to recede from the support—

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRUCE. Just a moment, and I will yield with pleasure—to recede from the support that I had given to Senator Smirnoff and to transfer it to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Copper]—

Which is the honor of that matter.

The junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Wheeler] came to my office, as he had a perfect right to do, talked over the situation with me, gave me to which I have taken

and left with the statement from me that if the Senator from Montana, with his capacity as a lawyer, with his caliper in every respect, could perform his part of those investigations without any grave breach of proper principles of procedure, but there were others who in my judgment did not.

So I do not hesitate to say again in my opinion the effect of those investigations, aside from the connection of the Senator from Montana with them, is very good. The United States would have been absolutely different if they had been conducted in a different manner by some of the members of the investigating committees.

Mr. ROBINSON of South Carolina. Mr. President.

Mr. BRUCE. I hope that the Senator will not interrupt me.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I ask the Senator to explain about the investigation of the Veterans' Bureau?

Mr. BRUCE. I, of course, know all about the investigation of that bureau, except that it seems to me that it was conducted in the most praiseworthy manner in every respect.

Mr. ROBINSON of South Carolina. The reason why I interrupted the Senator was that he was making a general statement exempting only the investigation conducted by the Senator from Montana, and I requested that he include in the exemption the conduct of the investigation of the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. BRUCE. I did not that in mind at all. I was speaking only of the grand inquisitorial body. The reason for the flagrant misconduct of Fall, and the equivocal, to say the least, conduct of Daugherty.

I have no criticism to state of the Senator from Montana. Of course, I have sometimes thought that he was too good a lawyer not to realize that there was no real constitutional foundation on which the resignation of Secretary Denby could be made, but I am glad he has resigned. I have no doubt that he honestly found some line of forensic reasoning that satisfied any scruples that he may have entertained upon that subject.

I have no more to say for that, and I hope that, at least, the Senator from Montana will not take too much to heart the feeling that has been engendered by the discussion that took place between the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Henson] and myself a few days ago, and for which I am so human as to think that I was in no wise responsible as the aggressor.

Just a word with reference to the selection of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Smirnoff] for the chairmanship of the Interstate Commerce Committee. I never voted for him in any caucus called by the Democratic Members of this body. So far as I know, no caucus was ever called, and to this day it has been a mystery to me, though the fact, I have no doubt, could be readily explained, why the purpose of the Members of this body on the other side of the Chamber to elect Senator Smirnoff was never communicated to me. I voted for Mr. Bruce. I have always been a man of principle, and I oppose the election of any candidate, even of a Democrat supported exclusively by Democrats, but when on the very first day that I changed my vote from Senator Smirnoff to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Copper], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Wheeler] came to my office and told me that the progressives on the other side of the Chamber were going to bring to this side of the Chamber sufficient votes to elect the Senator from Iowa. Mr. President, I felt that it was time for me with my convictions, public and party, to recede from the support—

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRUCE. Just a moment, and I will yield with pleasure—to recede from the support that I had given to Senator Smirnoff and to transfer it to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Copper]—

Mr. ROBINSON of South Carolina. Mr. President.
Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to a further question?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; if it is a little more timely than the one which the Senator from Arkansas has just asked.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is a question of the radical element of this body. The membership of the committee was not changed in any respect by the election of a Democratic chairman.

Mr. BRUCE. But the result was as I have stated. Mr. ROBINSON. What action taken by the committee does the Senator from Maryland regard as having been fatal?

Mr. BRUCE. It is the first step, as the French say, that costs.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is that the only answer the Senator can make to my question?

Mr. BRUCE. That one is good enough, in my judgment, for the purposes of the case.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator regards the election of a good Democrat as chairman of the committee when the Republicans could not agree upon any one, when they had two candidates and were unable to elect, as a fatal error, does he?

Mr. BRUCE. It left the impression upon the minds of the people of the country that the Democrats of this body were more opportunists.

Mr. ROBINSON. Why more opportunists if the Democrats of the Senate voted for a Democrat?

Mr. BRUCE. Because it seemed as if they were willing to form an alliance in any quarter that they could and with any one that they could and had abandoned the principles which they had always professed for principles that in my judgment are as foreign to the true principles of the party as the Arctic Circle is to the Antarctic.

Mr. ROBINSON. I shall yield to a further question, how does it constitute an abandonment of principle for a Democrat to vote for a Democrat?

Mr. BRUCE. Well, now, I really think that I have gotten to a point where I might say, at liberty, Mr. ROBINSON. Nobody but the deceased Doctor Johnson, does he?

Mr. ROBINSON. Does the Senator rather think that it was an abandonment of principle for a Democrat to vote for a Republican?

Mr. BRUCE. I have answered that repeatedly. I have, I was about to say, reached a point that reminds me of an observation of Doctor Johnson. Doctor Johnson was on one occasion conversing with somebody who kept saying, "I do not understand; I do not understand your reasons." "Well," replied Doctor Johnson, "I do not see that it is my duty to furnish you both with reasons and understanding." [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator, of course, assumes himself to be Doctor Johnson. That is a fine illustration of the Senator's frankness. If the Senator is satisfied with his answers to my questions, I am entirely satisfied to let the matter rest.

Mr. BRUCE. Well, I do not know that my answers are any more good, but they are quite as good as the Senator's questions, so that we may call things even.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has never yet explained to the Senate nor to the country what he conceived to be the first step, as the French say, that long as there was little chance of his election and then forsook him and voted for a Republican when he learned that enough votes might be secured to accomplish the election of his predecessor candidate.

Mr. BRUCE. I made the explanation at the time and I have made it since, and I do not propose to make it any more.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I had almost concluded what I wished to say when the Senator interrupted me. I have narrated the history of the shifting of my vote from Senator SMITH to Senator CUMMINS, and all I have to say in conclusion is that I have never seen the slightest occasion for regretting the change.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator will yield for one further question, he has said that his objection to voting for Senator SMITH at the time his election was consummated was that he learned the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] was going to vote for him. I ask if that is not a very good way for the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to control the vote of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BRUCE. I did not say Senator LA FOLLETTE at all. Senator LA FOLLETTE represents a good deal more than himself. It is only fair and just to him to say that he represents a party. What I meant to say was that I learned that Senator LA FOLLETTE and his adherents on the Republican side of the Chamber proposed to unite with Democratic Senators—
Mr. ROBINSON. And that the Senator from Maryland did not propose to vote for anybody the Senator from Wisconsin and his adherents would vote for, even though he had been voting a number of times for the Democratic candidate.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to the remarks of Senator Skelton as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee.

I want to say in conclusion that we have reached a stage where there is no good purpose to be secured by any Democrat in pursuing these absurd topics. All Senators will bear me out when I say that, independent, in some respects, as my course at the last session in this body was, no one in the Senate ever heard me utter one single, solitary, censorious word about any action that my colleagues chose to take in connection with those investigations or any other object of party policy that the majority of Democrats in this Chamber saw fit to pursue. Is that not the fact, I ask the leader on this side of the Chamber, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON. Is the Senator addressing his question to me?

Mr. BRUCE. I am.

Mr. ROBINSON. I was unfortunate enough to be out of the city when the Senator delivered his address to which the Senator from Montana has referred. I heard the language read to me from the Senate Chamber this morning, and I place upon the language the same construction as that placed upon it by the Senator from Montana. I think that the Senator from Maryland, if he admits that he has never heard me question the Senator from Montana, did criticize the investigations.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator misunderstood me again. I was not referring to anything that has happened at this session of the Senate. As I have said, I have no disposition to keep the embers of old antimonies alive, and I certainly have no desire to say anything to which the sensibilities of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Hamilton] could take exception. He and I had a little bout, and I think he could say in the language of the old Confederate soldier at Appomattox, "that he killed just as many of me as I killed of him," and I imagine that he has too generous a spirit to harbor any lasting resentment about anything that may arise between him and another Member of the Senate.

What I was saying was that at the last session of this body no Senator on this side of the Senate ever heard me question at any time the personal motives of any Democratic Senator who differed from me, or ever heard me utter one single reproachful personality to one of my colleagues.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I would like to say to the Senator that he will search my remarks in vain for any criticism of anything he did or anything he said at the last session of Congress. I rose to call attention to the remarks of the Senator a week ago; and I simply desire to inquire of the Senator now whether he desires to allow those remarks to stand?

Mr. BRUCE. Of course I do, because I conceive that I owe a higher obligation to the truth than I could ever owe to any personal, and I do not make any concessions of the truth; but so far as the Senator is concerned—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator will appreciate that his words include me as just as the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BRUCE. No; they do not. I referred to the selection of some of the members of the committees. The only mistake I made was in not excepting the Senator from Montana by name, that is all.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator asked me whether I heard him at the last session make personal criticism of his colleagues of the Chamber? And I will say that I did not, but hearing his answers to the Senator from Montana, I want now to inquire whether his address the other day was intended for some other of his colleagues than the Senator from Montana, who was excepted.

Mr. BRUCE. There is no use of going into that.

Mr. ROBINSON. Let me say that I do not think any very great good is to be accomplished by acrimonious debate or personal allusions.

Mr. BRUCE. No.

Mr. ROBINSON. And I myself have never indulged in them.

Mr. BRUCE. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Maryland has asked me for my personal question. Let me say, in reply to that, that from his whole course toward the colleagues on this side of the Chamber he will have to get his character as an amiable Democrat toward his colleagues from some other source.

Mr. BRUCE. Oh, I want to get it when you all unite again on the right sort of platform.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator is criticizing the platform.

May I ask the Senator what provisions of the Democratic platform he wants to eliminate, now that the campaign is over and the election accomplished? The Senator, it seems, now addresses his objection to the Democratic platform.

Mr. BRUCE. The time will come when all that passing error, as I saw it, will sink into the infinite past. As I discern it, the old current of thought and feeling that was taking us nowhere is already being reversed; and as I witness the reversal of that current—and it is settling in strongly—I can not but thinking of these characters in Shakespeare's Tempest, when the shipwrecked seamen in it were coming back from their travels:

The approaching tide
Will Shortly fill the reasonable shore
That now lies lea\ and muddy.

Let us have no more acrimony.

Mr. ROBINSON. May I suggest to the Senator from Maryland that he is the man who began it, and that I agree with him that it ought to be terminated immediately. So far as I am concerned, I have not said anything that by any possibility of construction could be construed as an intimation to the performance, which must be very gratifying to our friends on the other side of the Chamber, and which I have not the slightest doubt they have stimulated.

Mr. BRUCE. No; that is not.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator is like an old woman; he wants the last word; and so far as I am concerned, he can have it. (Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.)

Mr. BRUCE. Well, have you not noticed that the old women always have it?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; and I notice that the Senator is yielding.

Mr. BRUCE. Well, I will tell you: I do not mind so much—

Mr. PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend just a moment. Under the rules of the Senate, demonstrations of approval or disapproval are not allowed in the galleries; and the Chair desires to admonish the occupants of the galleries and advise them of that rule.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator from Arkansas is entitled to his laugh. That is all right. All I want to say to him is that I do not mind so much being called an old woman, because—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President?

Mr. BRUCE. One minute.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BRUCE. One minute. I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. It would be unparliamentary to call the Senator an old woman, however much he resembled one. It was not unparliamentary to say that he was like an old woman.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I thought the Senator yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will refrain from interrupting. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BRUCE. I feel it my bounden duty to remark that I recalled last winter to the Senator. We had once a very distinguished Democrat in Baltimore who had a most wonderful gift for preserving his good humor in the interruption of his speeches. On one occasion an Irishman named Larry Finnegan kept on interrupting him, just exactly as the Senator from Arkansas is now interrupting me. This was Governor Brady, and I believe the governor turned to him and said, "Be easy, Larry; and if you can't be easy, be as easy as you can."
The Senator says I am an old woman.
Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. BRUCE. No, Senator.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Arkansas?
Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has misquoted me.
Mr. BRUCE. Now, Senator--
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Arkansas?
Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has misquoted me.
Mr. BRUCE. Now, Senator--
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Arkansas?
Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has misquoted me.
Mr. BRUCE. I think that I understood what the Senator said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.
Mr. BRUCE. I say, I do not mind so much being put in the class of old women, because I recollect that my friend Benjamin Franklin once said, one of his famous productions, that all old women are good women.

Mr. ASHURST. All the old men are good men.

Mr. BRUCE. It is also true that in this world there are various types of old men, some of them are nearly as pestiferous as old women.

Mr. ROBINSON. Why does the Senator look in this direction when he makes a remark like that?

Mr. BRUCE. They are usually from the State of Arkansas.

Now, Senators, I really must conclude. All I want to say is that I have nothing except the warmest and most cordial feelings of regard for every single one of my fellow Democrats in this Chamber—for you, for you, for you, for you, for you, for you—and I hope that the time will come, if it has not come already, when I can say that that feeling is heartily reciprocated.

RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL SALARIES—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I hesitate to interrupt in any way the family quarrel across the Chamber. I rather thought, however, that the people of the country had settled those questions in an emphatic manner to the tune of some 7,000,000 votes last November; but apparently the quarrel continues on the floor of the Senate.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement we have only two days in which to consider the veto message of the President of the United States of the so-called postal salary increase bill. Likewise, under the unanimous-consent agreement, we are compelled to dispose to-day of a motion which is pending that the message and bill be referred to the Post Office and Post Roads Committee.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a question in that connection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. EDGE. I will yield for a question.

Mr. HARRISON. I merely want to state that I have an amendment pending, instructing the committee to report back the bill immediately with the recommendation that it pass so I hope, if the Senator is in favor of my amendment, that he will say something about it.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, the veto message was made by the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Smalling), as I recall. The amendment of the Senator from Mississippi I do not recall, but that is a matter of detail that can be discussed when the Secretary states the amendment.

As I said, the Senate must dispose to-day of the pending motion. I had not intended to discuss the motion itself particularly, although I oppose it, but it was my intention, rather, to discuss the veto message itself, the reason assigned by the President of the United States for his disapproval of the bill, and to endeavor to present to the Senate in some detail why I feel that the bill should be passed, the veto message notwithstanding.

So far as the pending motion to commit is concerned, I will express my views on that in a very few sentences. It can have but one effect, and that is to postpone, if not entirely prevent, the passage of the veto message.

I have already on several occasions expressed the view that postal revenues could and should be increased. I listened, however, with a great deal of attention to the explanation of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Mossa) on the motion in reporting the bill, which he was not well prepared for the specific purpose of increasing the postal revenue, and to me it was absolutely apparent and obvious that a bill could not be expected to do this. Practically every detail of the bill, every suggested increase in revenue, was the subject of attack, was the subject of a distinct difference of opinion. It was admitted time after time by the proponents of the Senate from New Hampshire (Mr. Mossa), that he was not at all confident the figures submitted by the Post Office Department were sufficiently accurate to base an opinion as to the justification of increases to the revenue-producing system. In other words, it was apparently any Senator in the Chamber on Saturday that a bill to increase the postal revenue, as has already happened in the committee, where public hearings were held for several days, would develop great opposition, with some very good arguments, very forceful arguments as to why the Government should encourage to some extent, through nominal postal rates, the dissemination of literature, newspapers, magazines, and other printed material. The proposal which, as we all know, goes back for perhaps 20 years, and has been considered from time to time by the Congress of the United States, has to date apparently gotten nowhere. We might as well face the facts, and should face the facts. The object of the motion to commit the veto message to the committee, with the bill, is, apparently, in order to see if it will be possible to kill the Moses bill under a pending veto message.

Let me say that I feel with great regret that I find myself in a position differing with the President's viewpoint on this matter; but I do differ, and it seems to me the four or five main reasons that have been presented by the President in his veto message can be very readily explained and justify the passage of the bill. I shall attempt to analyze them in the brief time that I have.

The President's veto, as I have indicated, is based on five objections—first, economy; second, the failure to provide additional revenue in order to meet the $86,000,000 necessary, as estimated, to pay the increased salaries; third, the failure to differentiate between living costs and increases in large cities and communities by establishing a rate of wage differential in large cities than in rural communities; fourth, some reference to the prevailing wage scale in other departments and other industries of a similar character; and, fifth, the relationship of the present wages to the present cost of living. I believe those are the five major objections presented by the veto.

The objection based on economy would generally appeal to all of us, but in my judgment economy must be considered, just the same in public business as in private business. There is a type of economy that is well understood to mean the failure to recognize the cost of living in private business enterprise, and corrected after that recognition. In my judgment it is false economy to have an army of 300,000 more or less dissatisfied workers. It is a type of economy that would not be shown in the results in that great and important department of the Government.

Looking over this problem from the standpoint of economy, I was very much impressed with the Budget estimate presented to the Congress shortly after it convened last December. That Budget estimate points with pride, commendable pride, to the statement of the finances of the country at the present time. Reading, now, from the Budget report of last year, it appears in the Congressional Record, was estimated that the surplus of receipts over expenditures for the fiscal year 1924 would amount to the tidy sum of over $250,000,000, and that this $250,000,000 would increase the neighborhood of $850,000,000, an increase of some sixty million and odd dollars in the past year. It was also estimated that the increase in excess of the deficit of the departmental estimates upon which we base our expenditures, was some $175,000,000 more than the Bureau of the Budget had anticipated.

It is quite true that showing it does not seem to me the country is facing bankruptcy at this particular moment. It does not seem to me that it will be entirely unjust and an evidence of a failure to recognize economy if the Government of the United States should raise the rates of letter postage. If, for instance, upon entering the service, get approximately $27 a week, to a salary somewhere near that of hod carriers, who at the present minute get $30 a week. It does not seem to me that this great country of ours will suffer in the matter of economy if we bring the standard of wages of the 300,000 men and women carrying our mails, in all types of weather, in every
section of the country, somewhere near a parallel with the salaries paid workers in other industries which are parallel. The average of the country is generally, almost universally, I may say, commended this raise in postal salaries. That has not been true of other Government expenditures. Apparently, the public do not consider that revenues be increased are also in entire sympathy with the vested salary bill now pending, because, as we know, this bill was added intact to the revenue bill introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire. I understand that the public feels that the President's very favorable toward raising postal salaries.

I am not going to take the time of the Senate to read lengthy editorials and financial statements, but one appearing in the Chicago Tribune quite recently appealed to me as being so logical and as setting forth in such a short space the story that I am going to read it for the benefit of those Senators who are following this discussion. It is as follows:

RAISE THE PAY FOR POSTAL WORKERS

Low pay and good Postal Service cannot stick together much longer. Twenty thousand postal workers resigned last year. That is some explanation of the necessity for a revision in salaries. The editorial continues:

That is a high turner for civil-service jobs. In the last year the President vetoed last June on the postal salary increase bill, it will be better for the mail service, fairest to the workers, and the President probably will not care much.

Under present pay scales a postal clerk or carrier must work from four and a half to eight years before he can get a maximum salary of $1,800.

That is a high price to train a new man. That is a high price to turn out a product that in the best service can absorb the salary increase. I think it has been demonstrated that this deficiency is subject to adjustment.

I wish to call the Senator's attention to this—it is estimated that the deficit will amount to only $10,000,000. Taking the figures from the Post Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1926, it is estimated that the present Postmaster General and the men in his department that there will be no deficit, but that there will be a surplus.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will permit me, I will say that I have before me a statement of the figures on the deficits from 1919 down to this time, as given by the Post Office Department in the hearing before the subcommittee during the last days which I would like to put them in the record on the Senator's speech, right at this point, because they bear out what the Senator is saying.

Mr. EDGE. I thank the Senator. I will be very glad to have them inserted in the Record as a part of my remarks.

Mr. GEORGE. In 1919 the deficit was $33,950,000; in 1920 it was $38,000,000; in 1921 it was $80,000,000; in 1922 it was $86,000,000; in 1923 it was $98,000,000, and in 1924 it was $84,000,000. In 1925—and I wish to call the Senator's attention to this—it is estimated that the deficit will amount to only $10,000,000. Taking the figures from the Post Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1926, it is estimated that the present Postmaster General and the men in his department that there will be no deficit, but that there will be a surplus.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, I am very glad to have that statement inserted as a part of my remarks. I will supplement it and explain to the Senator from Ohio what probably accounts for the discrepancy. The Senator from Ohio will find in each of the reports of the Postmaster General what might be termed two distinct estimates, one based on the figures I have read, in which it is shown by the report for the year ending June 30, 1924, that the cash deficiency in postal accounts was $84,000,000, and that it added by the various matters which seem necessary to a proper consideration, but in presenting these figures I have presented them all from the reports of the department and can only give that as proof of their accuracy.

I was discussing, when interrupted, the case with which the Senator can absorb the salary increases. It has been demonstrated that there may be a possible surplus in the next year as indicated by the statement just read, and that it is quite apparent that raises of this character can be made this year without being absorbed.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. Has the Senator's attention been called to the decrease in salaries and new positions created?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; and I was coming to that later. Effective July 1, 1924, the general newsprint rate and the special newsprint rate were reduced.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have a list here. I will insert it in the Record. If I may have consent to do so, and not take the time to read it. It includes raises for a great many of the head officers, including the Assistant Postmasters General and many others, raising quite a sum in total. There was absolutely no question raised at that time, as far as I recall it, as to the necessity of increasing the income in order to meet those additional expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from New Jersey is granted.

The table is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>1924, total amount</th>
<th>Estimated salary rate, fiscal year 1925</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special assistant to the Attorney General</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special assistant, Solicitor General, Minnesota</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal officer or appointment clerk</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaster chief clerk</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Georgia?
Reclassification of salaries, Post Office Department.—Statements showing, by offices in the Districts of Columbia, the salaries, etc.—Cont.

Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL—continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidential clerk to the Postmaster General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of clerical inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative assistant to the First Assistant Postmaster General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant chief, First Assistant Postmaster General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special assistant, division of post-office service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative assistant, division of mail service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Assistant Postmaster General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief clerk, First Assistant Postmaster General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent, division of post-office service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant superintendent, division of post-office service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative assistant, division of mail service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant superintendent, division of mail service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE OF THE SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Assistant Postmaster General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief clerk, Second Assistant Postmaster General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent, division of railway adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant superintendent, division of railway wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General superintendent, Division of Railway Mail Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of Office Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE OF THE THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Assistant Postmaster General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief clerk, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent, division of rural mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant superintendent of engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent, division of mail service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Dropped in lieu of administrative assistant.  
2 New.

Mr. EDGE. Another matter of great importance enters into the consideration of the policy of raising the revenue to meet the additional expenses involved. I have always attempted to make clear my position as a Member of this body, and I hope I have partially succeeded, as to believing and adhering to business principles. I remember my good friend from Ohio (Mr. Willis), when the bill was under discussion last June, raised the question if I did not believe that in effect every business should stand on its own bottom, and that the income should be sufficient to pay the expense of conducting the business. Generally speaking, I heartily agree with the suggestion and always have agreed with that conviction and policy. However, the service of the Post Office Department is quite a different proposition from the average private business, and always will be, and of necessity.

For instance, if Senators will turn to the report of the Postmaster General for the year ending June 30, 1924, they will find a paragraph devoted to free mailing privileges. In that paragraph it will be found that it is estimated that there were over 4,500,000 pieces of matter, weighing over 69,000,000 pounds, mailed free under the penalty privilege, the postage on which, at the ordinary rate, would amount to $12,842,000. The average business would, of course, not give away anything. The laws of the United States provide, as we all well know, that the franking privilege applies for departmental and congressional mail, and that a great volume of mail matter, notwithstanding the 69,000,000 pounds annually, is carried by the mails entirely free, but costing the Government over $12,842,000.

Again, we have a system in the country provided by statute—even the Postmaster General, addressed to the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. McLean), I have no doubt that the same will be true of other States, the laws of the country, known as the "free-in-county" mailings of second-class publications, which aggregated 67,000,000 pounds of matter carried during the year as covered by the report just referred to. We have other free mailing privileges for institutions, none of which I am criticising. We are simply pointing out the absurdity to compare with a business enterprise where for all service rendered a regulated or proper amount would be paid, and if that were done the Post Office Department, with the stated results, would have the increased income which reports demonstrate year by year, would right now show a decided surplus or profit to the taxpayers of the United States.

The question of policy as to whether postal salaries should be increased unless postal revenues are increased presents another interesting thought. As a matter of fact we have not increased postal revenues for a number of years with the exception of temporary increases during the war, and postage was increased and immediately reduced at the close of the war. As a matter of fact the tendency has been to lower postal rates, as I indicated at the beginning of my remarks.

The conviction has apparently come about that the Postal Service of the United States to a great extent is one of those great helpful departments of the Government, as is the Agricultural Department or the Department of the Interior, which contributes to the benefit and the upbuilding of the country, disseminating information, helping to build up communities, giving the people an opportunity to get more closely in touch with the news of the day and of the world. For that apparent conviction, we have always tried to keep rates down, and, in my judgment, properly so. As I said, the tendency has been to lower, not to try to increase rates unintelligently in order to meet a worthy and necessary increase in postal salaries.

A few years ago, before the war, we lowered the first-class postage rate from 3 cents to 2 cents an ounce. By the same process we increased the second-class, third-class, and other classes of mail, and raised the fourth-class. That is what I tried to point out, that we increased revenues, then we reduced the first-class postage from 3 cents to 2 cents, and of course decreased the revenues, we should have immediately decreased the salaries of the employees of the United States. It is a poor principle that does not work both ways.

No, Mr. President, there is no real businesslike relation between the income of the Post Office Department and the salaries to be paid to the men and women who work in that department. Fix the rates where they should be, but not necessitated by proper salary rates.

Are either entitled to an increase or are they not? If they are entitled to an increase, then it must come from some form of taxation, and it makes little difference to the public, after all is said and done, what the form of taxation may be. They pay it and that is all. It comes from anywhere, whether as additional postage to send second-class matter, newspapers, and magazines through the mails, or whether it is some other form of taxation.

A question before us is whether $23 a week, the present salary for a letter carrier, is proper in proportion to the $36 a week paid to the hod carrier. I am not depreciating the importance of the hod carrier, but I do think in a service of the nature of the Post Office Department, wages should be paid that who must necessarily have a fair and good education to meet the civil-service requirements, offering them absolutely no future excepting if they remain five years they will gradually raise from $1,400, the minimum, to $1,800, and there stop unless they can get into some special class or later become a superior or something of that character, the employees should have more consideration.

It is not comparable with any other type of business on earth. A man goes at a low salary into a business institution, a bank, or factory, and has a natural hope and expectation that the applies himself be work gradually get ahead and perhaps become the president of that organization some day. He has not such chance when he enters the Postal Service of the United States. We should pay them higher in comparison. We should not even try to compare them with the average salary of the bank clerk or some one else of that character. Speaking of that, I can show in a few words that they are not comparable with the employees of that class or later become a superior or something of that character, the employees should have more consideration.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator how the wages provided in his bill compare with the wages paid to employees in other Government departments where the services are comparable?

Mr. EDGE. I can answer that to a certain extent. There was a letter printed in the Congressional Record a few days ago from the Post Office Department, addressed to the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Coffee). I have no doubt that the same will be true of other States, the laws of the country, known as the "free-in-county" mailings of second-class publications, which aggregated 67,000,000 pounds of matter carried during the year.
correctly, was lower in some departments as compared to the Post Office Department. I inquired about that, because it was an interesting situation, although I think it would be most difficult to properly compare some departments of the Government, with entirely inside work, to some classes of the Post Office Department. At the same time, waiving that objection, I have been informed, and I can only give the Senator my best judgment, that if we would average all the workers in the various classifications, estimating the average from the first to sixth classes, which only included clerks whose salaries were in the neighborhood of $1,500 to $2,000 a year, we would find that much larger in proportion, while in the Post Office Department it includes clerks of all grades from first to and including supervisors, some of whom receive as high as $4,200. So that as we view it, the natural average, setting down to a minimum of $1,400, would, of course, be greater than from a similar minimum to a maximum of $1,800 or $2,000. I am simply transmitting the general information I have without the actual figures.

Continuing on the subject of the necessity to raise revenue, in order that the bill may become a law, we are faced with facts and not theories. I do not believe there is a Senator who will not agree that we can pass a bill this year raising revenues, even though we could prepare a scientific one, which the chairman of the committee himself could defend. Then we are faced with the situation, if that is the case, that the postal rates cannot be increased, certainly at this session of Congress. We have here a bill on which I regret being compelled to take a different position from that of the Chief Executive, whose economy record I have indefinitely praised.

We are faced with the situation that unless this bill, which has now gone nine-tenths of its parliamentary journey, shall be passed over the head of the postal salaries will not be raised and can be raised certainly until a future session of Congress.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey permit a question?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. Suppose the President's veto of the bill should be sustained, will the Senator from New Jersey in his absence, or for any other reason, assist in having passed a bill that will increase the salaries just as they are proposed to be in the bill vetoed and at the same time produce the revenue?

Mr. EDGE. Most assuredly, Mr. President. I have stated that fact so many times that I am surprised at the question. I shall be glad to assist in any possible way to pass a bill to raise salaries, but I am trying to point out the facts, and facts are hard to refute.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey permit me to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. I listened to the inquiry submitted by the Senator from South Dakota, and I inferred that he was alluding to the bill which he introduced and which was reported by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MccENney].

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will permit me-

Mr. EDGE. Yes; I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. I will state to the Senator from Virginia that I find in the document before me a few comparisons with certain sections of the country. The writer of the letter states:

'The letter is so practical, so matter of fact, and so direct that I thought it would appeal to the Senate. I have kept careful accounts of our expenses, and this is correct to a dollar. There may be some items here which a mail carrier should

Mr. STERLING. I would call a bill which provides for taxation generally, for taxation for the general expenses of the Government, a revenue bill within the meaning of the Constitution. A revenue bill is defined by the authorities. Mr. President, I do not think this is at all a revenue bill. It is true that if enacted it would raise some revenue by the adjustment of rates of postage, but such revenue would be merely incidental to the purpose or object of the bill. In the course of this discussion I will refer to the authorities on the subject, I will say to the Senator from Virginia, the average of the postal salaries.
not aspire to. For instance, the insurance on our lives; but I do not think this is likely desirable.

I went into the service in 1918, when it was next to impossible to get men at the price offered by the Government. I turned down an offer of $1,000 per year and went into the post office at $600 per year; and very soon the salary has taken 7 per cent.

If you can use this to any advantage when our salary bill comes up on January 5, I will be glad to have been of some small service in a good cause.

If, as including the President, seem to agree, the proposed raise is merited, why should it not be given to us, and provision made as soon as possible thereafter for increasing the revenue to meet the extra expense?

You know, and the President knows, and we carriers know, that if the administration bill takes the place of the present bill it will not be passed at this session of Congress.

Retail prices, at least in this section of the country, are going up. The only thing that I can think of that is cheaper than last year is coal. Good bituminous coal now sells for $13 to $15 per ton, about $2 per ton cheaper than last year.

Suits for men that cost $25 last year now cost $30 to $35; our uniforms are $5 to $10 higher.

Flour sells at 4.85 to 5 per hundred. Sugar, butter, eggs, meat, lard, etc. In fact, almost anything you buy is 5 to 10 per cent higher than a year ago.

Hoping that your efforts in behalf of the postal employees of the country will be rewarded and assuring you of our appreciation of your efforts.

Yours truly,

S. B. Barr
City Carrier No. 2, Devils Lake, N. Dak.

I wanted to read particularly the tabulation inclosed by Mr. Barr, entitled "How I spent my salary for last year":

1. Rent, at $35 per month

That is not extravagant.

2. Fuel (10 tons soft coal, at $1.50 per ton)

$150.00

3. Grocers' bills for the year

$259.07

Remember this is for a family of five.

4. Clothing for family of five, including one winter uniform, one cap and trousers for summer wear

$354.15

5. Life insurance as follows:

$96.84

$1,000 on my wife's life

$31.00

$500 on my son's life

$77.24

$1,000 on my daughter's life

$23.58

Total

$220.56

6. To church, $1 per week

$52.00

7. Light, water, and phone

$62.14

8. Doctor bills

$50.00

They are very fortunate in having such small doctors' bills in North Dakota.

9. Helping son and daughter in college

$200.00

10. Vacation trip for three of us

$200.00

Total

$1,877.96

Salary $1,800, less 2 1/2 per cent

$1,735.00

Deficit

$122.96

I presume that 2 1/2 per cent is the amount deducted on account of the Federal retirement fund.

Above is for family of five. One son and one daughter in college, and one son in junior high school.

The son and daughter in college are earning most of their expenses.

Which items shall I cut out this year?

S. B. Barr
City Carrier No. 2.

Mr. President, that is a sample of hundreds of similar letters which I have received. The writer of that letter is receiving the maximum. If he remains in the service until he dies in his tracks, he will not receive more than $1,800, unless legislation shall be passed increasing his compensation. Is he likely to look forward to some kind of a pension in the case of his retirement? In my judgment, in the face of such an illustration as that contained in the letter, it is not just to attempt to keep postal salaries at the standard on which they are now fixed.

The question has likewise been raised as to the differentials between city and country districts. That I think was the fifth and last item raised in this letter. While I concede there should be some increases as I recall, it was conceded that they should be distinct as between the cities and the rural districts. Those Senators who heard the Senator from the New Hampshire [Mr. Morse] discussing that problem on Saturday will realize how impossible it was for the committee to arrive at any differential. As a matter of fact, the problem does not work out in the manner in which it might be supposed to work out. In a number of cities, the living costs are less than they are in the suburbs of that city, such as Englewood and many of the other suburbs which might be named; and yet under any possible device for a differential, which could only be had by a bill, or the receipts of the offices, and naturally the receipts of the offices of New York and Chicago would be in that class which would invalidate the analysis. Any analysis would give higher differentials for the carriers and clerks within the city limits, although the clerks and carriers in many of the suburban towns, living in the towns where they work, are paying to-day a higher cost of living than some of the postal employees who live in houses in the hearts of the large cities. So the differential scheme does not work out; it can not be made practicable.

The unit system in all branches of the Government was referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Morse], who pointed out that a customs officer at some little point in Vermont or Maine, on the border line between Canada and the United States, receives exactly the same compensation as a customs inspector in the city of New York. The proposed increase is based to a great extent, of course, on the cost of living. Just as all the expenses of the Government should be proportionate to that cost, so we can not differentiate an automatic, hard-and-fast way and be at all fair to the large army of workers of this great branch of the public service.

Mr. President, it seems to me that I have demonstrated—I hope you, at least—that the five objections which have been raised are not, in fact, objections which may not easily be overcome by careful consideration of the circumstances. As to the great objection of economy, I stand with the President at all times for that economy to which we are entitled, and for the welfare of the people of this country, but I sincerely believe in this instance the economy which is proposed is a false one. In view of the great expense which is gathered, with our income in excess of our anticipated expenditures year after year, it seems to me that it is not necessary to grind down any of the employees of the Government or to necessitate passing a bill increasing the revenue in which great objections are raised, in order to bring this army of 300,000 men and women into a condition which will be some what pertinent to that of their fellow workers throughout the country. Do not let us be economical to a cost that is economical when it comes to some of the great experiments which are costing hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers to-day. Livelihood is not an experiment.

We are spending, apparently cheerfully, forty or fifty million dollars a year as a deficit in maintaining a merchant marine. I do not complain of it, because I recognize the great value of a merchant marine. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to develop various sections of our country, or at least to encourage their development, through the improvement of rivers and streams and bays and harbors, and we do it cheerfully. We do it because we believe it adds to the greatness and development of our country, because it encourages initiative and development. With all those splendid tributes to the determina­tion of our fellow citizens who are working for us, we offer a great opposition of compensation to an army of men and women whose entire future is wrapped up alone in the Government of the United States? It is plainly evident that we are following precedent when we raise their salaries without revising revenues. Why such a crime now? We are only placing them somewhere near the compensation of comparable employment in other lines of industry; we are encouraging them to better service and protecting a service which has lost 50,000 men and women in one year, and we are encouraging what should be and is the fundamental of all business—a happy, contented, a well-developed, a 100 per cent Postal Service.

Mr. President, as much as many of my colleagues—and I am with them—regret to be compelled to vote to override a veto of the great President of the United States, I am sure the Senate of the United States will realize that this is just, that this must be done, and that it would be cowardice to put it off for another eight months.

Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. President, when this matter was before the Senate last spring I moved a similar amendment, and therefore shall not find it necessary to take up very much time now. Since what I said was referred to by the Senator from New Jersey, however, I think it proper to quote from the Record to see just what I said.

On page 9592 of the Record for May 27 I said in part:

I myself went before the joint committee and made a statement in favor of an increase in postal salaries, but in every statement that I made and in every letter that I wrote I coupled this condition with
my request—that while, in my judgment, postal salaries ought to be increased, there ought to be at the same time such a readjustment of postal rates as would make the Post Office Department practically self-supporting. In my understanding that such a bill would be reported by the committee, but on examining the pending bill I discover that not a single word is contained in it in reference to an increase in postal revenue; that nothing has been done toward the readjustment of postal rates.

And then subsequently, in the course of the discussion, I made it as clear as I could that, while I favored the increase of postal salaries, I utterly rejected the theory then put forth, and now put forth, by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Exon] that there ought not to be any connection between income and expenditure.

Mr. President, to me it is an amazing theory to be advocated by a great Senator and a great business man—and the Senator from New Jersey is both of these—that in the conduct of such a business as is carried on by the Post Office Department we ought entirely to disregard the matter of relationship between income and expenditure. I understood the Senator's argument to be, in part, that because, according to the report of the Budget Commissioner, there was a surplus this year in the general fund of the Government of $329,000,000, and next year that the estimated surplus of $306,000,000, therefore we ought to pass this bill without any reference to the income of the Post Office Department and dig into the general funds of the people to pay the approximately $70,000,000 per annum increase which would be entailed by the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. President, there is a difference between the Post Office Department and other departments. It is said: "Why, we do not expect to get money returns for what we expend in the War Department, or perhaps not in the Interior Department." But, Mr. President, the Post Office Department carries on a different sort of work. It renders a direct service for certain people. It serves letters for some people and packages for other people. My contention is that so far as may be the people who use the post-office service ought to pay for the service, and it is the contention of the Senator from New Jersey that we ought not to pay any special attention to that.

Mr. EDGE rose.

Mr. WILLIS. I withdraw that statement. I think I overstated the Senator's contention a little bit.

Mr. EDGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIS. I will permit the Senator to state his own position, if he desires.

Mr. EDGE. No.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator did not state it quite in that way, but he did state repeatedly that it was of no importance at all that there should be any connection between income and expenditure; and it is his belief, I understand, that the deficit already existing—a deficit of approximately $40,000,000 a year; $30,000,000, according to the report that I have before me, and I will put all those figures in the Record, since they have been disputed—ought not to be considered in this connection.

Mr. EDGE. Will the Senator at the same time put in the $14,000,000 in one year that has been referred to?

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator can put in anything he desires in his own speech, but he cannot put it in my speech.

So that that matter may be cleared up definitely, Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record the table that appears on page 11 of this document, Senate Document No. 162, "Cost of Handling Mail Matter." The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

GROWTH OF THE POSTAL SERVICE—RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR CERTAIN YEARS FROM 1860 TO 1923

The growth of the Postal Service has been phenomenal. A comparison of the receipts and expenditures for certain years from 1860 to 1923 shows the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1920</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td>$290,804</td>
<td>$550,668,441</td>
<td>$1,111,077</td>
<td>$1,340,363</td>
<td>$3,106,700</td>
<td>$7,000,736</td>
<td>$11,772,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>213,894</td>
<td>490,969,700</td>
<td>1,169,626</td>
<td>1,340,786</td>
<td>3,000,700</td>
<td>6,000,736</td>
<td>11,772,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of receipts</td>
<td>$76,910</td>
<td>$36,698,696</td>
<td>$1,167,451</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$3,066,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of expenditures</td>
<td>$76,910</td>
<td>$36,698,696</td>
<td>$1,167,451</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$3,066,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This bill adds approximately $68,000,000 to the annual expenditures of the Government. It makes no provision for raising this amount as

1 Exclusive of $4,000,000, war-tax revenue accruing from increased postage rates.
2 Exclusive of $5,000,000, war-tax revenue accruing from increased postage rates.
3 Including estimated outstanding obligations.

Mr. WILLIS. Now, since I am referring to that, we will just check up on some of those figures.

The table, as it will be observed, shows receipts and expenditures in different years, first by 10-year periods. Going back as early as 1860, there was in that year a surplus of receipts of $65,000. In 1870 there was a surplus of receipts of $35,000. Then in 1880 it went the other way, and there was a surplus of expenditures of $45,000, and so on down. In 1850 there was an excess of receipts of $267,000, and in 1890 there was an excess of expenditures of $10,000,000. But coming down to more recent times—all of the table will appear in the Record—in 1920 there was an excess of expenditures of $35,000,000, in 1921 of $73,000,000, in 1922 of $39,000,000, and in 1923 of $39,000,000; so it is approximately $40,000,000. These enormous deficits indicate a growing tendency to disregard the sound economic policy which dominated when revenues and expenses were practically equal.

It is the contention of the Senator from New Jersey that instead of seeking finance, that already exists—a deficit, as I have shown, of approximately $40,000,000 per year—we should, without any reference to the income, add another deficit of approximately $70,000,000 a year, making a total deficit in that department of $110,000,000 per year, and yet upon that statement of facts the Senator averns that he is cordially in favor of the economy program of the President.

If the proposal is to take $110,000,000 out of the surplus of $292,000,000 that is indicated for the present year, if $110,000,000 is to go to one department to make up the deficit there, what becomes of the tax-reduction program to which the Senate most eloquently has pledged himself for the cause, if we shall now abandon the theory heretofore held that the people who use the service shall pay for it, and adopt the theory now advanced that the Post Office Department shall be carried on out of the general revenues, it is perfectly apparent that there can be and will be no tax reduction. The added $70,000,000 per year on the debt side will render practically impossible the tax-reduction program to which the President and Congress are pledged.

Since reference has been made to what the President said, it might be interesting right at this point to see just what he did say about this matter of economy. I have here a copy of the President's message. Let me read just two or three paragraphs.

On page 1 of the message he said, referring to Senate bill 1883:

This bill adds approximately $68,000,000 to the annual expenditures of the Government. It makes no provision for raising this amount as
postal revenue. The money must come from the pockets of the taxpayers. To the extent that we create further obligations which must not be met from the monies derived from taxation, to that extent we reduce the possibility of further reductions in taxes. Before such obligations are created it should be conclusively shown that they are essential in the best interests of the Nation.

The President further said:

It may be that some adjustments would be justified. So far as I am concerned I would be willing to go further than that. I believe that there is justification for a general increase of bond issues and that we have stated repeatedly, publicly and privately, in the Senate and out of it; but the thing I cannot understand is this: Why is it that Senators who say they are in favor of these increased salaries at the same time are opposing every act or proposal for raising the revenue, but insist that it shall be put on the shoulders of the general taxpayers of the country?

The President goes on to say:

It may be that some adjustments would be justified, but an organized effort by a near body of public employees to secure an indeterminate increase in compensation should have the most searching scrutiny. The needs of the public, the ability of the people to pay, must have some consideration.

Then, on page 3, the President says further, touching the financial side of the question:

Aside from this, no provision is made in this bill for raising the money which could be required to meet the additional expenditures which it proposes. Under its provisions we would be required to meet an additional expense of approximately $68,000,000 per year from the monies paid by the taxpayers and pass it on to the employees of the Postal Service. Certainly the interests of the people demand that any legislation increasing the cost of the Postal Service should give consideration to the raising of the monies necessary to defray the additional cost.

For the fiscal year 1926, the postal revenues were $52,990,950 less than the cost of the service for that year.

So that is what the President actually says upon the question of the finance, the question of economy; and, Mr. President, so far as I have yet heard or read, there has been no answer to that argument, and there will not be, and can not be, if it is a simple matter. Here is a service that is rendered to the people. Then the people who use the service ought, in the long run, to pay for it, rather than the general taxpayer, who individually may not use that service to any great extent.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio rise to a question?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BROOKHART. Does the Senator claim that each taxpayer ought to pay for the service which is rendered in carrying on this business?

Mr. WILLIS. Oh, Mr. President, that is not practical, of course, except approximately. You can not get that.

Mr. BROOKHART. No. I hear that argument a lot, that we ought to have letters for some people at much less than the cost of the service and charge up the excess to some other people.

Mr. WILLIS. I quite understand the Senator's contention. Of course, they can reach only an approximation in such things.

Mr. BROOKHART. Take the carriage of franked mail or penalty mail. That all has to be paid for by general taxation.

Mr. WILLIS. I agree with the Senator on that point. If the Senate will permit me now, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to have printed the Table No. 80, found on page 1290 of Senate Document No. 162. It relates entirely to cost ascertainment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Table 80,—Statement showing recapitulation of allocations and approximations of revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year 1926, shown in Table A, according to the classes of mail matter and special services, and the loss or gain on each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes of mail matter and special services</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Loss</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First class</td>
<td>$271,894,051.49</td>
<td>$191,476,335.17</td>
<td>$80,417,716.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second class</td>
<td>$74,508,903.27</td>
<td>$58,520,926.25</td>
<td>$15,987,977.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third class</td>
<td>$31,214,425.47</td>
<td>$26,352,902.25</td>
<td>$4,861,523.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth class</td>
<td>$47,234,903.40</td>
<td>$43,844,940.77</td>
<td>$3,399,962.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franked matter</td>
<td>$7,773,776.74</td>
<td>$4,990,504.00</td>
<td>$2,783,272.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Savings</td>
<td>$1,592,077.63</td>
<td>$1,447,572.00</td>
<td>$144,405.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 0. D.</td>
<td>$9,079,148.35</td>
<td>$8,940,940.74</td>
<td>$138,207.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>$255,047,347.41</td>
<td>$237,229,260.51</td>
<td>$17,818,086.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. WILLIS. Now, answering the Senator's question, of course I recognize that an absolute allocation of cost is not possible but when force figures are brought out by this report—for example, that first-class matter now makes a profit of $80,000,000 a year; that second-class matter is carried at a loss of $74,000,000 a year; that third-class matter is carried at a loss of $10,000,000 a year; and that the classes of mail matter which are creating the deficit to bear some of the burden, rather than to put it upon the general taxpayers.

Mr. BROOKHART. Are those facts based upon somebody's opinion?

Mr. WILLIS. Undoubtedly; that always will be the case. Mr. BROOKHART. Is there not quite a diversity of opinion as to that allocation?

Mr. WILLIS. Undoubtedly. Right on that point let me read something to the Senator that I wanted to use in the course of my remarks, and which I will take up right now. I think the question raised by the Senator is perfectly pertinent. Of course it is always bound to be a matter of opinion amongst the experts as to how these costs ought to be allocated. It is known, however, that this matter was the subject of inquiry and investigation for years. First, that was the report of the Hughes Commission, which went into the subject pretty thoroughly. All told, there have been spent something like $500,000 in ascertaining these facts.

The Senator from Iowa has just raised a very proper question as to the reliability of the findings of fact embodied in this report. The report was most carefully prepared, following an inquiry that extended over a number of years, including within its scope the report of the Hughes Commission. Following all that, this report was submitted to two firms of expert accountants, and at page 123 of Senate Document 162 I quote from what one of these firms—W. B. Dickenson & Co.—said relative to this report, so that the reliability of the statements of fact may be established, so far as possible:

"It had been our Intention to take up the points covered in the department's report step by step, but that report explains all the essential details and the reasons so clearly, that such a discussion on our part would be a repetition."

Note this:

It is our opinion that the principles involved are sound, that the work has been carefully and conscientiously done, and that the committee has achieved creditable results.

Subsequently this report was submitted to the firm of accountants known as Ernst & Ernst. I read fugitively from their report, just a paragraph or two, so that it may be clearly established that, so far as such a thing is possible, we have the facts now upon which to base our action. They say at page 123:

"We examined the data acquired as a result of the tests made under the direction of the cost committee, and noted the evidences of other
ight and thought devoted to their development and application in the individual operations. They were in our opinion sufficient to reflect average conditions, and the committee, in our opinion, exercised good judgment in determining upon the extent of the tests, having regard for the variety of conditions and geographical distribution.

Mr. EDDIE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. EDDIE. Was the Senator in the Chamber Saturday when the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Mosier] in presenting his bill, based to some extent, I presume, upon that report, stated that while the report indicated that parcel post, fourth-class matter, had developed a deficit of something over $6,000,000, it was his firm opinion that it was nearer $3,000,000?

Mr. WILLIS. I think I heard the Senator make that statement.

Mr. EDDIE. That was a statement made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Mosier].

Mr. WILLIS. Of course, Mr. President, I recognize that those must always be matters of estimate. The point I am now making is that we have before us a report that has been made after years of careful inquiry, and I am now undertaking to bring to the attention of the Senate what the expert accountants think of the methods that were pursued.

Ernst & further said:

A review of the revenues and expenditures over a period of several years and investigation and inquiries made by us in the course of our examination of this field all serve to influence us in the opinion that the statistical period selected by the cost committee is fully justified, in that it reflects a normal or average condition in regard to the relation of the various classes of mail handled and special services rendered. The conclusion which we reached justifies the opinion that if the analysis work had been carried forward for an entire year the final results would not be changed to any appreciable extent.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNary in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to get a right understanding, so as to give proper weight to this evidence and the opinion of these experts. By whom were they employed?

Mr. WILLIS. I could not answer the Senator's question from personal knowledge, but I understand they were employed by the commission. The Senator has the report. This is a letter to the Postmaster General from Ernst & Ernst. I really do not know by whom they were employed.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand it, the cost ascertainment committee received several reports, but those experts were not examined into the matters under investigation. They examined the report of the committee. So that we would have a second view of some extent, we were employing some outside fellows to look over their work, in order to get their opinion of their work; and paying them for that, I suppose. Of course, the experts said, "Why, it is fine work; good business."

Mr. WILLIS. As I understand the matter, these were men:

Mr. NORRIS. I am not trying to disparage the report. I only want to have the facts clear so as to know the weight which the reports are entitled.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. I think the Senator from Nebraska has an erroneous view.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to be corrected. I am trying to get information.

Mr. STERLING. Experts were first suggested and employed, I think, at the instance of the joint commission on postal facilities, and they assisted not only in the way of looking over the reports prepared by the Post Office Department, but also in the preparation of the report of the joint commission. Then that report was subject to review by yet other experts who had not participated at all in the preparation of the report.

Mr. WILLIS. How were those experts selected?

Mr. STERLING. They were selected by the Post Office authorities themselves.

Mr. WILLIS. All I know about it is what appears in the document which the Senator has before him.

Mr. NORRIS. That is all I know about it, and I judge from what they say there that their work consisted mainly in looking over the report of the commission.

Mr. WILLIS. As far as these accountants were concerned, I think that is true, though I think it is to be regretted that they did have experts in their employ all the time in getting the facts.

Mr. STERLING. It did.

Mr. WILLIS. This is simply an estimate given by Ernst & Ernst.

Mr. STERLING. Ernst & Ernst were certified accountants employed by the Post Office Department for the purpose of examining the report.

Mr. WILLIS. I must say, without desiring to advertise Ernst & Ernst, if it would be an advertisement, that my knowledge of that concern would lead me to believe that they could not be induced at all, even if anyone tried to induce them, to make a false report.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not mean that the Senator implied that. Mr. NORRIS. I do not mean to disparage their work.

Mr. WILLIS. I understand that.

Mr. NORRIS. But, as a matter of fact, if they were employed by a committee and asked to examine their report, and were paid for their work, as, of course, they were entitled to be, that fact is something which ought to be taken into consideration in weighing the evidence.

Mr. WILLIS. I agree with the Senator that that is proper to be considered. Ernst & Ernst further say in their report, at page 180 of this document—just reading occasional paragraphs, as so not to take too much time:

In our examination of offices and agencies in the field we were impressed with the fact that employees assigned to supervise the work were qualified by experience in the service and by special training for the responsibilities assumed by them. Our examination in the field influenced us in the opinion that the collecting of data and the reporting of it was given serious consideration by postmasters and others, and that the data submitted is adequate for the purpose for which it was used.

It is evident that care was exerted in selecting the men to make that report, and there is also evidence of an endeavor to accumulate such tests at a time when in the best judgment of all concerned a normal or average condition prevailed.

Then, at page 200, here is a paragraph which may be interesting:

In our contact with the officials of the Post Office Department and the cost committee we were impressed with their sincere endeavors to produce a result based on all available facts, unimpeached by personal or other considerations, and we received an unusual degree of willing cooperation and a hearty response to all of our inquiries and recommendations. This same opinion manifested itself in the field and has gone far in the accomplishment of the results which are so fully set out in the complete report covering the entire investigation.

We were impressed most favorably with the way in which we were received on the part of the cost committee in the development and application of their methods and the ability demonstrated by them in the direction and administration of so large an organization covering so wide an inquiry of current and cost finding.

It is our opinion that the data obtained for the purpose can be considered adequate and that it has been used in accordance with the best established practices observed in obtaining similar results in commercial enterprises. The report of the cost committee reflects a fair and reasonably accurate approximation of the relative revenues and expenditures applicable to the several classes of mail and special services.

I read that so that it may be a matter of record that this is not a mere guess, though it must be, as such things always will have to be, a matter of approximation. Let us suppose that here goes a mail train, laden with mail, some of it letters, some of it circulates, some newspapers; some going here and some there. It is a very difficult problem to work out the relative costs. The point I make is that after years of most intensive study, with the greatest care, these results have been reached, as indicated in the table which I have already asked to be printed as a part of my remarks.

Mr. DALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. DALE. Of course the Senator knows that it is shown in the report that certain classes of mail are carried at a loss, because some of it goes at a preferential rate because it
is religious, educational, or scientific, and that the parcel-post service is carried, even though at a loss, because of its advantage to the public. In raising this revenue where would the Senator make up this loss; on the other classes of mail? If not, he has not been very explicit. I think neither figure is material to the argument I am making.

Mr. WILLIS. That perhaps can be explained by the postal regulations. At all events, I do not know what other authority to apply to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NORRIS. I state to the Senator by a suggestion I got from the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Daz], in his question. It does not seem to me the Senator from Ohio made that plain, at least not to me. The Senator from Vermont asked a question that applies not only to franked mail and penalty mail but, as specifically said, it applies to mail that is given a preferential rate, such as religious magazines, scientific magazines, and so forth. I think he might have added another item in the Post Office Department—rural free delivery mail—all of which make up a part of the general loss. I would like to ask the Senator if he expects not only penalty mail and franked mail but the mail mentioned by the Senator from Vermont can be separated from the general business, and I would like to add to that the question whether he expects to separate the rural free delivery mail and whether, as to newspapers and magazines, there shall be postage rates sufficient high to pay it all?

Mr. WILLIS. I think that is a fair question, and I will answer it as fully as I can. I do not think it is impossible to reach an approximation of figures. My own information, as brought out by the inquiry submitted by the Senator from Vermont, is that particularly in the case of the franked matter and penalty matter it ought not to be charged to the Post Office Department. As to the other matters, such as religious publications, as I recall under the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Scopes], and reported on Saturday last by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moss], that objection is removed, but I think that is a relatively minor matter. There are some big, outstanding facts.

We know that third-class mail is carried at a tremendously low loss. We know that second-class mail is carried at a big loss. It seems to me that we should at least make an effort to make an adjustment of this expenditure rather than to shovel it into the Treasury and take out of the general funds of everybody and put an additional burden upon the taxpayers and not upon those who use the service.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit another interruption, the classes of mail suggested by the Senator from Vermont, to which I have added the other items, particularly second-class mail matter, are the ones that make up the great big losses in the Post Office Department. I supposed that was common knowledge. There is a great deal on second-class mail matter.

Mr. WILLIS. Yes; some $75,000,000.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator think we ought to charge a high enough rate on that particular matter to make up the loss?

Mr. WILLIS. I would doubt that, if I understand the Senator's question.

Mr. NORRIS. Then why not make that part of it out and make appropriation to cover that specifically?

Mr. WILLIS. Did the Senator mean whether we should charge on religious and scientific publications?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I included those as well as other second-class mail matter.

Mr. WILLIS. That opens up a great question of policy. Mr. NORRIS. Would the Senator charge a higher rate for a letter or a parcel or a paper that is delivered on a rural free delivery route than when delivered in town?

Mr. WILLIS. No; I do not think that would be practicable. I think that question has been settled.

Mr. NORRIS. If we make every particular mail service pay its expenses, we have to do something of that kind.

Mr. WILLIS. I have tried to be rather explicit and say that I recognize it is not possible under any human system of accounting to do more than reach an approximation, but when it is here proposed, in the face of a deficit of $40,000,000 a year, without any effort to get more revenue, that we are to add $70,000,000 more without the slightest attempt to distribute that burden upon the service itself and upon general funds—it is perfectly apparent to me that we are not doing what we ought to do if we are to deal with this thing in a businesslike way.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. WILLIS. I am anxious to conclude, but of course I will yield to New Jersey if he desires it.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator persists in referring to a deficit in the neighborhood of $40,000,000, and I thoroughly appreciate he has some authority in the table to that effect. But I am sure that the Senator knows the statement put forward by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Geoghegan] and also by myself, which rather indicated that with the present business there will probably be a surplus this year. It is hard to reconcile ourselves again to the divergent reports from the Post Office Department, but the fact remains that past statements have demonstrated that every salary increase has been absorbed within from one to two years in the ordinary business of the department.

Mr. WILLIS. That leads me to the question of absorption, about which the Senator spoke previously and to which he now refers. I am unable to reach quite the conclusion the Senator reaches. I have the figures from 1920 on. In 1920 there was an excess of expenditures of $38,000,000. In 1921 of $73,000,000, and in 1922 of $39,000,000, and in 1923 of $38,000,000.

I realize it is rather an unsatisfactory matter to discuss when only the Senator and myself can see the chart; but the chart shows very definitely that up to about 1918, or perhaps 1917, revenues and expenditures kept very closely together; but after 1918 they have been getting further and further apart all the time, and it is to be noted that about that time the salary increases were made. It is apparent, of course, if we are going to increase expenditures $38,000,000 a year, that increase that is going to be taken up by absorption. It has not been done in the past and there is no reason to suppose it will be done in the future.

Mr. WILLIS. I have the figures from 1920 on. Page 11 shows the deficit for that year was $73,000,000.

Mr. EDGE. Let us go to another page.

Mr. WILLIS. I will give my authority and go on. Page 11 of Senate Document 162 shows that the excess of expenditures in 1921 was $73,485,000.

Mr. EDGE. The Post Office Department's annual report for 1921, on page 19, under postal finances, after explaining the statements of money-orders and so forth, says there was a total deficiency of postal revenues of $157,517,688.11.

Mr. WILLIS. At all events I have the later report. My recollection is that I have already had permission to have it printed as a part of my remarks so that Senators may have it before them.

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

Mr. WILLIS. I should like to conclude, but I must yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator mentioned a divergence of expenses and receipts, and I think something ought to be said explaining the cause of that. For instance, rents and supplies went up 100 per cent and the contracts with the railroads in carrying the mail went up about 85 per cent, and there was no increase in the postal rates at all to meet those additional expenses was there?

Mr. WILLIS. No; there has been no increase, so far as I know.

Mr. BROOKHART. So we changed those items of contract and expense for service without paying any attention to the rates.

Mr. WILLIS. I have no idea, of course, that all the increase in expenditure was due to salaries. I do not believe that would be a sufficient explanation of that. It was shown by the Senator from New Jersey that we could just coolly add an expenditure of $70,000,000 a year without making any provision for revenue and that it would all be taken up by some sort of absorption.

Mr. BROOKHART. If we go ahead and make provision for increasing the pay of railroads and increasing rents and supplies, is not that making the work in the service entitled to as good treatment as the railroads?

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator overlooked the fact that there has been increases. If I will refer to the reference on page 2—and I was about to refer to it and I do so only because reference has been made to it by the Senator from New Jersey—he will find that the President in his message pointed out the increase.

The Government has been solicitous of the welfare of postal employees. Their compensation has been the subject of several recent legislation acts and adjusted to scales of pay as favorable as any in public service. The Post of July 2, 1918, increased the compensation of clerks and carriers in post offices and railway postal clerks $200 a year, and rural carriers $240 a year.

Mr. BROOKHART. At that point let me ask the Senator did we stop and did that on an increase of postal rates, making it an addition at that time?

Mr. WILLIS. I do not think so.

Mr. BROOKHART. Why should we do it now then?

Mr. WILLIS. I do not care anything about that; but I contend when we are proposing to make such a tremendous increase in expenditures as is here involved, as a simple business proposition, when we have before us a showing as to deficits, then ought to make some effort to collect the money from the people who get the service and not from the general taxpayer.

Mr. BROOKHART. Yes; but the Senator has pointed out that part of that deficit was caused deliberately, because of the policy of carrying religious and scientific matter at less than cost, and also rural-route deliveries, and so forth.

Mr. WILLIS. That also is a great question to be discussed.

Mr. BROOKHART. The services to which I have referred—may be paid for by some sort of legislation which we might add onto some other part of the Postal Service; and yet the Senator is asking us to go ahead here and put the cost in this instance into the general fund, which we believe would be undesirable even as to what it amounts to, or anything of that kind.

Mr. WILLIS. I am asking the Senate to take up the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Sterlino], and which has been here referred; and if the Senator from Iowa can offer an amendment that will improve the measure in any respect, I shall be glad to support it. My contention is that we have not done our duty as members of the board of managers of this great corporation, which we in a sense represent, if we do not at least make an effort to raise the money by reasonable readjustment of rates rather than simply to take the scoop and shovel the cost from the general fund, which must be produced by levying taxes upon the general taxpayers of the country, particularly when the report shows us so clearly how additional revenue may fairly be obtained.

Mr. BROOKHART. In explanation of the matter might show that the cost ought to be paid by the public.

Mr. WILLIS. I can understand how the Senator might take that view, because he believes that. He might believe—I do not say that he does—that it would be desirable that all of the post-office service should be free. I would not take that view of the matter.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not know, but I do not believe that common carriers should be controlled by the Government and should render their service free. I take the contrary view; that it is the business of the people who enjoy the service in the long run to pay for that service. I do not believe in the governmental ownership and operation of railroads.

Mr. BROOKHART. I understood the Senator to accede to the view that low rates ought to be accorded to religious and scientific publications, and also to rural routes.

Mr. WILLIS. I am firmly convinced, as I stated to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Falch] that it is not fair to charge penalty matter and franked matter to Post Office expenditures. Now, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to proceed.

Mr. WILLIS. I understand that I want to say in favor of salary increases, but if increased postal salaries shall not be secured it will be, in my humble judgment, because of the mistaken policy that has been followed by those in charge of this legislation. They have taken the position, "No; we will do nothing toward the increasing of revenue; we have the power to pass this bill over the presidential veto, and we will simply ride roughshod." We shall see whether that policy will come in. I do not know, but I do not believe that that bill will be passed over the President's veto. So believing, I think, as one who is favorable to postal salary increases, that it would be well to take advantage of the fact that has been brought in here by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Sterlino], and which has been reported by the com-
Mr. WILLIS. Certainly I will yield. I am destroyers of concluding my statement, but I will yield to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. DALE. I wish with all possible courtesy to the Senator from Ohio to take, issue with him on the statement that the committee in charge of this bill has ever occupied the position in the least degree that they would pass the bill without any consideration whatever of the raising of revenue.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I entirely absolve the Senator from Vermont from any such view as that. I said those who were in charge of the bill: I do not know just exactly the words I used, but the idea I had in mind, to be frank, are the friends of the postal salary bill outside of the Senate, to whom I have talked by the hundreds. I have stated to all of them by correspondence and in personal interviews and in appearing before several of their committees that the wise way to handle this question was by the method I have indicated; lay the veto proposition over and undertake to frame a bill which would make the salaries as the Executive suggests. However, I absolve the Senator from Vermont from anything of the kind which I have stated.

Mr. DALE. Let me ask the Senator from Ohio if, in his humble judgment, the veto of the President shall be sustained at this time there is a ghost of a chance of the postal revenue bill passing during this Congress?

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator will permit me to say so, if the friends of the bill—and I will not add the statement and say whether they be inside the Senate or out of it—if the friends of better salaries for postal workers would go to work upon the lines indicated in the bill introduced by the Senator from Vermont, I think their chances for success would be very much greater than it will be if insistence is made that this bill shall be passed over the presidential veto, because frankly I think it will not be so passed.

Mr. DALE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to proceed hurriedly to a conclusion—

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. FESS. Referring to the question of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE], if the President's veto is not sustained, how much of a chance would there be to enact the bill providing for increased postal revenue?

Mr. WILLIS. What is the opinion of the Senator upon that point?

Mr. FESS. I think there would not be a ghost of a chance.

Mr. WILLIS. I agree with my colleague absolutely on that point.

Mr. DALE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield just once more to me, the two Senators from Ohio are raising another issue by raising the issue of revenue. The committee behind this bill simply raised by the bill the one cold issue that these employees were not paid enough, and that any institution, no matter what its revenue was, ought at least to have manhood enough to pay its employees a living wage. That is the only question that is primarily before the Senate now.

Mr. WILLIS. If I may be permitted to say so, with the greatest of good feeling, I think those who have indicated that the vote shall be had upon the veto message—and I am ready to vote upon that any moment that it is desired to have a vote—have raised something else besides the mere question to which my friend from Vermont has referred; they have raised something that I shall not name with reference to the hopes of the postal employees for better salaries.

Mr. DALE. We did not raise it.

Mr. WILLIS. As I have said, I absolve my friend, the Senator from Vermont, but I do say that if this whole proposition is to be defeated, in my judgment, it will be because those who are in charge of this matter have insisted that nothing shall be done to meet the postal deficit, but that the burden shall be coldly shouldered upon the taxpayers of the country and not upon the users of the service.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WILLIS. I think I will have to yield to my friend, as I yield to everyone else, but very soon I am going to quit yielding and also quit talking. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am sorry to have to ask the question of the Senator, but he has several times referred to the friends of the postal salary increase measure. Whom does he mean by friends or enemies of the measure? The vote when this question was before the Senate was 78 to 3. Who are the friends and who are the enemies of the postal employees' salary increase bill?

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator wants to get my personal position that is perfectly well known. I, of course, was one of the feeble three that, for reasons which it stated, and as to which I have not and shall not hedge, voted against the bill, and I am not ashamed of my vote now.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does the Senator think that the 73 friends of the bill should yield to the opinion and views of its 3 enemies?

Mr. WILLIS. Whatever they should do, if the Senator wants my opinion—and it amounts to nothing upon this question, and his view is just as good and perhaps better than mine—I think this bill will not be passed over the veto of the President; I do not believe it will; I may be mistaken about that. It is not, however, a question of yielding. Of course, the Senator knows it is a question of each one of us doing the thing that in his judgment seems fair and wise, and in the public interest.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Eggos] in response to a question that was asked by the Senator from Connecticut made reference to comparative salaries. I was wondering whether the Senator from Connecticut had noted the comparison that is made at page 2 of the President's veto message. I ask permission, Mr. President, in order to save time to have printed at this point in my remarks all of page 2 of the veto message. Mr. President, in order to save time, to have printed public is good" and including all of that page. It will give the information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter will be printed in the Record.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The postal service rendered the public is good. The service conditions under which the employees perform their duties are probably more satisfactory than ever before in the history of the Post Office Department. The Government has been soliciting of the welfare of postal employees. Their compensation has been the subject of several recent legislative acts and adjusted to scales of pay favorable as any in the public service. The act of July 2, 1918, increased the compensation of clerks and carriers in post offices and railway postal clerks $200 a year and rural carriers $240 a year. In addition there were increases in compensation to a large number of the supervision force. The act of November 8, 1919, further increased the compensation of postal employees from $100 to $200 per annum. This was followed by the act of July 2, 1920, which increased the compensation ranging from $200 to $400 for clerks and carriers and railway postal clerks and $200 for rural carriers. Substantial increases were also provided in the salaries of the supervisory force, ranging from $250 to $500 a year.

The effect of these increases in salary grades over those for the fiscal year 1918 was an increase of $650 to clerks and carriers in post offices, $575 to railway postal clerks, and $530 to rural carriers.

By reason of these increases the Government has paid out during the fiscal years from 1919 to 1923 an additional aggregate of $459,000,000 in salaries to postal employees above what would have been paid under the scales in effect before these changes, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Increase in Salaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1919-1920</td>
<td>$33,292,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1921</td>
<td>$61,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-1922</td>
<td>$31,725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-1923</td>
<td>$25,330,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is apparent that the Government has dealt generously with this service.

As a result of these readjustments the average salaries for 1923 were:

Post-office clerks, $1,751, increase of $919 since 1909, or 110 per cent.

Post-office clerks, $1,762.83, increase of $890 since 1907, or 96 per cent.

Railway postal clerks, $2,107, increase of $946 since 1907, or 81 per cent.

Railway postal clerks, including travel allowances, $2,292, increase of $1,381 since 1907, or 97 per cent.

Rural carriers, $1,849.52, increase of $1,140 since 1907, or 100 per cent.
The average for all salaries of clerks now receiving from $1,440 to $2,040 per annum in the clerical, administrative, and fiscal services in all the departments in Washington will be approximately $1,554 on July 1, 1924, under the provisions of the classification act of 1923. It is thus seen that the lowest average of the salaries of the postal employees in the field service is nearly $200 more than the average for employees in the Government departments in Washington.

Mr. WILLIS. The specific point about which the Senator from Connecticut asked is covered by this statement of the President in his veto message:

The average for all salaries of clerks now receiving from $1,440 to $2,040 per annum in the clerical, administrative, and fiscal services in all the departments in Washington will be approximately $1,554 on July 1, 1924, under the provisions of the classification act of 1923. It is thus seen that the lowest average of the salaries of the postal employees in the field service is nearly $200 more than the average for employees in the Government departments in Washington.

I assume that that statement is correct, otherwise the President would not have made it.

Now, Mr. President, there are just one or two other matters to which I wish to refer. If it is assumed that there is absolute unanimity of opinion amongst the postal employees themselves as to the course which is marked out here, I beg to say that Senators are mistaken in that view. For example, I have here a letter from a postal worker in my State. For obvious reasons I shall not give the name of this gentleman. He might subject him to embarrassment. There has been great organization and a great propaganda on this subject. What does he say? I will read a paragraph from his letter:

Soon after Congress convened there will come before them the new bill—

The new bill—

providing for the increase in salaries for the postal employees, and also to raise the rates of postage to meet the deficit incurred. Personally, and in behalf of the post office clerks of—

Naming the city where he is a clerk, and he is a very prominent one—

I respectfully request your support of this bill. We feel both measures of the bill are merited and almost a necessity—

And so on.

Here is another letter from a postal employee:

Surely the public can see no good reason why postage should not be increased, as everything else has been increased, and postal employees' wages have not been increased for a long time.

Here is what another postal employee says:

As I understand, it has never been denied that the bill referred to above—

That is, Senate bill 1988—

is no more than just; but the paramount issue is in raising this necessary fund to take care of the bill, which in my estimation is a very poor excuse for not giving the employees justice.

But thanks to Senator STEERLING, who has come to the rescue with a bill which should overcome the aforementioned obstacles. While in my estimation the bill of Senator Sterling would undoubtedly work a hardship on the publishers of second-class mail, yet if that is necessary to promote justice I feel, and I think you will agree with me, that you would be only doing justice by supporting these bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WILLIS. I ask permission to print in the Record, at the close of my remarks, certain documents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIS. Not all the newspapers are agreed that the bill for raising revenue is unfair or uncompromising. For example:

The Akron Beacon Journal on December 10 says this in its editorial column:

During the last year the Post Office Department run approximately forty millions behind. To take the sum needed to give the postal people what they should have would be a serious blow to any further reduction of taxes next year. We are now going to get into trouble with some of our newspaper brethren. As usual the thing the publisher is almost as indignant a fraud as is the Congressman. In other words, both will never admit that he does anything except for the good of the common cause, but is in fact the bittering his own parsnips all the time. Consequently at this juncture we find him sitting on the congressional crupper yelling and beseeching that august body for the sake of education and Mike and the public good not to increase postal rates. Now as a matter of fact postal rates should be increased, especially on second and third class matter. We pay this because the loss in the Post Office Department is caused exactly by this class of matter. No other class of matter. No loss. And if the people of the world saw the amount of their money being spent on the newspapers, they would think of transmitting such matter at such a cost. It is only necessary to call the attention of any business man to one day's mail to illustrate the point we would make. All kinds of utterly unwarranted and fraudulent solicitations are being made and they are trying to make the world safe for some thing or other in which the public has no more interest than they have in the social progress of Topeka.

The grundigloquifer of a gandy corn plasters from an envelope that Uncle Sam has carried its fatal destination at a loss. Fakes and fakes, as well as saints and uplifters, all lend the lean earth with the particular twists they are taking at the core of error, and it is all done at an enormous loss to the Post Office Department, and consequently to the taxpayers of the country. Nine-tenths of this stuff is worse than useless. Not 1 per cent of it is ever read. Yet under some weird Danielson idea about education conceived when Horace Greeley was a boy the country has been deluded into the belief that the public should sustain this loss. We do not think so, and we are confident the people do not think so.

No business in the world outside of Government would tolerate the lunacy that now prevails in this regard. The post office should be placed not only on a self-sustaining basis, but it should charge enough for its services to return to the Revenue Department the greatest amount of tax money as possible, and to the Treasury to do it. All that is necessary is to quit carrying the millions of tons of junk annually at a loss, and to add to the cost of transportation enough to balance the postal budget, including the pay of employees.

On December 19 the Mansfield News said, in part:

The report of the Postmaster General, a former newspaper man and publisher, shows a deficit of $74,712,808.07 in second-class service. Of this amount $34,474,630 is charged to the distribution of daily newspapers, $20,112,153 to weekly newspapers, $14,951,808 to agricultural, trade, and scientific periodicals, and $4,612,233 to magazines and all others.

The committee of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association proposes to fight General New's recommendation that postal rates be readjusted to overcome this deficit and is asking publishers to contribute 1 per cent of their annual second-class postal bill to provide funds for the proposed opposition.

The News does not favor a fight on the measure and does not intend to make the contribution asked for. It does not see how any newspaper can make any just claim for any special privileges from the Government or any other institution. It believes that if the postal rates are too low, they should be readjusted to overcome any deficit and to take from the public the burden that the publishers themselves should carry.

The publishers are not within their rights to go before Congress and insist upon a postal rate lower than cost. They cannot with good grace and with fairness try to sandbag Members of the House and Senate into accepting their points of view by the use of the public press for or against them. When the publishers' association uses its machinery to thwart economy or to gain special rates, it becomes a bloc of detriment to public good and welfare and joins the class of lobbyists against whom there have been long and just protests. They have no more right to a claim of a postal rate lower than cost than the postal workers to a wage increase which is not justified by the present postal revenues. They have no more right to this special rate than any other class. They are insisting upon a percentage of rates that, if carried out, would bankrupt the Treasury and wreck the Postal Service. They must expect to bear their share of the burden.

And the New York World says, in its issue of December 19:

NO SUAURED FUND

Objection is made in discussion of postal-pay bills that the Post Office Department is run at a loss; that $80,000,000 profit made by carrying letters is more than offset by deficits in the money-order and registering work, in carrying third-class mail, in carrying first-class mail, and especially in the dealings of second-class matter, newspapers and magazines.

It has always been the American theory that this phase of postal work is educational; that the spreading of information through the country is something less of a public right than a public duty. Now, it is suggested that higher rates be charged in the activities which are conducted at a loss, so that wages may be raised without incurring any deficit. If the opinion prevails in Congress, as it seems it will do in the White House, that this should be done, the World, for one, has no objection.
We have been until now in accord with the general opinion that the circulation of periodicals at some loss in postal rates was justified by the educational value of that work. If this has led to the crippling of the department or to the denial of a living wage to faithful and hardy workers, it is now time that we look to this matter of expense of postal workers with a view to devising some better, more equitable, more public policy than these, then the World is opposed also to this subsidy for publishers. Let Justice be done! There should be no subsidized press at the expense of the government. Thus, it should be no favors to publishers at the expense of postal workers.

Mr. George, Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the Sterling bill or the committee report on that bill, which was discussed at length in this body on day before yesterday by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses]. I may have something to say about the department or to the denial of a living wage to faithful and hardy workers, that we are going to be subjected to night sessions here; and I take it that no man in this body believes for a moment that if the President's veto is sustained it will be at all possible to pass at this session of Congress a bill which will give to the employees of the Postal Service the increases which the President now supports, if he has approved the bill; and I understand from the press and from what was said by the Senator from New Hampshire it was understood, that is, from what has been many times intimated here—that he approves this bill. The President now admits the case of the postal employees; he makes it out himself; and, notwithstanding the two pages of his veto in which he said they were not entitled to these increases, he now confesses the case for the employees, and falls back upon the single proposition that since there was no means provided in the original bill for the payment of these increases in salary, now since the cost ascertainment commission has reported, and now that there is a bill before the Senate which provides the increases, the bill therefore has the approval of the Executive. Why he is stating the case a little strongly, but I do not want to do so. I want to state it fairly, I have read this veto message. I have tried to digest it. I do not understand the kind of philosophy which the President used in his veto. "Nevertheless, if you will find somebody's pocket out of which you can get the increase, I will approve the bill." I do not appreciate that sort of philosophy. I think that if the President approves this bill, or if the President's veto is sustained, he means to have it as a substitute, he approves the identical salaries which he vetoed. I know that he now admits that the salaries of the postal employees as carried in the first bill are just and right, and that he approved it. Why should we refer back to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads that bill and the President's veto message? The case for the employees is made out. The cost ascertainment commission has reported a bill which we are to understand has Executive approval. Why should we refer it back? If it does go back, or if the President's veto is sustained, we may be assured that the 351,930 postal employees affected by this bill will receive no salary increases during this Congress.

It is true that the President does talk about some other things in his veto message. It is quite true that he says something about differences; but that is a part of his argument against the demand of the postal employees. He says that if the postal employees are anywhere underpaid we should find those centers in which the feeling is that they are not entitled to an increase in salary. "Nevertheless, if you will find somebody's pocket out of which you can get the increase, I will approve the bill." I do not appreciate that sort of philosophy. I think that if the President approves this bill, or if the President's veto is sustained, he means to have it as a substitute, he approves the identical salaries which he vetoed. I know that he now admits that the salaries of the postal employees as carried in the first bill are just and right, and that he approved it. Why should we refer back to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads that bill and the President's veto message? The case for the employees is made out. The cost ascertainment commission has reported a bill which we are to understand has Executive approval. Why should we refer it back? If it does go back, or if the President's veto is sustained, we may be assured that the 351,930 postal employees affected by this bill will receive no salary increases during this Congress.

The last session of Congress had not adjourned before somebody was speculating for the President and saying that "The President is not so much against the claim of the postal employees, but he is objecting because no provision has been made for the payment of the increases in their salaries," and so the amendment, the real wreckage of his argument, did not sweep away the whole foundation from under Senators in this Chamber who really believe that there ought not to be an increase in postal salaries, regardless of what the President said, have the argument directed against the claim of the postal employees.

The last session of Congress had not adjourned before somebody was speculating for the President and saying that "The President is not so much against the claim of the postal employees, but he is objecting because no provision has been made for the payment of the increases in their salaries," and so the amendment, the real wreckage of his argument, did not sweep away the whole foundation from under Senators in this Chamber who really believe that there ought not to be an increase in postal salaries, regardless of what the President said, have the argument directed against the claim of the postal employees.

The last session of Congress had not adjourned before somebody was speculating for the President and saying that "The President is not so much against the claim of the postal employees, but he is objecting because no provision has been made for the payment of the increases in their salaries," and so the amendment, the real wreckage of his argument, did not sweep away the whole foundation from under Senators in this Chamber who really believe that there ought not to be an increase in postal salaries, regardless of what the President said, have the argument directed against the claim of the postal employees.

The last session of Congress had not adjourned before somebody was speculating for the President and saying that "The President is not so much against the claim of the postal employees, but he is objecting because no provision has been made for the payment of the increases in their salaries," and so the amendment, the real wreckage of his argument, did not sweep away the whole foundation from under Senators in this Chamber who really believe that there ought not to be an increase in postal salaries, regardless of what the President said, have the argument directed against the claim of the postal employees.

The last session of Congress had not adjourned before somebody was speculating for the President and saying that "The President is not so much against the claim of the postal employees, but he is objecting because no provision has been made for the payment of the increases in their salaries," and so the amendment, the real wreckage of his argument, did not sweep away the whole foundation from under Senators in this Chamber who really believe that there ought not to be an increase in postal salaries, regardless of what the President said, have the argument directed against the claim of the postal employees.

The last session of Congress had not adjourned before somebody was speculating for the President and saying that "The President is not so much against the claim of the postal employees, but he is objecting because no provision has been made for the payment of the increases in their salaries," and so the amendment, the real wreckage of his argument, did not sweep away the whole foundation from under Senators in this Chamber who really believe that there ought not to be an increase in postal salaries, regardless of what the President said, have the argument directed against the claim of the postal employees.
There is no argument by which you can evade that clear statement of the President. In earnest, he will not say, "If you sustain the President's veto, we will then pay the very same rates of salary provided in the vetoed bill, but at the same time we will meet the President's objections and pay the way the service ought to be paying them." 

There is the case. Will you send the bill back to the committee? If so, for what reason? For almost the first time in the history of the postal system of this country the President is saying that the postal system must pay its way. That was the British doctrine before the postal system was established in America, and when Benjamin Franklin was the colonial postmaster general he paid the cost of the colonial system out of his pocket, or so much of it as was a dedicat. Benjamin Franklin knew, back in those days, the unifying power of the Postal Service in the colonial life of America. If anybody had forgotten it, it was not the men who established this system, and the Postal Service never has gone upon the theory that the service must pay its way, if by that you mean that every branch of that service must pay all of its costs. We allow franked mail, we allow penalty mail, we make a differentiation in favor of literature for the blind, for the deaf, and for the dumb. More than that, we have established a foreign mail service. We have been the leaders in that great service to the world, and we know we are granting a subsidy on all of our foreign mail.

More than that, is there a Senator here who believes that the Rural Free Delivery Service should be borne by that particular branch of the service?

As reasonable Senators, we must know that that service is not paying more than half of its cost, and it is not reasonable to demand that it pay its entire cost. If we are going to make every branch of the Postal Service pay its whole way, then we will have to go back and reconstruct that service from the ground up. It makes no difference to this Congress whether money is taken out of one pocket and put into the other, but it makes a vast difference to the users of the mail when you want to make them pay for the special privileges which the Postal Congress has granted in its determination of a proper public policy with respect to the Postal Service.

Mr. President, I fully agree—and I do not for one moment admit anything to the contrary—that the Postal Service ought to be, as far as practicable, but when you lay down the broad proposition that every branch of that service must pay its way, then you are taking a position that cannot be sustained unless you are going to reorganize the whole system of mail service, and the Senator from Illinois is not going to do that.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMICK. The Senator would distinguish between the Postal Service paying its way and every branch of the Postal Service paying its way, just as far as practicable, but when you distinguish between a railroad paying its way and every kind of freight paying its way?

Mr. GEORGE. I would bear that distinction in mind.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, if it is necessary for a department to pay its way, and if nobody can use it unless it does pay its whole way, then why grant a subsidy to a particular user of the mail and deny it to somebody else?

Mr. GEORGE. You can not do that.

Mr. CARAWAY. There would be no justification for that, would there?

Mr. GEORGE. No moral justification.

Mr. CARAWAY. If some classes of freight pay the cost of handling and others do not, then the class that does not pay its way gets a subsidy.

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly so. There can be no moral justification for the grant of any subsidy or any free service to any user if we are going upon the theory that the whole service must pay its cost; but I did not so understand the Senator to indicate.

Mr. MCCORMICK. When I said it does not pay its way I had in mind freight which would not be carried at all if it had not been forced upon the various branches of the railway is not charged against that specific kind of freight.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Because if it were, it would not be carried.

Mr. GEORGE. I thought I understood the Senator.

Mr. MCCORMICK. I think perhaps the Senator from Arkansas may have been misunderstood.

Mr. CARAWAY. Still, if it may be permitted to say so, if the argument is that a service must pay its entire way, that it is inexcusable to advance the interests of the service unless it does pay, you can not afford to say that we will let some service stand on the rails when the rest of the service is paying the way upon some other part of the service. If it is necessary to pay the mails and the entire cost should be paid, then let everybody who touches the service pay for the advantage he gets out of it.

Mr. GEORGE. Unquestionably; I fully agree with the Senator.

Mr. MCCORMICK. That is the basis of the rate structure in the Post Office Service as the railway service.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is talking about the same thing; but I do not want to stop to settle that dispute between them.

Mr. CARAWAY. We are talking about the same thing.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not want to go into a discussion of the whole question of rate making. I do not at all criticize the cost-ascertainment report. As a cost-ascertainment report it is probably all right in some respects, and in very many in others. I am not criticizing the attitude of the man who made that report, but it is nothing but a cost-finding report, and I would object, and other Senators will object, when the time comes to making the rates with but one consideration in view; that is, the cost. Cost is an element in rate making, but it is not the whole element. It is not necessarily the controlling element, and in some respects, the controlling elements must be taken into consideration in determining the exact rate.

Congress has from time to time fixed rates in the postal system as a matter of public policy, some classes of mail being fixed above the cost, some classes bearing rates that were greatly under what the regular users of the postal system were required to pay. We permit the mail to go out under the franks of Senators and Representatives. We permit the departments to send out mail free of cost. We permit certain periodicals to go free to the blind, to the deaf, and to the dumb, as I have said, and other periodicals to be sent free. We cheerfully make that subsidy to the foreign mail, and I ask again, is there any man who will face the question squarely and who will not admit that you knew and now know that you are furnishing free delivery service in pursuance of an established public policy?

I believe it to be a sound policy that every branch of the service should pay its way so far as is practicable and convenient, with sound public policy, but beyond that we do not object to the ordinary principle of revenue being equal to cost. It is the finest example of special pleading that I have ever seen in any many a day.

It starts out to establish one contention and one conclusion, and every step taken, every process used, every set of statistics marshaled, all point to that ultimate conclusion, and with admirable skill and ability. It is a species of special pleading. The allusions of the majority of the railway is not charged against that specific kind of freight.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Because if it were, it would not be carried.

Mr. GEORGE. I thought I understood the Senator.

Mr. MCCORMICK. I think perhaps the Senator from Arkansas may have been misunderstood.

Mr. CARAWAY. Still, if it may be permitted to say so, if the argument is that a service must pay its entire way, that it is inexcusable to advance the interests of the service unless
lished from time to time by the Congress, but it does not take into consideration the full sense in which that policy has been clearly indicated. It does not serve the farmer. What is the significance of that policy? There is an additional cost, but there is an effort, consciously or unconsciously, to charge parcel post with as little cost as possible, because the men in the postal department, whether or not knowing it, know one thing through and through. The thing is this, that we established parcel post in America in the exercise of what the Congress thought was a sound public policy. In effect we said, and it will make no difference, but we will give to the farmer his packages, whether he pays full cost for the service or whether he does not. Therefore you will find in this cost-ascertainment report that the service rendered by the parcel post is not measured as far as possible. They do not want to make an issue with parcel post. The same may be said about the Rural Free Delivery Service. The men in the Post Office Department know that when we established rural free delivery of mails we were establishing a policy. We were voicing in that act a public policy, and that policy was that the farmers should receive their mail without charge parcel post with as little cost as possible, because the men in the postal department, whether or not knowing it, know one thing through and through. The thing is this, that we established parcel post in America in the exercise of what the Congress thought was a sound public policy. In effect we said, and it will make no difference, but we will give to the farmer his packages, whether he pays full cost for the service or whether he does not. Therefore you will find in this cost-ascertainment report that the service rendered by the parcel post is not measured as far as possible. They do not want to make an issue with parcel post.

That is expressed here for one purpose—to show that the service rendered by the parcel post to the farmer is negligible. I read further from Mr. Stewart's own testimony, where he said this:

As a further indication as to the final destination of parcel post, attention is called to the fact that during the cost-ascertainment statistical period—September 1, 1923 to November 30, 1923—there were delivered in all of incoming parcel in all the designated third and fourth class post offices for the 30-day period. Applying the average number of parcels received in third and fourth class offices during the 30-day period referred to all the third and fourth class offices produces totals as follows for the fiscal year:

In all third-class offices: 210,490,590
In all fourth-class offices: 216,558,889
Total: 427,049,489

The figures given above, representing the total number of pieces of parcel post received at all third and fourth class post offices for delivery to patrons of such services, represent 99.9 per cent of the total number of all originating parcels. However, it is well to call attention to the fact that the count of pieces referred to includes some which were counted twice in the distribution processes. As to the number of parcels that were counted twice, no data are obtainable. It is in the judgment of experienced postal officials that the total number of parcels delivered through third and fourth class offices would amount at least 35 per cent of all the originating parcels in the United States.

As already pointed out, rural carriers actually deliver over 10 per cent of all the parcels originating in the United States. The delivery service provided by rural carriers does not by any means provide for all the farmers. Many farmers receive parcel post direct from third and fourth class offices and on star routes from such offices. Third and fourth class post offices are naturally rural localities and much of the population of such offices is made up of farmers living within the immediate vicinity. The population of the average third-class office rarely exceeds 1,000; in most instances the population would range from 200 to 400. Fourth-class offices are still much smaller than the third-class offices. Many fourth-class offices could not boast of a population of more than 50 persons.

It is well to call attention to one other feature in this connection as having a bearing on the subject and that is the number of money orders issued in the United States during the fiscal year 1923 was 173,400,000 and the number of money orders issued in third and fourth class offices was approximately 44 per cent.

Reduced to percentage, it is stated by Mr. Stewart that the percentage of parcel post through these offices is just a little under 44 per cent of all the parcels handled by the Postal Service—and not all of those parcels went to farmers. Mr. Stewart concedes that “any man who wants to discuss it, the vast majority of the facts will concede it. The vast majority of them went to farmers. Many farmers receive parcel post direct from third and fourth class offices and on star routes from such offices. Third and fourth class post offices are naturally rural localities and much of the population of such offices is made up of farmers living within the immediate vicinity. The population of the average third-class office rarely exceeds 1,000; in most instances the population would range from 200 to 400. Fourth-class offices are still much smaller than the third-class offices. Many fourth-class offices could not boast of a population of more than 50 persons. It is well to call attention to one other feature in this connection as having a bearing on the subject and that is the number of money orders issued in the United States during the fiscal year 1923 was 173,400,000 and the number of money orders issued in third and fourth class offices was approximately 44 per cent. Reduced to percentage, it is stated by Mr. Stewart that the percentage of parcel post through these offices is just a little under 44 per cent of all the parcels handled by the Postal Service—and not all of those parcels went to farmers. Mr. Stewart concedes that “any man who wants to discuss it, the vast majority of the facts will concede it. The vast majority of them went to farmers. Many farmers receive parcel post direct from third and fourth class offices and on star routes from such offices. Third and fourth class post offices are naturally rural localities and much of the population of such offices is made up of farmers living within the immediate vicinity. The population of the average third-class office rarely exceeds 1,000; in most instances the population would range from 200 to 400. Fourth-class offices are still much smaller than the third-class offices. Many fourth-class offices could not boast of a population of more than 50 persons. It is well to call attention to one other feature in this connection as having a bearing on the subject and that is the number of money orders issued in the United States during the fiscal year 1923 was 173,400,000 and the number of money orders issued in third and fourth class offices was approximately 44 per cent. Reduced to percentage, it is stated by Mr. Stewart that the percentage of parcel post through these offices is just a little under 44 per cent of all the parcels handled by the Postal Service—and not all of those parcels went to farmers. Mr. Stewart concedes that “any man who wants to discuss it, the vast majority of the facts will concede it. The vast majority of them went to farmers. Many farmers receive parcel post direct from third and fourth class offices and on star routes from such offices. Third and fourth class post offices are naturally rural localities and much of the population of such offices is made up of farmers living within the immediate vicinity. The population of the average third-class office rarely exceeds 1,000; in most instances the population would range from 200 to 400. Fourth-class offices are still much smaller than the third-class offices. Many fourth-class offices could not boast of a population of more than 50 persons. It is well to call attention to one other feature in this connection as having a bearing on the subject and that is the number of money orders issued in the United States during the fiscal year 1923 was 173,400,000 and the number of money orders issued in third and fourth class offices was approximately 44 per cent.
lished by Congress without regard to the revenue alone which those particular branches of the service will produce.

In the first place, I have to confess, without any real reason why we should now be invited, at the time we increase the salaries of the postal employees, to provide the additional revenue? I have pointed out during the course of the remarks of the New Jersey Senator, and the facts are to be found in the testimony of Postmaster General New and of Mr. Stewart, that for the fiscal year ending July, 1926, just ended, the Postmaster General made the Post Office Department estimates that on the basis of present expenditure—not, of course, including the proposed increase in salaries, but on the basis of present expenditure—it will be more than self-sustaining, and what is that fact? It comes to this: That the Postal Service has from time to time absorbed all of the increases that have been given to the employees in that service by way of salary adjustment. It has taken care of its additional expense for the postal employees, my judgment which normally and naturally might be expected to have increased in the department, and that is clearly indicated when we consider that since the present administration came in the deficit in the Postal Department has been reduced from $280,000,000 a year to the close of the present fiscal year, when the department itself admits it will have a deficit in operating expenses for the year of not more than $10,000,000.

What is the use therefore of coupling with the proposal to provide their increased salaries this hasty consideration, unintelligible rate schedule? Mr. President, I believe as a matter of sound legislation, I believe as a matter of sound principle in legislation, that there should be no coupling of the two. There has had been ample time when we have had to consider the whole question—and why? My zeal for the postal employees, my desire to give them what they are entitled to, many ways, the judgment which normally and naturally might be against the proposed increases in postal rates. The two propositions ought to be handled on their own merits. The two propositions ought to be considered and determined separately. The conditions of many of the States—and we can learn very much from the States in our consideration of national legislation—provide that no law shall pass which refers to more than one subject matter. That is a sound principle. In my judgment there is much argument that can be submitted in favor of it.

If we had ample time in which to devise a proper rate schedule, if we had ample opportunity in which to devise a proper rate schedule, if we had ample time in which to satisfy ourselves that we knew what was a just rate to be imposed on first, second, third, and fourth class mail matter, I still would say that we should determine whether postal salaries ought to be increased in the first instance and, as a matter of secondary consideration, of course, to be considered in its proper place, how postal rates should be adjusted.

In mind the question of parcel post, Mr. President, let me call the attention of the Senate to one additional fact. Not only does the parcel post serve the farmer but there have been taken the recommendations of the Post Office Department and those of the C. O. D. delivery, which has been independently by the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads Committee with respect to money orders and with respect to C. O. D. delivery, and it is proposed to double the cost to the users of the money order and of the C. O. D. package. What do we hit when we do this? We reach back to the farmer; we go back to the same man who uses the third-class office and fourth-class office. We reach the man whom Congress tried to serve when it established the Rural Free Delivery Service, when it established the Parcel Post System. Every time we double the cost of the service rendered by the little third-class office and the little fourth-class office we reach the farmer. When we take a just estimate of how far the farmer is served by the parcel post we come to the inevitable conclusion that more than half or, in all reason, at least half of the service is rendered to the farmer and not merely 10 or 11 percent.

The President, it seems to me that the whole question here is whether or not the postal salaries are now adequate. Let me repeat, the President admits their inadequacy. He now admits the postal employees are not being paid what they are entitled to and what is the right to give them what I denied them on June 7. There is not a change in that schedule; he admits it; he confesses it. I say that the bill which is the approval of the President of the United States if we will accept it, which carries with it another admission, a solemn admission that it is a mere makeshift; that it is neither right nor just, that it is not an integral part of the Post Office Department, or, if right or just, we do not know it, for it carries with it the solemn admission that it shall be in operation for 10 months only. The whole case for the employees is admitted by the President when he approves the same rate, a horizontal rate of increase that the President vetoed on June 7. The whole case against the bill now offered by the Post Office and Post Roads Committee against the bill on its face confesses that it is purely temporary, that it does not presage either a just rate, or, if it presages a just rate, we are not able to say with any degree of confidence that it is just.

Is that the way in which to legislate? Is that the way in which to make laws? Is that the way in which to legislate? Where is the emergency? Where is the case for such legislation as that? The Postmaster General tells us that at the end of the fiscal year 1925—that is, December 31, 1925—there was a deficit in operating expenses of only $10,000,000. Say that this bill will increase that deficit by $80,000,000. That will only be a $78,000,000 deficit, and yet in 1923 the Post Office Department faced a deficit and Congress gave it $80,000,000.

Emergency! It does not exist. Justification! It does not exist. The users of second-class mail matter, and the users of third-class mail matter, and the users of the parcel post, and the users of the special services—the cash-on-delivery and the money-order departments of the service—have a just right to complain to this Congress. We know, and we might as well say that if the President's veto is sustained there will be no legislation on the subject at this session, and the farmers who use the Rural Free Delivery Service and the Parcel Post Service and the special services carried in the Postal Department, and the second-class mail users, and even the third-class mail users will be subjected to this hastily devised, this imperfect and unjust postal rate schedule without the Congress apologizes for, for which even the Congress says, we do not know very much about it, and we therefore provide that it is to operate against you only for the short period of 10 months.

Mr. President, there is no occasion for it. I am not able to see why the President should want to deal with the question in the way it is presented. In what way is it an emergency? And who can, I say there is nothing involved but the delicate sensitiveness of the White House, for whom I entertain the most profound respect; but the sensitivities of no man ought to be used as justification for legislation such as this and under circumstances such as these.

I am going to close. Mr. President, by reading from a telegram—for no one has spoken for them as yet—as to what will happen to the farmers who are served through the parcel post. I read from a telegram from the most responsible and reliable person, perhaps, in the country, a man who has virtually given his life to the service not of himself but to the service of my State, a man not of my State but, as I recall, from one of the New England States, but who in coming early to that State saw what the farmers of my State most needed. Here is what he has to say:

I have discovered that our current issue of seed catalogues, weighing a quarter of a pound each, would cost $120,000 if mailed under revised Sterling 69—just double present cost. New taxes under same of property and in weight from 8 to 4 ounces for flat rate of postage most indefensible; also preferential rates for seeds, plants, bulbs, recognized by Congress since 1879, practically wiped out.

Mr. President, let none of us be deceived. If we should pass the Sterling bill in its present form we would have placed upon the users of the parcel post, and in a large measure upon the men and women in the country whom we tried to serve in the establishment of these respective services, a burden which will be very definitely felt. In single instances it may seem small, but it builds large, and so large on the class of people already have all the burden they can bear as to preclude them from the real benefits of a service to which they are entitled. There can be no excuse for it nor justification for it. It is not because we have ample time, and there is not a single reason why we should not utilize that time and the opportunity afforded us during that time to work out a just rate.

Whatever Senators may say and however the appeal may make itself to individual Senators, as for myself, when the justice and righteousness of the case for the 351,000 postal employees is here and now so clearly and admitted, I am going to vote to override the President's veto, and I am going to vote to override the President's veto, and to vote against the motion to refer the bill and the veto message to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. Before the 16th day of December, I made the motion to refer this bill, together with the President's veto message, to the committee, I thought of the existed good and excellent reason for that reference. Now, after the lapse of time, and in view of what has happened meanwhile, I think the reasons for the reference of the bill to the committee are multiplied over and beyond what they were at the time.
Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question in that connection?

Mr. STERLING. I will yield for a question.

Mr. HARRISON. Is the Senator fixed to vote on the President's veto to-morrow, what effect would the motion for the purpose of acts and rear and rear

Mr. STERLING. I think probably it would.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator thinks it would cancel it?

Mr. STERLING. I think so.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has the honor for a time of being chairman of the Joint Postal rear

June 7th, 1925.

In that veto message on the ground that there were less than three years. they are demanding now this very cost of living has not been reduced as rapidly as we

For the purpose of the act of 1920 no further increase of employees were concerned at the time, no urgent necessity under existing conditions for

It is the highest and best kind of politics. The President said in his veto message that this bill could not meet the people's mandate is that we should, and they protest against an additional burden of

The President, I must take exception to some things that have been said in regard to the President's message and the quota

It can not be reasonable now, considering the changes that have happened since the President said in his veto message that this bill could not meet the people's mandate is that we should, and they protest against an additional burden of

In the course of his exposition of the bill and a statement of the estimates of the revenues that would be produced under the bill; and in the face of what has happened, the work that has been done, it seems to me anything but courageous for the Senate of the United States to say that it might not be reasonable now, considering the changes that have happened since the President said in his veto message that this bill could not meet

The President, some things have happened since the President's veto was laid before the Senate on the 7th of June last. There followed the vacation, the political conventions, and the campaign which followed, in which campaign, of course, the veto message of the President was for the purpose of

Mr. STERLING. If it stood alone as a question of salaries, without provision being made by which to pay the salaries, it would be a different proposition; but here, as might be gathered from what the President said in his veto message, we had a new bill, leaving the salaries in every particular just as they were in the original bill vetoed by the President, and providing the means by which the salaries shall be paid.

Mr. President, is it reasonable that these means or attempt to do so? I want to say in passing that all possible expedition has been used to forward this measure, and I think it shows the entire good faith of the Senators who are interested in having this bill referred to the committee and who have been interested in introducing and having considered the new bill. Immediately upon its reference, before the holl

I think probably it would.

Mr. STERLING. It is, I am just wondering what has happened be-cause the President, some things have happened since the President's veto was laid before the Senate on the 7th of June last. There followed the vacation, the political conventions, and the campaign which followed, in which campaign, of course, the veto message of the President was for the purpose of influencing the vote against the President and against the Republican Party.

Mr. STERLING. I understand the Senator to say that he believed the present bill was justified at the present time.

Mr. STERLING. If it stood alone as a question of salaries, without provision being made by which to pay the salaries, it would be a different proposition; but here, as might be gathered from what the President said in his veto message, we had a new bill, leaving the salaries in every particular just as they were in the original bill vetoed by the President, and providing the means by which the salaries shall be paid.

Mr. President, is it reasonable that these means or attempt to do so? I want to say in passing that all possible expedition has been used to forward this measure, and I think it shows the entire good faith of the Senators who are interested in having this bill referred to the committee and who have been interested in introducing and having considered the new bill. Immediately upon its reference, before the holl

The President, I must take exception to some things that have been said in regard to the President's message and the quota

In the course of his exposition of the bill and a statement of the estimates of the revenues that would be produced under the bill; and in the face of what has happened, the work that has been done, it seems to me anything but courageous for the Senate of the United States to say that it might not be reasonable now, considering the changes that have happened since the President said in his veto message that this bill could not meet

The President, I must take exception to some things that have been said in regard to the President's message and the quota

In the course of his exposition of the bill and a statement of the estimates of the revenues that would be produced under the bill; and in the face of what has happened, the work that has been done, it seems to me anything but courageous for the Senate of the United States to say that it might not be reasonable now, considering the changes that have happened since the President said in his veto message that this bill could not meet

Mr. President, is it reasonable that these means or attempt to do so? I want to say in passing that all possible expedition has been used to forward this measure, and I think it shows the entire good faith of the Senators who are interested in having this bill referred to the committee and who have been interested in introducing and having considered the new bill. Immediately upon its reference, before the holl

The President, I must take exception to some things that have been said in regard to the President's message and the quota

In the course of his exposition of the bill and a statement of the estimates of the revenues that would be produced under the bill; and in the face of what has happened, the work that has been done, it seems to me anything but courageous for the Senate of the United States to say that it might not be reasonable now, considering the changes that have happened since the President said in his veto message that this bill could not meet
the new bill with the same zeal that some have shown in trying to override the veto and it will be accomplished.

Mr. President, the hour is growing very late. I started out with the idea of making my remarks very brief, and I intend to keep to the point. I have a letter that I received from my home town, Redfield, S. Dak., this very morning, and I want to read it. It says that this matter is not altogether one-sided. It says: "I am a counselor that you go west to those rural communities of this country, as they are in Illinois, as they are in the two Dakotas, as they are in Minnesota, and many other States, and ask the average man and the average woman if they would consider this matter willing, without any means being provided for its payment except through general taxation, to have this great increase of salaries made to the extent of $38,000,000.

Further in that connection, much has been said here—it is in a matter of debate, I suppose we should not discuss it—about the branch of the mail service to pay its way. We do not expect each branch to pay all its way, and as to that most important service, the second-class mail service, we would expect anything else than that it should come anywhere near paying its way. The post-office-annum report shows $75,000,000 of a deficit in the second-class mail service, or nearly that—$1,712,250 2 and reads in part as follows: There is that much of a deficit. The bill which I had the honor of introducing required that $10,000,000 additional should be paid by the users of second-class mail, leaving nearly $35,000,000 yet of a deficit. An amendment made by the subcommittee of the Senate on Post Office and Post Roads reduces that still further. Under that amendment second-class mail is supposed to yield an additional increase of not over $5,500,000, as against a loss of $75,000,000.

Are Senators proceeding on the theory that the farmer who uses the parcel post to the extent of 11 per cent of parcel curriers' mail has no idea as to that he wants a parcel or a gratuity? If so, they are mistaken in the temper of the farmers of the United States. They are too proud, too independent, too patriotic to ask that this great Government be at an expense to be borne by all the people to render them a particular and a special service. I grant that as to second-class mail, which gives information, which carries news, which carries literature, and through all this and so additional to the people of the United States, it may well be carried at a loss. I never anticipated that it should pay its way, nor would I think of framing a bill or voting for a bill that would require that. But it ought to pay a reasonable percentage of that $75,000,000 which it now loses to the Government.

This is the letter to which I would call attention. It is dated January 2 and reads in part as follows:

My DEAR SENATOR: I thank you for your letter of the 5th ultimo relative to the salary bill, I am sure that 1, and I am quite certain that the other boys—By the "boys" he means the boys connected with the Post office, the clerks, and the rural and city carriers—realize your position, that it is correct, that in no expenditure should there be any unwise expenditure of the revenue, and if it is provided. I do not think, if I were in the Post Office, that I would have charge of the Post Office should be supported by general taxation. Those who use the service should pay for maintenance of that service.

Mr. President, I am led to say that the sentiment expressed in this last sentence of that letter is one not at all foreign to the average American citizen. I have here a little summary, without going into detail, of what would be expected to be raised from various sources under the amended bill presented by the Senator from New Hampshire.

From post cards, distinguished from postal cards—and I think Senators are familiar with that distinction, from the discussion the other day—$15,500,000. From publications of second-class matter generally, $4,000,000. From transient matter—that is, second-class matter—mailled by the individual here and there, and so on, $1,500,000. Total, $31,500,000.

Parcel post, $15,000,000. From the 2-cent service charge, as I have figured it out, though I may be in error in regard to it—$1,125,000. For various services—orders, registered mail, insurance, collect-on-delivery service, and special-delivery service, an aggregate of $35,024,510. Total of $86,767,910, against approximately $38,000,000 that, under the vetoed bill, would be added as taxes to make up the postal salary increase. I think we have come a little nearer making up the $68,000,000 than the whole

mate furnished by the Post Office Department under the terms of the original bill.

That is about all I have to say. I think Senators who have noted the proceedings from the time this matter was first brought up will agree that we have received from the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Owen), which goes to the root of the matter, I think, in so far as the smaller daily newspapers are concerned.

An analysis of the effects of the rates in the bill as amended shows that increases in the amount of $3,501,477.56 would be gained by the department from the first, second, third, and fourth zones, as against decreases in those zones incident to the quarter cent reduction on reading matter of $466,248.50. The bill as reported to the Senate provides for no increase in postage beyond the fifth zone, but rather for decreases in postage on advertising as well as on reading matter beyond that zone. It can thus be seen that all of the increases are confined to the first four zones of the circulation of the smaller daily newspapers is confined.

It is estimated that the large city dailies now send out only about 10 per cent of their first-class circulation through the mails and the charge to them might be estimated at $18,000,000 of their net revenue, as against 25 per cent of the net revenue of the smaller dailies. The small papers' mail circulation is confined almost wholly to the fourth zone, which is that which falls in radius from the office of publication. In New York State alone the average haul of the smaller dailies is about 35 miles. With increases in postage provided only in the first three zones it will thus be seen that the burden will fall almost wholly on the smaller daily newspapers, with no compensating effect from the reduction in postage in the further zones, such as would be enjoyed by the larger newspapers or the periodicals.

With the permission of the Senate I shall append to this statement a table showing the total increase and decrease on reading and advertising matter under the proposed rates. This table sets forth that the net increase which would be gained—mark this—from these rates would be $642,078.39. This increase is arrived at by subtracting from the gross increase of $3,501,477.56, the reduction of $466,248.50 charged to them might be estimated at $642,078.39. It is 6.39. This increase is arrived at by subtracting from the gross increase of $3,501,477.56, the reduction of $466,248.50 that decrease in the rates on advertising in the far zones and the decrease in the rate on purely news matter in all the zones. It is the opinion of the publishers of the smaller dailies, however, that they will not be able to stand this increase in postage in the zones where they do business, and that the net effect of the bill will be to curtail circulation in such a manner that the small papers of the near-by zone will be driven out of business. The Government will suffer a net reduction in revenue without any compensating advantage of a net reduction in expenses. Whether in committee or on the floor, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada demands a consideration which it seems to me has not been given to it by the committee or the Senate.

I submit a table, and ask that it be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>Net Increase</th>
<th>Net Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,689,960.28</td>
<td>$711,476.32</td>
<td>$1,978,483.96</td>
<td>$441,474.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$240,442.26</td>
<td>$189,882.56</td>
<td>$50,559.69</td>
<td>$1,941,474.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,356,393.90</td>
<td>$1,836,393.90</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,356,393.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3,501,477.56</td>
<td>$671,547.65</td>
<td>$2,829,930.91</td>
<td>$671,547.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$952,219.61</td>
<td>$566,973.61</td>
<td>$385,246.00</td>
<td>$566,973.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Increase $642,078.39. It will be observed that the net increase in the first four zones amounts to $2,585,963.91. For various services—orders, registered mail, insurance, collect-on-delivery service, and special-delivery service, an aggregate of $35,024,510.
from doing more than merely endeavoring to bring the discussion back to the question that is really in issue here. The question is made up of a political charge. It is not the following of a presidential policy, nor is it in any degree a question upon which the two sides of the aisle of this Chamber should in the slightest degree divide. The only thing that is at stake here now is whether the United States of America is big enough, broad enough, generous enough, and decent enough to give a living wage to the employees of the United States of America. There is not any other question which at this moment is involved.

It is nonsense to say, and I say with respect and deference to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Steere], that there was a mandate in the last election of one kind or another. There were any number of mandates in the last mandate upon the presidential veto it was a mandate against any increase in wages at all. When the President of the United States and the leaders of the administration come here and say that they believe in an increase, then they dispose of any suggestion of mandate that may be made and any argument that they have made thus far upon the measure. To say that it interferes with the policy of the economy of the President or a policy of Congress of the Republican Party is even more chimerical and nonsensical. There is no economy in borrowing from Peter to pay Paul. If on the ground of economy the bill should not be passed then it could not be passed at all, and, I think, a kind of taxation indirectly we will raise the revenue with which to pay the increased salaries is to negative at once any question of economy.

I learned long ago, when I was governor of a State, as Senators who have been in executive positions have learned, that where there was a policy that was desired to be put over and withdrawn there was an (inaudible) uniformity by which its defeat was sought, and that was a preface of agreeing in principle with you, but suggesting that it be done in some other way. The way, any experience in executive positions has just that experience heretofore in dealing with public policy or with legislative acts.

Here is a measure that passed the Senate of the United States, ago by a vote of 73 to 5. What is the change that has come over the spirit of your dreams in the last six months? I do not know, Mr. President, where regrettably ends and less majesty begins. I do not care where regularity ends and less majesty begins. Here is a measure that is just. Here is an increase that no man dares say on the floor of the Senate to-day is not just. Here is an increase in pay that the committee admits is equitable and ought to be passed. Here is a bill increasing the salaries which from the President down every individual connected with the administration now admits ought to become a law, and if it be admitted that it be payable to-day and on and on, but let me have the manhood to pass it. There is only one way to pass it, and that is to vote our independent judgment upon the bill which is before us, veto or no veto, and give to men who desire not in whatever capacity employment the raise in salary which they so richly deserve.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to speak only to one clause in the bill, and that is a political charge. I do not care with those who voted against the bill when it was originally passed. I have no criticism to make of the President for vetoing it. I do not find fault either with those who voted for it when it passed originally and who since then have experienced a real change of heart, and desire and intend now to vote against the bill and support the President in his veto. There remains, however, more particularly on the Republican side of the Chamber another class who voted for the bill when it passed originally and who insist on voting the same way now. It is to that class that I desire now to address a few words.

Mr. President, I am surprised, I am dumfounded, I am be-wildered, I am almost broken-hearted to see this wonderful exhibition of insolvency within our ranks. If there is one thing necessary to give one confidence that we understand what it is and will stand under all circumstances and conditions, to obey our leader. We have just passed through a campaign when the slogan was "Stand by the President" and the country has vindicated the slogan not only magnificently but under every possible manner of condition. I do not think that the case is not among those in my own party who show indications at least that they are not going to obey the command and respect the wishes of our leader.

I want to say to you, my friends, as a regular of many years standing, that you are occupying a very dangerous position. [Laughter.] You are on a precipice. You are about to plunge over into what seems in theory to be a beautiful body of water called the lake of consolations. You are going to follow, you say, what you believe to be right—obey the wishes of your leader. What is your wish? Is it not with a consolations conviction or a conscience in which to keep it? I say to you when you plunge off into that body of water, that while it looks inviting, perhaps, from the funda-mental theory you are going down into the bottom where the water is cold, and if, perchance, in your mad plunge to follow your conscience, your feet land upon a solid rock and you get your head above the water, you will realize then, if you do not do it now, my friends, that the thing you will do will be to raise your hands in pity and ex-claim, "Help me, Cissus, or I sink!" But, my friends, we have not yet passed that point. We have not yet passed that point. You have not yet passed that point. Now is the hour when you must enlist under the flag of regularity if you want to retain your standing.

Remember, it is only a few weeks ago since we regulars met in solemn concord and expelled for a reason four of those who had hitherto been members. It is true we did not notify them. It is true we did it peremptorily, without trial, and without giving anybody a hearing. But I want to call your attention to the danger that you may face if you persist in this insurgent conduct. We expelled them from the Republican Party. We expelled them because they refused to follow our campaign. Incidentally, my friends, it was the same leader, and he will not be satisfied at all until he has expelled them then as he is now. We expelled them—think of it! None of them controlled many votes, as the result showed. They have done very much harm—very much harm. They have controlled a thousand votes was all. What are you about to do in this mad rush without reason! There are more than one hundred million population in the country. There are 66 Senators. I do not believe a man's vote means more than a million votes of any one person. If you will only act on your own initiative you will be hanged by the neck until dead, and thereafter you will be deprived of holding any office of profit or trust under the Constitution of the United States.

That will not be all, my friends. You will be debarred to join the Democratic Party and carry water and other liquid refreshments to the Democratic donkey the balance of your days. [Laughter.] I ask you, therefore, to hasten before yet take of those in the circus, who have seen their leaders fail. If expulsion is the proper penalty for those who influenced a little handful of votes, what shall happen to you if you carry a million votes away from our leader? Why, my friends, you will not only be expelled from the party, but you will be hanged by the neck until dead, and thereafter you will be deprived of holding any office of profit or trust under the Constitution of the United States.

That will not be all, my friends. You will be debarred to join the Democratic Party and carry water and other liquid refreshments to the Democratic donkey the balance of your days. [Laughter.] I ask you, therefore, to hasten before yet take of those in the circus, who have seen their leaders fail. If expulsion is the proper penalty for those who influenced a little handful of votes, what shall happen to you if you carry a million votes away from our leader? Why, my friends, you will not only be expelled from the party, but you will be hanged by the neck until dead, and thereafter you will be deprived of holding any office of profit or trust under the Constitution of the United States.

That will not be all, my friends. You will be debarred to join the Democratic Party and carry water and other liquid refreshments to the Democratic donkey the balance of your days. [Laughter.] I ask you, therefore, to hasten before yet take of those in the circus, who have seen their leaders fail. If expulsion is the proper penalty for those who influenced a little handful of votes, what shall happen to you if you carry a million votes away from our leader? Why, my friends, you will not only be expelled from the party, but you will be hanged by the neck until dead, and thereafter you will be deprived of holding any office of profit or trust under the Constitution of the United States.

That will not be all, my friends. You will be debarred to join the Democratic Party and carry water and other liquid refreshments to the Democratic donkey the balance of your days. [Laughter.] I ask you, therefore, to hasten before yet take of those in the circus, who have seen their leaders fail. If expulsion is the proper penalty for those who influenced a little handful of votes, what shall happen to you if you carry a million votes away from our leader? Why, my friends, you will not only be expelled from the party, but you will be hanged by the neck until dead, and thereafter you will be deprived of holding any office of profit or trust under the Constitution of the United States.

That will not be all, my friends. You will be debarred to join the Democratic Party and carry water and other liquid refreshments to the Democratic donkey the balance of your days. [Laughter.] I ask you, therefore, to hasten before yet take of those in the circus, who have seen their leaders fail. If expulsion is the proper penalty for those who influenced a little handful of votes, what shall happen to you if you carry a million votes away from our leader? Why, my friends, you will not only be expelled from the party, but you will be hanged by the neck until dead, and thereafter you will be deprived of holding any office of profit or trust under the Constitution of the United States.
We ought to give them this increase; we ought not to dangle them in the air any longer; and I hope that when the matter comes to a vote to-morrow, there can be almost unanimous vote expressed their determination hereafter will do the same determination now. I trust that the bill which has been put before us simply as a smoke screen to blind the true intent of the legislators may have a bill which will indicate a desire on the part of Senators to enact it into law. I hope that when we come to a vote we will give the postal employees the increases in salaries to which the state which indicates that this act of justice can be done without embarrassment to the country.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask for the yea's and nays.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If the motion of the Senator from South Dakota shall be rejected, will an opportunity be given to-morrow to discuss the question of overriding the President's veto?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that such an opportunity will be afforded. The question before the Senate is whether or not the Senate from South Dakota shall refer the veto message and the bill to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, a few moments ago if, in his opinion, his motion should prevail and the bill should be sent to the committee, whether or not we would be able then, under the unanimous-consent order, to have a vote to-morrow on the question of overriding the President's veto? It was his opinion that if his motion should prevail we would not have the opportunity of voting to-morrow to override the President's veto? May I ask, what is the opinion of the Chair with respect to that matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair will not be called upon to rule upon that question unless the matter comes before the Senate when he is occupying the chair.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there can be no doubt about the answer to the question the Senator has propounded. If the matter is referred to the committee, it disappears from the Senate; we will not have it before us to-morrow; and, of course, we shall not be able to vote on it to-morrow.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senate can not vote on a matter that is before it.

Mr. HARRISON. When this question was before us previously, I suggested that I would move to amend the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to the effect that the committee would have the bill referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.
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\[ \text{We ought to give them this increase; we ought not to dangle them in the air any longer; and I hope that when the matter comes to a vote to-morrow, there can be almost unanimous vote.} \]

\[ \text{Mr. HEFLIN. I ask for the yea's and nays.} \]

\[ \text{Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.} \]

\[ \text{The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.} \]

\[ \text{Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If the motion of the Senator from South Dakota shall be rejected, will an opportunity be given to-morrow to discuss the question of overriding the President's veto?} \]

\[ \text{The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that such an opportunity will be afforded.} \]

\[ \text{Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.} \]

\[ \text{The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi will state his parliamentary inquiry.} \]

\[ \text{Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, a few moments ago if, in his opinion, his motion should prevail and the bill should be sent to the committee, whether or not we would be able then, under the unanimous-consent order, to have a vote to-morrow on the question of overriding the President's veto?} \]

\[ \text{The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair will not be called upon to rule upon that question unless the matter comes before the Senate when he is occupying the chair.} \]

\[ \text{Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there can be no doubt about the answer to the question the Senator has propounded. If the matter is referred to the committee, it disappears from the Senate; we will not have it before us to-morrow; and, of course, we shall not be able to vote on it to-morrow.} \]

\[ \text{Mr. SWANSON. The Senate can not vote on a matter that is before it.} \]

\[ \text{Mr. HARRISON. When this question was before us previously, I suggested that I would move to amend the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to the effect that the committee would have the bill referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.} \]

\[ \text{Mr. JANUARY 5} \]
Mr. ROBINSON (when the name of Mr. Rinz of Missouri was called). I desire to announce that the senator Senator from Missouri is unavoidably detained.

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senator Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MACE], and will vote. I vote "yea." The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KING. Upon this question I have a general pair with the Junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Wheeler]. If he were present, he would vote "yea," and I would vote "yea." I am therefore compelled to withhold my vote.

Mr. SHEPSTEAD. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota] is unavoidably absent from the Senate on account of illness in his family. If present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—30

Ball
Butler
Cummins
Capper
Missouri
Dale
eral pair
Cotten
lnd
Curtis

NAYS—52

Ashurst
Bayard
Brookhart
Clay
Bruce
Caraway
Cochran
Coffey
Coss
Edwards
Edwardson

NOT VOTING—13

Pikas
Johnson, Minn.
Kemp
Lenroot

So the Senate refused to refer the bill and veto message to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 6, 1925, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 5, 1925

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Harlan Fiske Stone, of New York, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Joseph McKenna, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 5, 1925

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harold P. Williams, to be United States Attorney, district of Massachusetts, vice Robert O. Harris, removed.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Ben Lee, Cazadero.
John F. Cavanaugh, Del Mar.
Gladys B Evans, Graffton.
Mamie L Royce, Pittsburg.
Florence M. Cole, Rose.
Maryln M. Thomas, Stanford University.
Floyd M. Filson, Tenanti.

GEORGIA

Robert S. Franklin, Adairsville.
Ann B. Hutchens, Buchanan.

Harry W. Womelsdorf, Cartersville.
Unio L. Carmical, College Park.
George M. Greeley, Decatur.
Sam N. Thompson, East Point.
James A. Allen, La Fayette.
Charles P. Coleough, Macon.
Albert S. J. McPherson, Doraville.
R. Gordon Rices, Register.
William H. Bittick, Statesboro.
J. Percy Freeman, Stone Mountain.
Landis B. LeBeau, Decatur.
William C. Griffin, Tunnel Hill.

MAINE

Lawrence A. Brown, Brunswick.
Frank P. Freeman, Harrison.

MASSACHUSETTS

Andrew J. Maguire, Randolph.

MICHIGAN

Frank A. Cole, Grass Lake.

OREGON

Earl B. Watt, Falls City.

PENNSYLVANIA

Walter A. Cokern, Avonmore.
Adah E. Pettis, Sargersonot.

WASHINGTON

Albert Maurer, Kelso.
Birdie L. Crook, Nespelem.
Pearl R. Barrill, Snoqualmie Falls.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, January 5, 1925

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Heavenly Father, we bless and praise Thy holy name for the eternal constancy of Thy goodness and mercy. We thank Thee for life, for its opportunities, and for its wonderful privileges. Do Thou bring us into full and complete harmony with everything that is good and upright. May Thy ways be our ways and may we ask no other reward than Thy approval. Toward the God of all life and wisdom may we turn our thoughts as we take up the tasks of the day. In joy or in pain never allow us to stand alone, and when sorrow comes may it be dissolved into the sunshine of Thy love. For the sake of Jesus, do hear us. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 3, 1925, was read and approved.

RIVERS AND HARBOURS

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Recess a letter from General Taylor, Chief of Engineers, on the river and harbor improvements bill, now pending in Congress. It is an answer to an editorial in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Reccess by printing a letter from General Taylor, Chief of Engineers. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me to print I submit the following letter written by Major General Taylor, Chief of Engineers, on the river and harbor appropriations:

THE RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

To the Editor of The Post:

Sir: In your issue of December 22, 1924, under the caption of "Progress and puck," you discuss editorially the river and harbor improvement bill, which is now pending in Congress.

Your editorial was evidently written under a misapprehension as to the character of the bill referred to. You speak of the bill as if it carried an appropriation of $35,000,000. The bill to which you refer does not carry one dollar of appropriations. It authorizes certain improvements to be carried on with funds which are to be appropriated in the future. As it now reads, even if it should become a law at once, no money can be expended during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, on any of the projects which would be authorized. The question of providing funds for carrying on these projects, should they be authorized, will come up again next year before the Director of the Budget