

Borne only on high occasions, it was displayed at the centennial of the Battle of Bunker Hill, 1875, and at the centennial of the Declaration of Independence at Philadelphia, 1876; at the centennial of the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown, 1881, and at the sesquicentennial of the taking command of the American Army by Gen. George Washington, May 23, 1925, at Philadelphia, in parade with the Old Guard State Fencibles celebrating the event.

Having been in existence for nearly a century and showing many signs of wear, it was quilted in 1874 upon a similar piece of crimson silk in order that it might be preserved, if possible, for another hundred years.

The flag is kept in a bank vault and is never on display except under the especial care and command of a commissioned officer of the Washington Light Infantry; it is never taken from nor redeposited in the bank vault except in the presence of an officer of the company with a witness.

REGULATION OF RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 9971.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9971) for the regulation of radio communications, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with an amendment.

EXPENDITURES IN SENATORIAL ELECTIONS

Mr. CURTIS obtained the floor.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President—

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia to make an announcement.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the Senate shall convene on Thursday, the 1st day of July, I may be permitted to address the Senate on Senate Resolution 268 and the recent primary election in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I will have to object to that, Mr. President.

Mr. NEELY. Then I give notice that I will discuss the question at that time without the permission of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 30, 1926, at 12 o'clock meridian.

TUESDAY, June 29, 1926

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

O Lord God, lead us into the secrets of that wisdom that quiets doubts and gives the heart joy and confidence. Spare us from groundless fears and anxieties, and may our labors be a delight and not a drudgery. Preserve us from a hurried life of wear and friction, and bless us with a sweet and restful assurance that bestows the riches of Thy peace. Whatever ability, power, or influence we possess, may they be so used that we shall make the world our debtor. Oh, may the welfare of all become the supreme law of our land, so that all institutions shall stand on the love and loyalty of all citizens. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SECOND DEFICIENCY BILL, 1926

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13040.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13040, with Mr. HAWLEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13040, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13040) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and June 30, 1927, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose last night the first paragraph of the bill had been read. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

To pay the widow of Harry I. Thayer, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, \$10,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, after line 9, insert a separate paragraph, the following: "The foregoing appropriations shall be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment to Warren Worth Bailey for expenses incurred as contestant in the contested-election case of Bailey against Walters, audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 2, \$2,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, after line 5, insert the following:

"For payment to Anderson H. Walters for expenses incurred as contestee in the contested-election case of Bailey against Walters, audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 2, \$2,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerk to the Speaker's table, \$400; clerk to the Committee on Ways and Means, \$600; clerks to the Committees on the Judiciary, Accounts, and Claims, at \$420 each; superintendent of the House document room, \$450; special employee in the House document room (Joel Grayson), \$560; in all, \$3,270.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 11989. An act for the relief of Caleb W. Swink.

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

H. R. 6087. An act to reinstate Joe Burton Coursey in the West Point Military Academy;

H. R. 12175. An act to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924;

H. R. 12313. An act granting the consent of Congress to William H. Armbricht to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tombigbee River at or near Pickensville, in the county of Pickens, Ala.;

H. R. 12314. An act granting the consent of Congress to William H. Armbricht to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tombigbee River at or near Cochrane, in the county of Pickens, Ala.;

H. R. 12537. An act granting the consent of Congress to William H. Armbricht to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tombigbee River at or near Jackson, in the county of Clarke, Ala.;

H. R. 12538. An act granting the consent of Congress to William H. Armbricht to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tombigbee River at or near Gainesville, in the county of Sumter, Ala.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 12175) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, had requested a conference with the House thereon, and had ordered that Mr. REED of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMOOR, and Mr. JONES of New Mexico as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2868) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgments in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes.

SECOND DEFICIENCY BILL, 1926

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, after line 20, insert a new paragraph:

"For 41 pages, including 10 pages for duty at the entrances to the Hall of the House, at \$3.30 per day each, and three session telephone operators, at the rate of \$100 per month each from July 1, 1926, until the end of the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, so much as may be necessary is appropriated."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, after line 20, insert as a new paragraph:

"The unexpended balance on June 30, 1926, appropriation of \$3,000 for the fiscal year 1925, for the employment of competent persons to assist in continuing the work of compiling, codifying, and revising the laws and treaties of the United States, is continued and made available during the fiscal year 1927."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Biographical Directory of the American Congress: To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay upon vouchers approved by the chairman or the vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing for collecting information, editing, copying, and preparing manuscript for preservation for a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress, \$10,000, to remain available until June 30, 1927.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 9, after the year "1927," insert "and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, and such parts of this sum as the chairman or vice chairman of the joint committee directs may be paid as additional compensation to any employee of the United States."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriation of \$800 for payment to Charles C. Allen for extra services as messenger on night duty during the first session of the Sixty-eighth Congress, contained in the "second deficiency act, fiscal year 1924," is reappropriated and made available for payment to the executrix of his estate.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, after line 12, insert "enlarging the Capitol grounds: For carrying out the purposes of the act entitled 'An act for the enlargement of the Capitol grounds, approved June 23, 1926,' including not exceeding \$500 for incidental expenses for the fiscal year 1927, \$1,331,958.37, to be expended under the direction of the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

Damage claims: To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the General Accounting Office under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding \$1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Document No. 296, Sixty-ninth Congress, \$78.85.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, after line 26, insert the following: "Oldroyd collection of Lincoln relics: To enable the commission created hereby to carry out the purposes of the act entitled 'An act for the purchase of the Oldroyd collection of Lincoln relics,' approved May 11, 1926, fiscal year 1927, \$50,000."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

TARIFF COMMISSION

For all printing and binding for the Tariff Commission, fiscal year 1926, \$6,820.76.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 9, line 3, after the sum "\$6,820.76," insert the following: "to be available until June 30, 1927."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed \$4,000 of the appropriation of \$1,000,000 for repairs to streets contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1927 shall be available for resurfacing Twelfth Street SW., between E Street and the railroad.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 12, line 16, after the word "railroad," insert the following: "and not to exceed \$3,500 of such appropriation shall be available for paving Belmont Road NW., Massachusetts Avenue to Tracy Place."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDUSTRIAL HOME SCHOOL FOR COLORED CHILDREN

The appropriation of \$2,000 contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1925, for furniture and furnishings for a new cottage at the Industrial Home School for Colored Children is hereby made available for such purposes until June 30, 1927.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 17, after line 14, insert "Board of Public Welfare: Home care for dependent children: To carry out the purposes of the act entitled 'An act to provide home care for dependent children in the District of Columbia,' approved June 22, 1926, including not to exceed \$10,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, in accordance with the classification act of 1923, fiscal year 1927, \$75,000."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am very glad to see that this matter of child-welfare legislation has finally reached the stage of appropriation. I personally strongly advocated a separate board to handle the matters pertaining to children in the District of Columbia, but the legislation finally worked out I hope will prove adequate and satisfactory. The appropriation in this bill is, of course, only supplementary, but I feel that the whole matter of the care of dependent children has been satisfactorily worked out by Congress for the District of Columbia.

The immediate supplemental and deficiency appropriation which we are considering is as follows:

BOARD OF CHILDREN'S GUARDIANS

For maintenance of feeble-minded children (white and colored), fiscal year 1926, \$10,000.

For board and care of all children committed to the guardianship of said board by the courts of the District, and for temporary care of children pending investigation or while being transferred from place to place, with authority to pay not more than \$1,500 each to institutions under sectarian control and not more than \$400 for burial of children dying while under charge of the board, fiscal year 1926, \$24,000.

I had the pleasure last Saturday of opening the general debate on this second deficiency appropriation bill, and I then discussed quite fully the appropriation for the military posts

construction fund and the appropriation for the undercover spies in the Prohibition Unit. There are, therefore, only a few matters I wish to discuss at the present time. Some one may ask for a vote on the appropriation for the Prohibition Unit, which includes the undercover spies. In the House of Representatives there are a great many Members who are strongly in favor of reasonable modification of the Volstead Act, who feel it their duty, however, to vote for any and all appropriations for prohibition, no matter how improper. It is therefore to be noted that no vote on such an item as this appropriation item is a test of the strength in the House of Representatives of those who favor modification of the Volstead Act for wine and beer to be sold under proper circumstances.

The progress of modification has made great strides in this House. A committee of 60 Representatives has conducted the fight for modification, and when this question comes squarely before the House for a vote in the next session there will be considerably over 175 Members ready to vote for making the Volstead Act grant to all classes of our people the same rights. I desire to call attention to the situation in the House, as expressed by the work of the unofficial committee on modification of the Volstead Act. The following is the membership of this committee in this House:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SIXTY-NINTH CONGRESS, THE COMMITTEE ON MODIFICATION OF THE VOLSTEAD ACT (UNOFFICIAL)

Oscar L. Auf der Heide, New Jersey; Victor L. Berger, Wisconsin; Loring M. Black, jr., New York; Sol Bloom, New York; Henry L. Bowles, Massachusetts; John J. Boylan, New York; Fred A. Britten, Illinois; George F. Brumm, Pennsylvania; John F. Carew, New York; Emanuel Celler, New York; William E. Cleary, New York; William P. Connery, jr., Massachusetts; James J. Connolly, Pennsylvania; Parker Corning, New York; Thomas H. Cullen, New York; Samuel Dickstein, New York; John J. Douglass, Massachusetts; Charles J. Esterly, Pennsylvania; Lawrence J. Flaherty, California; Thomas A. Doyle, Illinois; Leonidas C. Dyer, Missouri; James A. Gallivan, Massachusetts; Stephen W. Gambrill, Maryland; Benjamin M. Golder, Pennsylvania; John J. Gorman, Illinois; Anthony J. Griffin, New York; Florence P. Kahn, California; Oscar E. Keller, Minnesota; John J. Kindred, New York; Stanley H. Kunz, Illinois; Florello H. LaGuardia, New York; Florian Lampert, Wisconsin; Frederick R. Lehlbach, New Jersey; George W. Lindsay, New York; J. Charles Lathicum, Maryland; Clarence MacGregor, New York; James M. Mead, New York; Charles A. Mooney, Ohio; John M. Morin, Pennsylvania; C. A. Newton, Missouri; Mary T. Norton, New Jersey; David J. O'Connell, New York; James O'Connor, Louisiana; John J. O'Connor, New York; Frank Oliver, New York; Nathan D. Perlman, New York; Anning S. Prall, New York; John F. Quayle, New York; Harry C. Ransley, Pennsylvania; Adolph J. Sabath, Illinois; John C. Schafer, Wisconsin; George J. Schneider, Wisconsin; Andrew L. Somers, New York; John B. Sosnowski, Michigan; A. E. B. Stephens, Ohio; C. D. Sullivan, New York; Millard E. Tydings, Maryland; Edward Voigt, Wisconsin; Royal H. Weller, New York; and John Philip Hill, Maryland, chairman.

On May 26, 1926, the Committee on Modification of the Volstead Act (unofficial) met for the purposes set forth in the following notice of the committee meeting:

MAY 18, 1926.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Yesterday the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate reported favorably Senator Goff's bill (S. 4207) to amend and strengthen the national prohibition act, and the act of November 23, 1921, supplemental thereto, and for other purposes.

I inclose you herewith the committee print of the above bill.

The proponents of this bill will make every effort to bring it up as soon as possible in the Senate; and if the Anti-Saloon League is successful, it will also be brought up in the House.

The inclosed bill greatly extends the iniquities of the Volstead Act. It must be fought whenever it comes before the House. It proposes to amend and therefore opens up the whole question of amendment of the Volstead Act.

There will be a meeting of this committee at 4, House Terrace, the Capitol, next Wednesday, May 26, at 10.30 a. m., for the purpose of (1) making plans for preventing the passage of S. 4207 and (2) of agreeing upon a modification of the Volstead Act, which may be offered as an amendment to S. 4207 or a similar House bill.

Before the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee there were proposed three outstanding forms of modification of the Volstead Act:

(1) H. R. 67, providing that "each State shall for itself define the meaning of the words 'intoxicating liquors' as used in section 1 of Article XVIII of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and each State shall itself enforce within its own limits its own laws on this subject."

(2) H. R. 11050, providing for the repeal of the Volstead Act and the substitution of the following therefor: "The manufacture, sale, or transportation of distilled alcoholic liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and

all Territories subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited."

(3) H. R. 11057, providing to amend the Volstead Act "by striking out the words 'containing one-half of 1 per cent or more of alcohol by volume' and the words 'containing more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume' wherever they appear in said act and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'intoxicating in fact.'"

This committee will meet in executive session next Wednesday to consider agreeing on one of these bills or on its own redraft of any one or of all three of these bills, or on any other form of modification it may desire, with the purpose of offering said committee bill as an amendment to S. 4207, and for the further purpose of permitting any Members of the House who are not members of this committee to file this committee's modification bill.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN PHILIP HILL.

The action taken by the Committee on Modification of the Volstead Act at that time is set forth in the following confirmation of its action reported to its members:

MAY 26, 1926.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: This committee met this morning at 10.30 in accordance with the call of May 18. Various proposed plans of modification of the Volstead Act were discussed in executive session.

It was decided that this committee favors modification of the Volstead Act, as follows: "The Federal act to enforce the eighteenth amendment is hereby modified so that the same shall not prohibit the manufacture, sale, transportation, importation, or exportation of beverages which are not in fact intoxicating as determined in accordance with the laws of the respective States."

I was authorized to appoint a subcommittee from the members of this committee who are also members of the Judiciary Committee of the House to draft and report back to this committee a bill modifying the Volstead Act along the above lines. I have appointed Representatives DYER, PERLMAN, GORMAN, and WELLER.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN PHILIP HILL.

A bill is now being drafted for the Committee on Modification of the Volstead Act and will be presented at the next session of this Congress.

One can not speak of modification of the Volstead Act without thinking of the position taken in this regard by the State of Maryland, which has caused it to be called "The Maryland Free State." I think it will be interesting to the membership of the House to hear read a brief quotation from an article by Mr. Hamilton Owens, the editor of the Baltimore Evening Sun, in the March issue of the American Mercury. This is a most interesting article and should be read in full, but I desire to have read for the information of this committee the following very brief extract:

Before the legislature met, the Maryland Court of Appeals had handed down a decision holding that there was no obligation upon the officials of Maryland to enforce the national Volstead Act. That decision put a double burden upon the Anti-Saloon League, and at the same time gave courage to the embattled wets. The bill "putting Maryland into the Union" was the chief item on the dry agenda. Since in Maryland, as in most other States where there is a large city, the farmer's vote is worth about two or three times that of the city man, the country delegates, which is nearly equivalent to saying the Anti-Saloon League delegates, were greatly in the majority in the lower house. So they passed the dry bill without delay. But in the senate the fight was hotter. The wets were slightly outnumbered, but they were possessed of superior strategists. The whole State watched a fight in which every devious device known to the political mind was brought to bear. While the political parsons held prayer meetings in the lobbies, logs were rolled, and deals made in the committee rooms. The bill was twisted, turned, amended, committed, brought out, and recommitted. In the midst of this manoeuvring, JOHN PHILIP HILL came over from Washington and joined the wet side. Somewhere, somehow, somebody slipped into the bill a provision calling for a referendum on the measure. This was a challenge that the Anti-Saloon League, knowing the temper of Baltimore city, could not afford to accept. The wets triumphantly voted for the amended bill. The dries voted against it, and it was killed. Thus was finally born the Maryland Free State, and thus the cause came into being.

The Maryland Free State stands on prohibition as on all other matters, on the fundamental principles of the Constitution. We in Maryland believe in local government for city, county, and State on local matters. We do not believe that the purely local matters should be regulated from Washington, any more than we believe that the affairs of the United States should be regulated by the League of Nations sitting at Geneva. We call the Maryland Free State so because we believe in local freedom. We stand for the principles of America first—no World Court, and local self-government for city, county, and State. [Applause.]

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ROCK CREEK AND POTOMAC PARKWAY COMMISSION

To enable the commission created by section 22 of the public buildings act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. p. 885), to continue the acquisition of lands for a connecting parkway between Potomac Park, Zoological Park, and Rock Creek Park, fiscal years 1927 and 1928, \$600,000, to be paid from the special fund created by the act approved February 2, 1925, entitled "An act making an adjustment of certain accounts between the United States and the District of Columbia."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. TREADWAY. I wish to ask a question in reference to this item just read, Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not that work is expected to progress rapidly to completion, to connect the two parks? This matter has been before Congress for a long period of years without a great deal of accomplishment. I take it that with this large appropriation it is expected that the work will progress so that the two parks will be directly connected by the boulevard in the near future.

I would like to ask also, if I may, whether the plan contemplates an opportunity to reach that boulevard from Massachusetts Avenue as it passes from one park to the other?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that the plan of development has not all been worked out yet. Whether it will involve a method of reaching this boulevard from Massachusetts Avenue, I do not know. But I will state to the gentleman that the amount of \$600,000 here will purchase approximately 12 acres of land on the basis of its assessed value, and the purchase of this land will enable the commission to carry out the project to completion.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I further ask, Mr. Chairman, in whose hands the decision as to whether or not an entrance will be made from Massachusetts Avenue will be left for final determination, and when it may be expected that the plans will be sufficiently matured so we may know whether such an entrance will be provided? There is now, as the gentleman, of course, knows, an opportunity to get from Massachusetts Avenue to the park roadway over a horseback route, which seems to me could very readily be made into an entrance from Massachusetts Avenue to the boulevard itself.

Mr. ANTHONY. As the gentleman knows, the proposed parkway is much below the grade of Massachusetts Avenue, and undoubtedly there will have to be considerable work done to enable direct communication from Massachusetts Avenue to this new parkway. The entire jurisdiction in this case lies in the hands of the Park and Planning Commission, in conjunction with Colonel Grant, the engineer officer in charge of the parks of the District. It would be my idea, I will say to the gentleman—Massachusetts Avenue being such a main artery of traffic—that the Park and Planning Commission would undoubtedly give careful study to such a connection as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. TREADWAY. I thank the gentleman for the information. No doubt the proper authorities will recognize the desirability of including this entrance in their plans. I withdraw the pro forma motion.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read to page 22, line 15.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 22, after line 14, insert as a new paragraph the following:

"For carrying into effect the act entitled 'An act for the relief of John Milton Pew,' approved June 10, 1926, fiscal year 1926, §114."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY

For an additional amount for investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet an emergency caused by the appearance of the *Thurberia* (wild cotton) weevil in stands of cultivated cotton, including personal services and other expenses connected

therewith in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, fiscal year 1927, \$10,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYDEN: Page 22, line 23, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$35,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to disagree with the Committee on Appropriations with respect to the amount of this appropriation. The amendment I have offered increases the amount to \$35,000, which is the sum recommended by the Bureau of the Budget as transmitted to Congress by the President in a supplemental estimate on June 5 of this year.

The common cotton-boll weevil probably originated in Mexico or Central America and first appeared in the United States near Brownsville, Tex., in 1892. In the past 34 years it has spread into 12 States where cotton is grown, and the direct loss from this insect is conservatively estimated at \$200,000,000 each year.

In 1912 a native variety of boll weevil was discovered not far from Tucson, Ariz., occurring on the *Thurberia* plant, a wild cotton which has a scattered growth in the mountains and along the washes leading down from the mountains in that vicinity. Very little cotton was then grown near Tucson, but since that time the area planted to that crop has gradually increased until about 15,000 acres was planted last year. Whenever the cultivated cotton is located near the wild cotton it has been demonstrated that the *Thurberia* weevil will readily transfer to the cultivated plants.

Upon the wild cotton, its natural host plant, the *Thurberia* weevil reproduces but once a year and can live during periods of drought for three years in a state of suspended animation. Upon cultivated cotton this weevil will produce several generations in a single season, just as does the ordinary boll weevil. The two insects look alike and are undoubtedly of common origin, the proof of which is that they will interbreed, but the *Thurberia* weevil is a much more dangerous pest.

The mortality of the ordinary boll weevil is very high. The average survival over the winter is only about 2½ per cent, while 75 per cent of the *Thurberia* weevils live over from one season to another. This is explained by the fact that the *Thurberia* weevil seals itself up in a cell during the period of hibernation, while the larger number of the ordinary weevil leave the fields to seek shelter during the winter in woods, hedges, and other places where conditions for their protection are more favorable.

Hot, dry weather during the summer exercises a tremendous control over the ordinary weevil, but the *Thurberia* weevil, which has learned how to live in an arid climate, thrives on summer heat. Careful and repeated tests by the Bureau of Entomology have shown that the *Thurberia* weevil can stand 20 degrees more heat than the ordinary weevil and will rapidly multiply under such conditions.

The ordinary boll weevil first feeds on the squares or the fruit buds and will attack the boll only when the squares become comparatively scarce. The *Thurberia* weevil prefers the boll first, last, and all the time. The principal means of combating the ordinary weevil in the South is to grow a variety of cotton which will mature a reasonable crop of bolls before the insect has become abundant enough to eat up the squares and transfer to the bolls. The habits of the *Thurberia* weevil destroy the possibility of securing good results from that system of planting.

The fact that the *Thurberia* weevil hibernates within the boll, sealed up in a cell, makes it ideally adapted to be transported long distances by water. The weevil, unprotected by any covering, will live 10 days under water. In the experiments that were conducted all of them did not die until 21 days after they were submerged. Sealed inside of a cotton boll they can travel hundreds of miles in a flowing stream.

Fortunately for the rest of the country, the Santa Cruz River spreads out on the desert and sinks into the ground. Only in years of exceptional rainfall does any water from the Santa Cruz reach the Gila. The infestation of cultivated cotton in the Santa Cruz Valley above Tucson is therefore not so great a menace to the cotton growers elsewhere in Arizona as it otherwise might be.

The most alarming fact that has been developed is that the *Thurberia* weevil has been found on wild cotton in the mountains near San Simon, Ariz., about four miles from cultivated cotton fields. The San Simon wash drains into the Gila River near Solomonville, and there are many cotton fields below that point in Graham County. If this insect pest is once established there the infested bolls could readily be carried down the Gila to Florence and Casa Grande and on to Yuma. The Imperial Canal now has its heading on the Colorado

River below Yuma, so that it will be entirely possible to introduce the *Thurberia* weevil into the cotton fields of the Imperial Valley by bolls floating in the water used for irrigation.

The statements that I have made are all based on the authority of the trained entomologists of the Department of Agriculture, every one of whom is convinced that the *Thurberia* weevil is a most dangerous menace to the cotton crops now grown in west Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, which are now free from damage by the ordinary boll weevil. In addition, they all agree that this weevil, if permitted to spread over all of the cotton-growing States, would be practically uncontrollable. These same scientists asked for help from Congress to resist the Mexican boll weevil when it first crossed the Rio Grande, but their appeals fell upon deaf ears, with the resulting loss of billions of dollars in the last quarter of a century.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. With pleasure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I ask when this boll weevil first made its appearance; this typical boll weevil of the arid West?

Mr. HAYDEN. This boll weevil was first found in 1912 on a wild cotton plant called *Thurberia*, which is akin to the ordinary cotton plant except that it is a perennial. The plant forms a small boll about the size of a man's thumb, which contains seeds but no lint.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. Arizona tried to put in a quarantine, and the courts of Arizona held they could not do it. The Government of the United States is now proposing to put in the quarantine, and we have an appropriation in this bill of \$35,000 to enforce it. We have \$17,500 more that is available for this purpose—\$10,000 in this bill and \$7,500 in the Agricultural bill, all of which can be used for the further investigation and eradication of the *Thurberia* boll weevil.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. What Arizona wants is to have the Federal Government cut the bushes on which this boll weevil propagates at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States. We feel that if these bushes are going to be cut Arizona should cut them, and we ought not to furnish money here out of the Treasury of the United States to do the physical work in Arizona which the people of Arizona themselves ought to do, and for that reason the amendment of the gentleman ought not to pass.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are two ways of attacking this menace; one is to destroy the insect, and the other to destroy the plant upon which it lives. Congress is appropriating large sums of money every year, and millions of dollars are being spent by the cotton growers of the South in an attempt to destroy the boll weevil.

If the Mexican boll weevil could have been prevented from coming into the United States—if that menace had been met at the Rio Grande just as we have stopped the pink bollworm from coming from Mexico—the agriculture of the South would have been saved at least \$200,000,000 a year. Here is an insect which is much worse than the common boll weevil, an insect that will do infinitely more damage, which has been discovered in the isolated mountain ranges of southern Arizona. The Bureau of Entomology of the Department of Agriculture is not sure that it is possible to completely eradicate the bush upon which the *Thurberia* weevil feeds, but they ask for enough money to make an experiment to see if such a plan is feasible.

Gentlemen should realize that the eradication of the *Thurberia* plant is but one line of investigation which the Department of Agriculture proposes to undertake with this money. Congress is asked to appropriate \$35,000 to be used in various ways to accomplish the best results.

What is \$35,000 to meet a national menace when it is a part of an appropriation bill like this, which carries a total of \$43,000,000? It is so small a sum of money that when the Department of Agriculture can get the item past the hard-bolled Budget and convince the President that the expenditure is wise, this House should not hesitate to grant the request. Why should Congress pare the cheese so thin and give only \$10,000 instead of \$35,000? Why allow the Department of Agriculture to "pass the buck" to Congress? If the *Thurberia* weevil gets loose it will be necessary to appropriate many hundreds of thousands of dollars, not to speak of the great losses which the cotton growers of the country will suffer.

Congress should give the Agricultural Department, whose scientists tell us this weevil is a real menace, all the money requested, and that is all I am asking in this amendment. I seek nothing more than the amount which has been regularly estimated for by the Budget.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Does the gentleman think this \$35,000 would be worth more to the people of the United States as a whole than the \$34,000 that the bill provides for the house-keeper of the institution referred to in the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall not make comparisons because they are sometimes odious. My amendment deserves approval upon its own merits.

The experts of the Bureau of Entomology frankly say that they do not know exactly how to meet this situation. They want \$35,000 to be expended in research work in order to find out. If it is demonstrated that the best way to destroy the *Thurberia* weevil is to go up into the mountains of southern Arizona and eradicate the wild cotton plants upon which the insect lives, then Congress should provide the necessary funds, just as we have, to eradicate the barberry bush and other plants.

I sincerely hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations made a very exhaustive study of the boll weevil situation in Arizona and reached the conclusion that it has provided a sufficient amount of money to meet the situation. The House should understand that in addition to the \$10,000 provided in this paragraph for carrying on the fight against the boll weevil there still remains unexpended out of former appropriations \$7,500 available for the work, and in the next paragraph to be read there is an appropriation of \$35,000 for work in carrying out the quarantine to be put into effect against the Arizona boll weevil.

I call attention further to the fact that the amount of money provided here in this measure to carry on the work of eradication of the wild cotton-boll weevil is much larger in proportion than the appropriation for the eradication of the boll weevil in other places. The committee believes that the amount of money is ample to cope with the evil which the gentleman from Arizona has so eloquently explained.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 23, strike out "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel so keenly the merits of this proposal that I have offered a second amendment providing for \$20,000, which is the absolute minimum amount that should be appropriated. The very best experts of the Federal Government have testified that the *Thurberia* boll weevil is a national menace. If nothing more than 15,000 acres of cotton land in Arizona were involved, the argument made by the gentleman would appear to be sound and logical, but even those cotton growers of my State are entitled to the same consideration as other American farmers receive from the Federal Government. The fact is that the cotton grown in the Santa Cruz Valley enters into interstate commerce and can be shipped in any direction. It is therefore possible to infest cotton in all parts of the country. If the *Thurberia* weevil gets into the fields of the South, it will be practically impossible to grow cotton anywhere in the United States.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does not the gentleman from Arizona think that \$35,000 is sufficient to quarantine and prevent the spread of this wild cotton weevil, and does the gentleman want us to enter into a policy of going into all of the canyons and up into the mountains to find every one of these wild cotton plants and cut them out by the roots? If you embark on that policy, it is going to involve an awful amount of work. It would involve an immense amount of labor.

Mr. HAYDEN. No quarantine can be 100 per cent effective. There is always danger that the insect pest may escape. The Department of Agriculture now asks for money for study and research to determine the character and habits of this insect and to eradicate it at its source.

Mr. ANTHONY. The department said they wanted to use the money to eradicate the wild cotton bushes.

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be the best way to solve the problem.

Mr. ANTHONY. That would be an interminable task and we thought we would start it with this appropriation, and if it was successful this year we would go further.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Secretary of Agriculture will report the result of the investigations and then we will know how to proceed. At the present time he has asked through the Budget for \$35,000, and Congress should at least appropriate \$20,000 in accordance with his request.

Mr. ANTHONY. The committee used its judgment as to the amount of work that could be done with the appropriation we give them and we decided that that amount would be sufficient for the present.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman's committee must assume that responsibility. The failure to provide a sufficient sum of money rests with the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ANTHONY. If we appropriated \$100,000 we could not eradicate all the wild cotton plants.

Mr. HAYDEN. All that I have asked is that Congress appropriate the amount asked for by the Department of Agriculture and allowed by the Budget.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. When the pink boll worm first appeared in Texas from across the border in Mexico it looked like it was going to be a serious menace to the whole cotton industry of the South. The Department of Agriculture took vigorous and effective steps, not only to quarantine against the spread of the pink boll worm into other regions but to eradicate it in the regions where it was at work. One of the methods of eradication was to establish non-cotton zones where during a period of years no cotton was to be grown at all. Some said that was a foolish thing for the department to do, but Congress had the wisdom to inaugurate the policy and to appropriate the necessary money to be spent on the part of the Federal Government, and the Texas legislature did its part and the work has been very effective.

The pink boll worm no longer seems to be a serious menace to the cotton-growing industry. I take issue with my good friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] that the eradication of this pest is purely a local matter for the State of Arizona. I do not think that is correct. It is a matter in which the Nation is vitally concerned. The insect should be vigorously combated.

Mr. MADDEN. I did not say eradication. I said removal of the bushes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. That is one of the methods of eradication. I do not know what other methods they intend to use in expending the money, but the Department of Agriculture has said that they need \$35,000 to make an effective fight against this menace to the cotton industry, and I submit that it would be little enough for us to do to appropriate \$20,000 for that purpose. I intend to vote for the amendment. [Applause.]

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAYDEN) there were—ayes 38, noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to print certain extracts from the testimony of various officials of the Department of Agriculture before the House Committee on Appropriations. The necessity for a careful, scientific investigation of the menace to cultivated cotton from a new variety of boll weevil discovered on the Thurberia wild cotton plant was first presented to Congress at a hearing held on November 20, 1924. An estimate had been submitted through the Bureau of the Budget for \$12,060 for a serious study of the location and habits of the wild cotton weevil to be made during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926. The Committee on Appropriations reduced the amount by \$4,560 and allowed \$7,500 to be expended for that purpose. The following is an extract from the hearing held at that time:

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY

STATEMENT OF MR. B. R. COAD, IN CHARGE OF SOUTHERN FIELD CROPS INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. MAGEE. Now we will proceed to the next item on page 219, for investigation of insects affecting southern field crops, etc.

Doctor HOWARD. The chief of that section, Doctor Hunter, was not able to be here. I will ask Mr. Coad to talk about that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. How much is the item for the Arizona cotton weevil?

Mr. COAD. That item amounts to \$12,060.

Mr. MAGEE. There was quite a material increase allowed in connection with this year's bill over that of 1924, \$60,000 or more. What was that for?

Mr. COAD. Various lines of work with the cotton boll weevil proper, as distinguished from this Arizona weevil, which is another branch of the same family, a very close relative.

COTTON WEEVIL CONTROL IN ARIZONA

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will you need all this money for the next year?

Mr. COAD. We feel that we do. We have two distinct problems that have rather thrust themselves upon us this year, and after the work that we have done on them this season we are firmly convinced of the need of what we have requested.

The Arizona cotton weevil in itself is not strictly new—that is, it was discovered in 1913, occurring on a wild cotton plant in the mountains of Arizona, and was soon shown to be nothing but a geographical variety of the ordinary boll weevil that was adapted to conditions quite different from those where the ordinary boll weevil thrived. The preliminary studies then showed that it would transfer its attention to cotton whenever opportunity developed, but no cotton was being planted where this occurred. In the last few years the extension of cotton cultivation in that section of Arizona, primarily around Tucson, has brought the cultivated cotton close enough to where the wild cotton occurs for the weevil to transfer its attention. In the past two years this weevil attacked the cultivated cotton. The department recommended a noncotton zone as a safeguard for the remainder of the industry. The State authorities attempted to put this into effect, and of course ran into legal difficulties, and we had some very interesting trials out there during the course of the season—injunction suits, and so on.

The pest is really very dangerous in two ways. In the first place, there is no boll weevil in this Arizona-California cotton development at the present time. It is a very productive section, making large yields of fine-quality cotton, and it has been possible to keep the ordinary weevil out by quarantine regulation and by the natural barriers which intervened. The damage which would be done directly in those sections would be very great, of course, but even more serious than that from our viewpoint of a national problem is this: The boll weevil has been unable to thrive in the arid sections of Texas and Oklahoma. Probably two-thirds of the cotton acreage in Texas, and a very fair proportion of Oklahoma, has been practically immune to weevil damage for years. In a wet season it will extend out that way, but with dry weather they are forced back again, and as a result Texas has become the dominating State in cotton production. It is producing over 4,000,000 bales out of 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 bales that we have been getting during the last few years, and a large portion of that is due to the fact that the acreage in Texas has been shifted where the weevil is not injurious or less injurious.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The acreage in Texas has also increased.

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir; that is so, and people have come in there from other States.

We have an insect that is thriving in Arizona where the rainfall is about 8 inches a year, and where, as some say, the evaporation is 8 feet a year, or something to that effect, but it is a form of weevil thoroughly adapted, apparently, to the conditions under which cotton is now escaping the weevil in Texas. It can do a vast amount of damage out there.

Mr. BUCHANAN. If you have a dry-weather weevil and a wet-weather weevil, you are in a bad fix. During the wet year the wet-weather weevil will eat the cotton up, and during the dry year the dry weevil will eat it all up.

Mr. COAD. What we have in mind there, in the first place, is a delineation of the exact limits of spread of that weevil. We have never had an opportunity to survey where it occurs and where we must guard against it, and then the further study as to the possibility of the best means of quarantine there and the possibility of eliminating the menace by going into those mountains and wiping out both the food plant and the weevil. It has a comparatively limited distribution now.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You can not do that without legislation from the State of Arizona.

Mr. COAD. I think that Arizona would be very much inclined to take such steps, but they are more or less placing the burden of responsibility for recommendation, etc., on the department.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not suppose they want you to assume responsibility when they feel that they are right.

Mr. COAD. They ask us to tell them whether they are right or wrong.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is this Arizona weevil like this other one in form and shape?

Mr. COAD. It is hard to tell the difference; in fact, they interbreed readily. I have taken the two forms to the same place and they cross-bred readily. You can take a couple of them and look them over, and you will see that they have certain distinct characteristics by which you can group them.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Where is this weevil working?

Mr. COAD. Anywhere from 1,200 to above 7,000 feet.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does this come from Mexico?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir; the two originated from the same parent stock, and they have separated, one of them following the mountain region northward along the western border of Mexico, and the other followed around the eastern coastal region.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That would have one indication, that our wet-weather weevil got gradually into the southern section of the dry belt.

Mr. COAD. Except for two things, and one of them is the factor of time, the other being the influence of the artificiality of cultivation to which the present weevil is subjected; and it may have some definite effect on the trend of adaptation. Certainly it has taken hundreds of years, as far as we can guess, for these two to separate and acquire these different characteristics. In that country it is a problem of a great deal of excitement; in fact, they were having lawsuits and everything of the sort when we were out there over the recommended quarantine, and they consider it no mean problem in Arizona.

Mr. BUCHANAN. How much cotton does Arizona raise?

Mr. COAD. I do not recall, Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It raises only a small amount, does it not?

Mr. COAD. No, sir; I do not think so.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is long-staple cotton?

Mr. COAD. It raises somewhere around 400,000 bales.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is long-staple cotton, is it not?

Mr. COAD. Not all of it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It must have increased.

Mr. COAD. By that I include all the arid sections overlapping into California and New Mexico. It is all the same character of production.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is this weevil in California?

Mr. COAD. No; there is only one of the Arizona cotton districts that we know so far which has this weevil.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is what you want this increased appropriation for? What do you expect to do?

Mr. COAD. One thing is to survey the extent and distribution of this weevil, and the extent to which it occurs in any other district; outline definitely the mountains that are infested and see whether or not it is possible to attempt direct eradication of the weevil.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You have to determine the amount of territory infested?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir; and at the same time we want to begin to accumulate information on how this weevil behaves under the conditions of cotton cultivation there on an experimental basis, of course.

Mr. BUCHANAN. If he has the same bill this cut has [indicating] and he puts his egg inside, and it hatches up, it is impossible to kill him.

Mr. COAD. It is the same activity. I was out there myself in 1914. I planted cotton about 2 miles from the nearest wild cotton field, not fields, just individual plants, scattered along the wash. I had about a quarter of an acre, and by mid season I had a very nice infestation of what would look like Texas weevil work.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Did you say that that was in 1914?

Mr. COAD. That was in 1914; yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You think that it was the same weevil?

Mr. COAD. Oh, yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You just discovered him last year.

Mr. COAD. Oh, no. It was discovered in 1913. I went there in 1914 to investigate it, but the cultivated cotton was not planted anywhere near these mountain ranges at that time where the weevil worked, and it has only been transferred to cultivated cotton during the last few years. It has become an acute problem now rather than a latent one.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You do not think that this appropriation without the increase is sufficient to enable you to make that survey?

Mr. COAD. No, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is all you can do, I suppose?

Mr. COAD. We have not only the survey in mind but we need more than that to complete the study, as far as we can, of this insect, its possibilities and potentialities; for example, it has one habit which differs at present from the southern weevil; instead of going to the woods to hibernate, it lives over in a cell, which it makes in the hard cotton boll, a very hard cell, and in that country it is an adaptation to the arid conditions. It can not emerge from its cell until it gets enough rain to soften, and if there is no rainfall for two or three years, if the weevil came out, it would starve. It is something that happens up in those mountain sections occasionally, but the problem is whether or not it would adhere to this cell hibernation habit in cultivated cotton. It is very doubtful, but if it would, control would be very simple by the winter clean-up, but that is something on which we can not take the risk.

Perhaps encouraged by the cut in the appropriation made by the Committee on Appropriations, the Budget Bureau decided to recommend further reductions in the money to be expended for investigations of southern field crop insects. The estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, were decreased \$20,440, all of which was to be taken from the boll-weevil item. It was very fortunate that Congressman BUCHANAN, of Texas, became convinced that this appropriation should not be reduced, and upon his advice \$7,500 was made available for a further study

of the *Thurberia* weevil. The testimony relative thereto taken on December 28, 1925, is as follows:

SOUTHERN FIELD CROP INSECTS

Mr. MAGEE. Now, take up the item on page 226, southern field crop insects:

"For investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane, etc., and the cigarette beetle and Argentine ant, \$235,000."

The estimated appropriation for 1927 is \$235,000; appropriated for 1926, \$255,440, a proposed decrease of \$20,440.

EFFECT OF PROPOSED DECREASE

Mr. BUCHANAN. How much of this cut of \$20,440 will come off of the weevil item?

Mr. COAD. All of it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. All of it?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will that hamper your work any, or retard it?

Mr. COAD. It means the eliminating of some of our work in South Carolina, and it is something we dislike very much to do. It also means reducing some of our work on machinery, the way we have decided to allot it. We have a complicating factor in this Arizona weevil problem that has become more acute this year than ever before. We had a special appropriation providing an increase for that last year of \$7,500.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is the dry-land boll weevil?

Mr. COAD. Yes. But that amount is not nearly ample to cover the problem we have out there and it has been necessary to use some of our general cotton-insect funds in fighting that weevil. It cropped up again this season in certain new localities in the areas of cultivated cotton in the West and very nearly slipped through into the El Paso district in Texas.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You mean the dry-land weevil?

Mr. COAD. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You say it very nearly slipped through. What do you mean by that?

Mr. COAD. The Texas authorities were permitting the shipment of seed to El Paso for milling from some of the sections where we had not been able to make surveys and where we thought the weevil did not occur. It happened only a few cars had been prepared when our inspectors got around to it and found a heavy infestation in the fields where this cotton was grown. It probably means we are going to have to consider Federal quarantines as well as State quarantines, particularly owing to the fact that in this infested district there are several main highways that go north of the regular routes of transportation, carrying laborers back and forth from the cotton areas of west Texas into the cotton areas of Arizona and offering a chance to bridge over that territory without coming through the El Paso section.

THE BOLL WEEVIL IN NATIVE WILD COTTON

Mr. BUCHANAN. Has it increased to amount to anything in Arizona?

Mr. COAD. The weevil, of course, as you know, occurs normally in the wild cotton plant.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The native wild cotton?

Mr. COAD. The native wild cotton.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And you do not know how long it has been there?

Mr. COAD. Why, evidently for generations. So far, it has been found on this plant only in two counties, at the southern end of the State, which occur around two or three of the larger cotton-planting areas. The wild cotton plant does occur in other sections and we are still checking up to find if the weevil is on there, and that work is not complete. As long as the cultivated cotton is kept a reasonable distance away from the wild cotton, we have no transfer, no attack; but, as soon as they begin to stretch out toward the line of the mountains with cultivated cotton, the transfer occurs.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Have you found this weevil on any domestic cotton?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does it work in the same manner as our brand, the old boll weevil, upon the square?

Mr. COAD. The great difference there is that it prefers the boll to the square.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The other prefers the square to the boll?

Mr. COAD. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does this new weevil also puncture the square?

Mr. COAD. It will puncture the square in the absence of bolls.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is something like the other weevil in that, only the other weevil punctures the square in preference to the bolls.

Mr. COAD. Yes. The great problem now is to get your boll set past the weevil and this one will let your square alone as long as he can puncture the boll. To check up the actual effect on the cultivated cotton, we planted an acre out in the middle of a desert this year and introduced a few weevils and have been studying their behavior.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You mean you planted an acre of domestic cotton?

Mr. COAD. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What is the percentage of destruction on that?

Mr. COAD. I have not the final figures on that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Do you think they can puncture as many bolls as the other weevil punctures squares?

Mr. COAD. On that acre there was approximately, I think, 70 per cent of the bolls that were attacked by the weevil.

Mr. BUCHANAN. This dry-land weevil punctures the bolls and the other one punctures the squares?

Mr. COAD. This one will puncture bolls that would be safe from the other weevil in that they were mature beyond the point of damage.

Mr. BUCHANAN. One punctures the square and the other punctures the boll, and both together they pull up the stalk and spit in the hole?

Mr. COAD. Yes; making a bad combination. The most dangerous situation with reference to the western beetle is the possibility of it getting into the arid regions of Texas where our ordinary weevil has not been able to thrive, on account of the dry weather.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The question in my mind is it has been there always, probably, ever since the wild cotton plants have been standing there; it has not spread much, and I do not see why it should spread now unless there is more communication between the two places. Do the people go up in these mountains where that wild cotton is?

Mr. COAD. Well, there has been no opportunity for spread. This wild cotton plant is one that is fighting a losing struggle with existence; it is not very abundant at any one point and follows only the waterways of the mountains; that is, the dry washes. It runs from away up, 7,000 feet in the mountains, out through the foothills and in some places into the desert, down to elevations as low as 1,200 feet. While there is just this string of isolated plants, the infestation has been holding its own on those. These ranges are not like we have in the East here, continuous ranges, but are separated by long stretches of desert, with no travel or traffic through them, and it is only in the last few years when they started planting cultivated cotton out into the foothills that there has been a chance for this weevil to transfer onto the cultivated cotton and then to multiply and move out.

Mr. BUCHANAN. How much would it cost; would it be very expensive to undertake a systematic campaign to destroy that wild cotton?

Mr. COAD. That is an experiment we have under way out there now. Of course, the present emergency is met by a series of quarantines, regulatory measures; and so on; but, as a permanent proposition, that will some day fail, of course.

STATE COOPERATION

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not suppose the State is doing anything toward control?

Mr. COAD. The State is doing a great deal; the State is very active in cooperation with our work.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does this cut affect that work on the dry-land weevil any?

Mr. COAD. No, sir. That only affects it in one way. We are actually having to devote more money to this insect than was appropriated especially for it, and it makes the cut even more serious in our regular boll-weevil work.

As a result of the first year's work in the cotton fields of the Santa Cruz Valley, Ariz., and in the adjacent mountains the responsible officials of the Department of Agriculture became convinced that the *Thurberia weevil* is a dangerous menace to the entire cotton-growing industry of the United States. A conference was called by the Federal Horticultural Board, which took place in Washington on June 1, 1926, at which the following-named persons were present:

C. L. Marlatt, chairman; M. B. Waite, member; J. E. Graf, member; R. C. Althouse, assistant to the chairman of the board; HENRY F. ASHURST, United States Senator, Arizona; Oscar C. Bartlett, State entomologist, Phoenix, Ariz.; R. E. Butler, Tucson, Santa Cruz, Cochise Chambers of Commerce, Tucson, Ariz.; RALPH R. CAMERON, United States Senator, Arizona; T. P. Cassidy, entomologist, Tucson, Ariz.; B. R. Coad, Bureau of Entomology, Tallulah, La.; Frank E. Curley, attorney, Tucson, Ariz.; C. B. Doyle, Bureau of Plant Industry, Washington, D. C.; Henry M. Eaton, representing West Texas Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C.; William Ellsworth, Safford, Ariz.; S. P. Fletcher, president Graham County Farm Bureau, Safford, Ariz.; B. F. Fly, all organizations, Yuma, Ariz.; William A. Glassford, Arizona Pima Cotton Growers, Phoenix, Ariz.; S. W. Grier, Tucson Chamber of Commerce (Pima Farms Co.); S. H. Hastings, ranchman, Phoenix, Ariz.; CARL HAYDEN, Member of Congress, Arizona; T. H. Kearney, Bureau of Plant Industry, Washington, D. C.; K. F. Kellerman, Bureau of Plant Industry, Washington, D. C.; R. E. McDonald, entomologist, Austin, Tex.; Dr. Elwood Mead, commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.; J. H. Montgomery, quarantine inspector, Gainesville, Fla.; Walter Peteet, secretary National Council Cooperation, Washington, D. C.; F. S. Puckett, Federal Horticultural Board, Houston, Tex.; E. R. Sasser, entomologist, Washington, D. C.; Thomas G. Shearman, attorney, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; L. M. Scott, quarantine inspector, Washington, D. C.; J. L. Webb, Bureau of Entomology, Washington, D. C.

Following this conference the Secretary of Agriculture submitted a request for additional funds to the Director of the

Budget, which was approved by him and transmitted to Congress by the President in the following form:

[House Document No. 423, 69th Cong., 1st sess.]

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY

Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Bureau of Entomology amounting to \$35,000, and also a draft of proposed legislation affecting an existing appropriation of the Federal Horticultural Board, both for the Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 7, 1926.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Bureau of Entomology amounting to \$35,000, and also a draft of proposed legislation affecting an existing appropriation of the Federal Horticultural Board, both for the Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927.

The details of this estimate and the proposed legislation, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for their submission at this time are set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget transmitted herewith, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully,

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,

Washington, June 5, 1926.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration, and upon your approval for transmission to Congress, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Bureau of Entomology amounting to \$35,000, and a draft of proposed legislation affecting an existing appropriation of the Federal Horticultural Board, both for the Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927:

" SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE

"General expenses, Bureau of Entomology, southern field-crop insects: For an additional amount for investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet an emergency caused by the appearance of the *Thurberia* (wild cotton) weevil in stands of cultivated cotton, including all objects of expenditure specified in the act making appropriation for the same purposes for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1927, approved May 11, 1926.----- \$35,000

" PROPOSED LEGISLATION

"Not to exceed \$35,000 of the \$300,000 appropriated for the eradication of the pink bollworm of cotton by the act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1927, approved May 11, 1926, is hereby made available for the establishment of a quarantine to prevent the spread of the *Thurberia weevil*, under the Federal plant quarantine act of August 20, 1912, as amended, including employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, cooperation with the State, and for all other necessary expenses."

The estimate and proposed legislation submitted herewith are to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the appearance of the *Thurberia weevil* in stands of cultivated cotton in Arizona. The *Thurberia weevil* is similar to the weevil which has for many years infested the cotton crop of the South and which has been known by the common name of "cotton boll weevil." While comparatively little is known of the *Thurberia weevil* at present, it has been proven that it is a much harder insect and will survive conditions under which the ordinary cotton weevil can not exist.

The funds provided by this estimate and proposed legislation will be used for investigation and control or eradication of this insect and also to prevent its spread into surrounding and adjacent States. Further details with regard to the situation caused by the *Thurberia weevil* are set forth in the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture transmitted herewith.

The above estimate of appropriation and the proposed legislation affecting an existing appropriation are required to meet an emergency which has developed since the transmission of the Budget for the fiscal year 1927, and their approval is recommended.

Very respectfully,

H. M. LORD,

Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

THE PRESIDENT.

On June 8, 1926, a hearing was held before the Committee on Appropriations, after which the committee agreed to the transfer of \$35,000 from the appropriation theretofore made for control of the pink bollworm to be used for enforcing a proposed quarantine. However, only \$10,000 was recommended by the committee to be appropriated for further investigations

of the *Thurberia* cotton boll weevil. The testimony taken on that date is as follows:

INVESTIGATION OF THURBERIA WEEVIL IN ARIZONA

STATEMENTS OF DR. C. L. MARLATT, ASSISTANT CHIEF AND CHAIRMAN FEDERAL HORTICULTURAL BOARD; MR. B. R. COAD, IN CHARGE OF COTTON INSECT INVESTIGATIONS; AND MR. W. A. JUMP, BUDGET OFFICER

The CHAIRMAN. You have an item before us of \$35,000 under general expenses, Bureau of Entomology, southern field-crop insects:

"For an additional amount for investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet an emergency caused by the appearance of the *Thurberia* (wild cotton) weevil in stands of cultivated cotton, including all objects of expenditure specified in the act making appropriation for the same purposes for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1927, approved May 11, 1926."

What is the situation here, and where is it? I wish you would make us a comprehensive statement as to just what this is, what it means, why you are asking for this money, and what the particular emergency is that requires it. Tell us where the money is going to be used, the purposes for which it is going to be used, and how it is to be used, in detail.

Mr. COAD. We have a two-sided item, as you will notice, one providing for legislation to make it possible to carry out certain quarantine regulatory measures. The other item provides for an additional fund to be used in meeting the situation in the field other than as to regulations.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us what the \$35,000 is wanted for and where it is to be used.

Mr. COAD. That is to be used—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Give us a full statement about it. You have not started in right. Tell us what it is about and what caused the emergency.

Mr. COAD. This insect has been known in southern Arizona, occurring in the mountains in the wild cotton plants for a number of years, and there was an indication that it would transfer to the cultivated cotton whenever cotton culture extended close enough to it. That has developed only in recent years.

The principal infestation is around Tucson, Ariz., extending through the Tucson Mountain ranges up and down the valley called the Santa Cruz Valley.

Last year they planted about 15,000 acres of cotton in the valley. In the late winter we found the infestation occurring on that cotton practically throughout the entire acreage. We were still in some doubt as to just how much of a menace this would be, and we had started certain researches and investigations on that under an item in the agricultural bill which provided \$7,500 two years ago.

This work has been carried through the winter. We have found that this insect is not only as dangerous as the real cotton boll weevil, but we think it is much more dangerous. The two are so closely related that, while we have named this a subspecies or variety, there is really nothing but an environmental difference between them. In structure it is almost impossible to distinguish it from the ordinary boll weevil, and the two insects are of common origin, undoubtedly. This insect has been living for ages on this wild cotton in the mountains out there and has become adapted to very extreme conditions. The ordinary weevil is held in check in considerable degree through the dry, hot weather. We have an area in west Texas, for example, that produces over 2,000,000 bales of cotton a year where the ordinary weevil does not operate at all. It can not stand the hot weather. However, we find this Arizona weevil can stand about 20° higher temperature than the ordinary boll weevil can. We also find that instead of surviving the winter, as we call it, with a 2½ per cent survival, it goes through, or has gone through this past winter, with a survival of over 75 per cent. It has another bad habit from its association with the *Thurberia* plant of preferring the boll or fruit to the bud. Producing cotton under those conditions depends upon what can be wrested from the weevil. The ordinary weevil has a preference for buds, and the effort is made to obtain more than a sufficient supply of them for the weevil until so that enough will escape and grow bolls past the point of damage. These points have convinced us that this *Thurberia* weevil is, for the western arid region, the most serious pest we have encountered.

The CHAIRMAN. How many acres of cotton land are there in that section of the country to be cultivated?

Mr. COAD. I can give you the cotton production there for this past year. It was something like two and a half million bales.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean in Arizona?

Mr. COAD. No, sir; not in Arizona, but in the area threatened by this weevil.

The CHAIRMAN. What territory does that comprise?

Mr. COAD. Southern California, Arizona, New Mexico, and western Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood you to say that this weevil could not stand the Texas climate.

Mr. COAD. No, sir; the southern cotton-boll weevil can not stand the west Texas climate; but this one can. The greatest menace is that this insect may be allowed to get out of Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. What steps do you propose to take?

Mr. COAD. For the immediate present, of course, the first step is to provide regulations for stopping the movement of any product that might transmit or carry it.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you stop the movement of cotton?

Mr. COAD. We would stop the movement of cotton and cotton products, except after fumigation, but before we can work that situation out very thoroughly we must know the complete distribution of the weevil in nature and also in the cultivated cotton. We have followed that plan and are now scouting to determine that; but on the present basis there will be at least three years' work to do, and it is exceedingly important that we expedite that work. Then, there is another possibility, and that is that some permanent solution can be worked out on the basis of some form of control, possibly extending even to a clean-up of the wild plant or of the weevil in nature. Our scouting operations do not show how much of the territory is now involved or whether that is physically possible.

The CHAIRMAN. How much territory is affected, as you understand it now?

Mr. COAD. There are parts of three counties infected.

The CHAIRMAN. This new pest has been found in parts of three counties?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been confined to those three counties up until now?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is cotton produced in that territory?

Mr. COAD. They have cotton on those 15,000 acres in that area or in those three counties.

The CHAIRMAN. To what extent has cotton in that territory been affected?

Mr. COAD. This was the first year of the infestation, and the infestation generally has been comparatively light and scattering. The heaviest damage reported is approximately 8 per cent of the crop in the cultivated fields this year.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that 8 per cent of the crop destroyed altogether?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir; it prevents the production of the potential crop.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the first year they have destroyed it?

Mr. COAD. This past year the damage has not been so much. The whole idea is to simply obtain the facts on that area. It is simply a question of stepping in now while we still have time to prevent its multiplication.

The CHAIRMAN. What makes you think you can stop its spread?

Mr. COAD. We do not know that we can.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not stopped it at other places?

Mr. COAD. We have not had this insect before. This is more closely related to the pink bollworm problem than any other.

The CHAIRMAN. You propose to give this problem the treatment that you are now giving the pink bollworm problem?

Mr. COAD. If the preliminary investigations show that is feasible, we will approach it in much the same way—that is, by a clean-up, or a noncotton area, so as to wipe it out.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not wiped out the other pest, have you?

Mr. COAD. It is found in only this one place—

The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about the pink bollworm.

Mr. COAD. The pink bollworm has been cleared out of all inland sections of the United States, so far as we know.

The CHAIRMAN. You are maintaining a quarantine against the pink bollworm now?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All over the country?

Mr. COAD. There is a quarantine surrounding the infested area along the Rio Grande River, where we can not have a clean-up.

The CHAIRMAN. Why not?

Mr. COAD. It is subject to constant reinfestation from the Mexican side of the river.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you do about that if you were given this money?

Mr. COAD. We are doing nothing with that under this item at all. That is an entirely distinct problem. I was merely pointing out the analogy between the problems.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the use of giving you the money for this, if you can not do anything with the other problem?

Mr. COAD. Our problem in Arizona corresponds very closely to the problem of the pink bollworm at inland points, where we have cleaned it up—that is, where this same procedure has been followed.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that, being close to the Mexican border, there is a reinfestation by the pink bollworm, or that there is a likelihood of reinfestation on this side?

Mr. COAD. We would not be subject to reinfestation, so far as this weevil is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. Not even from Mexico?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Why not?

Mr. COAD. So far we have no record of it occurring there.

The CHAIRMAN. You said it came from across the border, did you not?

Mr. COAD. No, sir; I was referring to the pink bollworm.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you think that if the committee recommends this appropriation, and the House authorizes it, you will be able to meet the situation that exists down in that cotton belt?

Mr. COAD. It is really not sufficient money to admit of a clean-up campaign there, but it is sufficient for the proposed study now to find out what the problem really amounts to. If it comes to the question of actually attempting to eradicate the insect, that is something for future consideration and which will probably involve hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you said you had made a study of it.

Mr. COAD. No, sir; we have this study under way, but that is going on only to the extent of \$7,500. That is not sufficient for the work we should do.

The CHAIRMAN. What has been the result of your studies up to now?

Mr. COAD. We have been working out the area of distribution, and we have made findings in cultivated cotton.

The CHAIRMAN. You have found beyond question that the pest is there?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What other proof do you want?

Mr. COAD. We will prove further just where it is.

The CHAIRMAN. You said you knew it was in three counties.

Mr. COAD. We know that it is in three counties, but there is a great deal of unscouted territory outside of that that we have not been able to go into. It is a slow process to work this out.

The CHAIRMAN. What will you do? Will you send out scouting parties?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If you get this money, you will send out scouts?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you ascertain where it is?

Mr. COAD. In scouting in nature the present system is to use a Ford truck as headquarters. That is a very inaccessible country. They drive out as far as they can go, and then they take the canyon or washes in the mountains and work them through in rotation, foot by foot, and mapping the exact occurrence and abundance of the plant and the weevil.

The CHAIRMAN. Then what do you do?

Mr. COAD. Fortunately we have only found this insect in these ranges in certain canyons. We find them at the very bottom of the canyon wash, where there is an underground supply of water. That makes it possible to systematically work up the distribution. Then, if we find that it does not extend over too much territory, eradication may be considered; and, even if it does, having that knowledge, we need only to watch the washes for its occurrence, because it is carried from these places principally by drainage. During the brief periods of the rush of water, following rains, these insects are washed along.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it in the canyons simply because this cotton is there?

Mr. COAD. It is being moved out all the time; and the fact that the cotton happens to be planted in there gives it an opportunity to live.

The CHAIRMAN. That gives it an opportunity to stay here and live?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir. Here [indicating] is some ordinary boll-weevil material that I will exhibit to you. This [indicating] is the ordinary cotton-boll weevil put in for comparison, and this [indicating] is the boll of the wild-cotton plant. Normally it opens, but this weevil, when it attacks the boll, seals it up, the weevil remaining intact on the inside. As the boll falls off the plant it may be carried by the water down the washes to the drainage districts below. We find that this weevil can survive complete submergence in the water for 21 days. You have here [indicating] the form in which it appears in the cultivated cotton. It still retains that sealing habit. There is a probability of our being able to do a great deal of work on the system of sterilizing the cotton, as we call it—that is, by heating the cotton at the gins and killing the weevils at the gin. As to the area infested, here is a map of the scouting area in this portion of Arizona. Here [indicating] is Tucson.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they raise cotton right in and around that area?

Mr. COAD. Cotton is raised in a belt starting at Nogales, running up the valley to a point here [indicating]. There is a gap at present between this new cotton area and the big Salt River Valley area of nearly 100 miles. However, the Coolidge Dam project is opening, and that will put cotton culture in there, making continuous cotton culture all the way through. The area we are placing under quarantine is

shown by this line here [indicating]. Of course, that is a comparatively large area. As you understand, the cultivation is only in the narrow belt along the river valley; but in that belt at present there are about 15,000 acres of cotton. The infestation is heaviest in the cultivated cotton at this end [indicating between Tucson and the Mexican border], which is about the principal source of supply, and decreases as we go up. There is a possibility that we may be able to clean up the plant and weevil in these ranges. [Indicating the ranges bordering the Santa Cruz Valley.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Do you mean that you will clean up this wild-cotton plant?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANTHONY. How do you do that?

Mr. COAD. We have under way a preliminary plan of killing the plant by means of chemicals, explosives, etc. It has a vigorous rooting system and a bad habit of sprouting up.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the plant prolific and widely spread?

Mr. COAD. It does not spread much. You may find a colony of, perhaps, 5 to 10 or 100 plants; 100 plants would be a large colony. Then you may go a hundred miles before you see any other plants. The plant is fighting a losing battle in nature and decreasing anyway.

The CHAIRMAN. If you are given this \$35,000, what will you do with it?

Mr. COAD. We will continue to expand this experimental method of clean-up. If the scouting work seems to indicate that there is any possibility whatever of confining it in that particular area, we will do that. We will clean up a small portion of the area, perhaps a canyon or so, and will utilize the methods that the preliminary tests show most feasible. Ultimately, we will find the method that is most feasible and practicable as to cost, the idea being that by means of the scouting work we can make a fairly accurate estimate of what it will cost to make a clean-up.

Mr. BYRNS. This appropriation and the proposed legislation carry \$70,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The estimate is \$35,000.

Mr. BYRNS. The proposed legislation authorizes the use of \$35,000 out of the regular appropriation for the eradication of the pink bollworm.

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir.

Mr. BYRNS. Is it the understanding that you have not enough money in the regular appropriation for southern insect infestations to use for this purpose, or do you have any authority to use it?

Mr. COAD. Here is the point: The legislation authorizing the use of existing funds relates to the activities of the Federal Horticultural Board, and this supplemental appropriation relates to the activities of the Bureau of Entomology, which is a purely research organization. We have already taken from the appropriation for cotton insects every cent they could possibly spare, even to the extent of reducing some of their other work.

Mr. BYRNS. I was wondering why, if this pest has been known so long and the injury has been apparent so long, there should have been any delay about requesting an appropriation in the regular appropriation bill.

Mr. COAD. The cultivated cotton infestation has only taken place within the last year. Before that everything we had was guesswork. We thought that it would injure cotton, but were not sure. It has been only since we have carried out those preliminary investigations that we found it would survive the winter. There was considerable doubt about that.

Mr. BYRNS. They had never grown cotton in that particular territory until last year?

Mr. COAD. No, sir; there had been a little cotton in the upper valley; that was not subject to infestation.

Mr. BYRNS. There was no cotton growing up there?

Mr. COAD. That is largely new development. There was an effort made to raise a rubber plant up there. It was an experimental area.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you not ask for this in the regular annual bill?

Mr. COAD. This question was not before us at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you discover this situation?

Mr. COAD. The infestation in cultivated cotton was not found until the survey was finished in December.

The CHAIRMAN. It was discovered in December?

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The annual appropriation bill was passed long after that.

Mr. COAD. Here is the point as to that: It took us several months to work out the distribution, and we were still in doubt as to whether this weevil could survive the winter in cultivated cotton.

The CHAIRMAN. Why not wait on this until the next annual appropriation bill, to give you an opportunity to make a better study of the problem, and give our committee a better chance to determine whether you are justified in asking the money?

Mr. COAD. That would give one year longer for the weevil to get ahead of us.

Mr. BYRNS. As I understand it, they have just commenced to grow cotton in this section, or just commenced it last year, and this weevil exists only in that certain section.

Mr. COAD. Yes, sir.

Mr. BYRNS. Now, they are just commencing the production of cotton right up there in the midst of this weevil, and, instead of coming here and asking for an appropriation to take care of something which you say is liable to involve hundreds of thousands of dollars—

Mr. COAD (interposing). The State of Arizona attempted to meet that by putting in a noncotton zone in that section, but it was found that the law under which they promulgated the zone was unconstitutional, and they were left helpless.

Mr. BYRNS. As I understand it, this weevil is confined to this one section, where they planted 15,000 acres in cotton last year. They were trying to grow cotton right in the midst of this pest.

Mr. COAD. They planted it last year.

Mr. BYRNS. If that is going to involve the United States Government in the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars in order to stamp it out, it seems to me they should be required to grow something else.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me that you should give this committee a chance to study the problem. You submit to us something that involves an entirely new plan, and there ought not to be any demands made on us that we are not able to investigate fully.

Mr. JUMP. We have the duty to protect those other States right away. We ought to protect Texas, Oklahoma, California, and the others endangered.

The CHAIRMAN. You can protect them without this money.

Mr. JUMP. We would have to have a quarantine in order to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a quarantine now.

Mr. JUMP. The quarantine is about to be promulgated, but we ask that not to exceed \$35,000 of the appropriation for the eradication of the pink bollworm be made available for its enforcement.

Doctor MARLATT. Mr. Chairman, we have presented here two propositions. One is a quarantine proposition, in which we are simply asking authority to use money which you have already appropriated for the pink bollworm eradication work.

The CHAIRMAN. To extend the quarantine?

Doctor MARLATT. To extend the quarantine to this pest. That, of course, involves no additional appropriation but simply authority. The other is the proposition which Mr. Coad has been describing, which involves research and investigational work to supplement the quarantine work. That work is necessary in order to make it possible to carry on the quarantine work intelligently. That work must also be the basis for field control, or perhaps clean up or eradication of the pest altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. If those two things are dependent upon each other, then you should not get this other fund, it seems to me, until the question has been studied by the department and by the committee.

Doctor MARLATT. I would like to point out a phase of the situation which I think has been overlooked. This is a new pest in this arid region of the West, including Texas, Arizona, and through to California. We have what we realize is a new pest, and if it escapes from the rather restricted valley of the Santa Cruz, which is just beginning to grow cotton, it may involve the huge cotton industry of the Salt River Valley project, which is not now infested with the weevil. We have also the Yuma project to protect, and another project which is now under consideration. Those three projects have involved and will involve the expenditure of enormous amounts of Federal money, and if this weevil should get into the cotton grown under those projects it might not be possible to produce enough cotton to return the cost of the irrigation. The weevil might well destroy much of the value to the Nation of those projects. We want to protect those investments. We have those three projects to protect, and at the same time the State of California has a right to be protected, as well as New Mexico and Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you not bring this question before the committee having charge of the annual appropriation bill instead of submitting it for this deficiency bill?

Doctor MARLATT. Mr. Coad has just brought out the fact that the full menace to cotton was not then known.

The CHAIRMAN. He said they had the knowledge last December. If you had the information last December, you had plenty of time to bring it before the committee considering the estimates for the regular bill.

Mr. COAD. This question has been discussed twice, or in the last two bills, with the House Subcommittee on Agriculture, and they have allowed us \$7,500.

The CHAIRMAN. They did allow that?

Mr. WASON. That was allowed in the regular bill.

Mr. COAD. That was on this basis, that the situation was not sufficiently urgent to justify a large expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that it is sufficiently urgent to justify you in coming in here with a deficiency estimate?

Mr. WASON. The \$7,500 appropriated was what the department asked.

Mr. BYRNS. As I understand it, this appropriation is made necessary, in your opinion, because of the fact that they have commenced to grow cotton in this valley to which you have referred, and it would not be necessary if they had not commenced the growing of cotton there?

Doctor MARLATT. If the Federal Government had control of it, a simple solution of the matter would be to prohibit the growing of cotton in that valley. We have no such authority as that. The State of Arizona did, in effect, undertake to establish a noncotton-growing zone there a year ago, but a certain group of men who were interested in land sales and development in there, got an injunction in the Federal court on the basis of lack of State authority to declare such zone.

The CHAIRMAN. That is no reason why the Federal Government should be called upon to spend a lot of money, because of the land speculations of these men.

Doctor MARLATT. There was a rush for planting cotton there. We wish to safeguard the movement of cotton out of that immediate district, but also to protect from invasion areas much farther away. We want to prevent the spread of the weevil to the Salt River and Yuma projects, and if we let it go for a year it may get into those two valleys.

The CHAIRMAN. You can put a quarantine on.

Doctor MARLATT. We can if we have the money.

The CHAIRMAN. If we give you authority to use this money for the purpose, you can put on your quarantine; you can get along without the other appropriation until you come around next year.

Doctor MARLATT. We ask authority to do the quarantine work out of the pink bollworm fund simply to avoid asking for additional money for that feature, but we can not take from that one fund money to do both pieces of work.

The CHAIRMAN. If you had the money now, or the facilities with which to execute the quarantine to make it effective, could you prohibit the shipment of cotton from this valley?

Doctor MARLATT. Yes, sir; we could control movement of cotton products absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all you need the money for; that is, to execute the quarantine?

Doctor MARLATT. We would immediately control the movement of cotton from there.

Mr. BYRNS. This would not absolutely guarantee that the pest would not spread beyond the borders of Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. If not, you do not need money for quarantine purposes.

Mr. JUMP. It would not be an absolute guaranty by any means, but it would be the best effort we could possibly make.

Doctor MARLATT. We have not the funds now to do the research work necessary for the proper determination of the quarantine. For instance, a quarantine would involve the surveys already discussed to make sure that the whole field of danger was covered. If that were not done the quarantine might be wasted effort.

The CHAIRMAN. If you are given the money you are asking for the enforcement of the quarantine, what will you do with it?

Doctor MARLATT. The quarantine regulations are already drafted.

The CHAIRMAN. How will you spend the money?

Doctor MARLATT. We will immediately prohibit the movement of cotton from Arizona, except under conditions of disinfection. We will expect the State of Arizona to supplement the Federal quarantine by a State quarantine.

The CHAIRMAN. Inasmuch as the State of Arizona wanted to take steps to prevent the spread of this pest, if you are given the authority asked for here to enforce the Federal quarantine, that will enable them to enforce the State quarantine.

Doctor MARLATT. Yes, sir. Then we will require the compression and disinfection of the cotton moving out of this district, and will prohibit the movement of such cotton products as cottonseed, hulls, etc. We will also provide for a clean-up of railroad cars that have been fouled with such material. In that way we will endeavor to prevent any artificial spread of this pest.

Mr. BYRNS. In the meantime, you have \$7,500 with which you can proceed with the investigation.

Doctor MARLATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BYRNS. Suppose you take \$35,000 from the pink bollworm fund for this purpose; how will that affect the pink bollworm work? Will it be restricted?

Doctor MARLATT. We hope it will not. We have looked upon the pink bollworm appropriation somewhat as an emergency item. We have turned back to the Treasury larger or smaller sums, depending on the necessities of the year, and we have a record of having turned back very considerable sums in the past from that appropriation.

Mr. BYRNS. Therefore, from your present information, to take \$35,000 from that appropriation will not interfere with the work in connection with the pink bollworm?

Doctor MARLATT. I hope it will not. In presenting that to the Budget I indicated that I hoped to be able to use \$35,000 to carry out the necessary quarantine work with the Arizona weevil without hurt to the pink bollworm project.

The CHAIRMAN. This provides for not to exceed \$35,000?

Doctor MARLATT. For the quarantine?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Doctor MARLATT. The quarantine will involve the inspection and handling of a good deal of traffic that moves out of and through the infested district in Arizona, and it will mean the employment of a good many inspectors.

The CHAIRMAN. This provides for not to exceed \$35,000?

Doctor MARLATT. This provides for work that will be done with such cooperation as the State will give, and the State will give considerable cooperation.

QUARANTINE REGULATIONS

The CHAIRMAN. When you put that quarantine into effect out there, that, of course, would automatically stop the growth of cotton, would it not?

Doctor MARLATT. No; this quarantine is merely to safeguard the movement of cotton from the district.

Mr. BYRNS. If they can not move it, they will not grow it?

Mr. JUMP. They will move it under those conditions. But if we establish this quarantine out there, with the money we have asked from the pink bollworm appropriation, conditions within the State of Arizona will get steadily worse unless there is provision of extending the investigational work on the weevil.

The CHAIRMAN. You will have to go to the committee which has the time to study that thing in connection with the annual appropriation bill and ask them to give you more money.

Mr. JUMP. If we do nothing more than place a quarantine we will have a badly confused situation which would be extremely dangerous to all the surrounding States where the cotton crop is susceptible to the infestation of this weevil.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you not present this case before?

Mr. JUMP. It was not as critical as it is now. We have discussed it in a general way with the other committee. We knew the weevil was there and secured an increase of \$7,500 for research work on the regular appropriations, but did not have the present emergency then.

The CHAIRMAN. There are not any more weevils there now than before, are there?

Doctor MARLATT. During the past year we have had 15,000 more acres in cultivation.

Mr. BYRNS. This has been made critical for the reason that certain landowners or farmers have proceeded to grow cotton on the borders of this mountain region where this wild cotton grows. If they had not started that, you would not have to ask for this appropriation?

Doctor MARLATT. I presume not.

Mr. BYRNS. If this quarantine stops that, then it is entirely possible that you will not need any money?

Doctor MARLATT. I doubt if the quarantine will stop that.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know any more about that than we do?

Mr. JUMP. It does not seem probable.

Doctor MARLATT. The authority of the Federal board does not extend within the State at all, and the State has not the authority to stop the growth of cotton there.

The CHAIRMAN. We are not asking you to do that. We are trying to protect the Federal Treasury from an invasion.

Doctor MARLATT. The Federal plant quarantine act requires us to provide for the movement.

The CHAIRMAN. For the quarantine. You have the right to quarantine?

Doctor MARLATT. But there will be cotton there, and we are required under the law to protect its movement, where it can be safely done. That is in the provisions of the act.

The CHAIRMAN. We are not putting any embargo on you. You are asking us to give you the right to spend \$35,000 to enforce quarantine?

Doctor MARLATT. We have a very serious situation. Here is a new pest which is threatening the success of big irrigation projects on which the Government is spending millions of dollars. We do not want to have these projects jeopardized in a year because we can not carry out this protection.

Mr. BYRNS. Here is the situation as I gather it from the statements that have been made: If you spend this \$35,000 which you are asking for, you will protect the cotton growing out there on the edge of this infested region. If you stop the growing of cotton there by quarantine, then you protect millions of bales of cotton grown in these other sections of Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas.

The question in my mind is whether or not the Government should go ahead and spend this \$35,000, with the possibility of having to spend millions of dollars because a few people are undertaking to grow cotton down there right in the midst of this weevil which is destroying their cotton.

Doctor MARLATT. We are not looking to the expenditure of millions of dollars; we are looking to the saving of millions in losses.

Mr. BYRNS. But we may have to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Doctor MARLATT. If we fail to take hold of this situation now, when it should be taken hold of, we may have next year no proposition to make at all. If this pest gets into the Salt River Valley, through failure to make proper field investigations, it will get into California and west Texas, and that will be the end of the matter. That is the outcome that we are hoping to avoid.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you not bring it up to the committee last fall? You knew about it then. Why do you wait until Congress is about ready to adjourn, and then submit it to a committee which has not the time to study the matter and see whether this is justified?

Doctor MARLATT. We have done our best, Mr. Chairman; I have dug into my own appropriation, which I did not need to do to take care of the cost as far as possible. But this new survey and research work is necessary if we are going to make good, and if we do not make good there will not be any problem to work on later on.

Mr. WASON. But the chairman's question is this: When did you first know that this weevil was there?

Doctor MARLATT. We knew that that weevil was in the mountains for several years. As a matter of fact, it is what we call "native" to that region. It has nothing to do, in its origin, with the Mexican boll weevil in Texas. But the important point is that it has only been known within a month that the *Thurberia* weevil can survive in cotton over winter. We have been conducting investigations. The weevil comes down from the mountains and has infested the cotton, and we have only known within the last month that this emergency is as great as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. What I want to get in your minds is that you have not been exactly frank with us. The question was of just as much importance last December as it is now.

Mr. JUMP. It was very important, but it was not as critical as it is now, by any means.

The CHAIRMAN. You had the question before the committee, which had plenty of time to consider it, and you did not present it.

Mr. JUMP. We did not then have the critical situation which is present now.

The CHAIRMAN. I am in favor of giving you the right to quarantine, but you say that will not do any good unless you get this money.

Doctor MARLATT. I am afraid it will mean that we will be working on inadequate information as to conditions outside of the area now scouted, and where we ought, very possibly, to be doing something also.

The CHAIRMAN. You can take the quarantine now and then present this case, with all the facts that relate to it, in connection with the annual appropriation bill.

Mr. COAD. I might say in discussing this with the other committee, we still had an expression of doubt as to whether this weevil would thrive on cultivated cotton. The big question was the one as to whether or not it would survive the winter on cotton where it can not remain in the cell, as in the case of the *Thurberia* plant. There was some doubt about that. That is something that has only been determined within the last 30 days. It was determined by taking the weevils that were on the cotton last summer and carrying them through the experience of hibernation this last winter. After that was completed the full danger was established. We did not have a complete case on it before.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES

For all printing and binding for the Department of Commerce, including all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, except the Patent Office and the Bureau of Mines, fiscal year 1926, \$30,000, to be available until June 30, 1927.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As I recall it, when the general appropriation bill was passed, the Department of Commerce was allowed an extra appropriation for printing of some two or three hundred thousand dollars over what it had before. Is that correct?

Mr. MADDEN. That was due to the consolidation of the Bureau of Mines and the Patent Office with the Department of Commerce. Whatever the increase was, it was due to that transfer of these activities to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. TYDINGS. I notice that the Secretary of Commerce asks for an appropriation for printing and binding of \$1,400,000, whereas, in round numbers, in 1924 the appropriation was for about \$600,000. That was an increase of 250 per cent.

Mr. MADDEN. Let me tell the gentleman this: Up to that time he did not have the Patent Office. Of course, the printing and binding in the Patent Office is enormous. Patents can not be issued until they are printed. We even have a very large sum for printing and binding in this bill for the needs of the Patent Office.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the gentleman. I understand where part of it goes; but, looking at some of the reports that are put out by the Department of Commerce now, I notice one on

how an Indian ward spends her money. It appears she bought a fur coat for \$300. This fact was circularized through all of the newspapers through the country. There was another report about toy balloons, or the importation of toy balloons. When we consider the vast number of employees necessary to compile that information and get it out to the public and the utter worthlessness of the information, it seems to me a sheer waste of money to give for printing and binding any more appropriation than that contained in the general appropriation bill.

I am sorry that I have not it here with me, but the list for one day put out by the Department of Commerce is about that high and deals with the subject as to how an Indian ward spends her money and the importation of toy balloons, and many other things. Some of these have substance to them and some are very valuable, but when they go into every realm of the activities for publicity purposes, it seems to me we ought to sit down on any further appropriation to the Department of Commerce for printing and binding.

Mr. MADDEN. I wonder if the gentleman knows that the printing bill for the Patent Office alone amounts to \$900,000 a year in the course of this legitimate business of issuing patents.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not quarreling with the legitimate expenses of the Patent Office, but why in the world the experts and the employees of the Government should go to the trouble of telling how an Indian ward spends her money and how many toy balloons were imported into America last year seems to me to be going beyond the realm of the proper activities of the Department of Commerce.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman know that there are a good many thousand people employed in the United States making toy balloons? It is one of our legitimate industries.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly I know that.

Mr. BEGG. Why are they not entitled to that information just as much as the manufacturers of any other nonnecessity?

Mr. TYDINGS. And I ask the gentleman what useful purpose the information about the importation of toy balloons and a pamphlet upon this has to serve in running the Government?

Mr. BEGG. It serves the information to the manufacturers as to the volume of competition they have, and they stand in no different attitude from the manufacturers of any other line that is not a necessity.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the gentleman approve, then, of employing the numerous Government employees to work out such pamphlets?

Mr. BEGG. On toy balloons?

Mr. TYDINGS. And how many people who make toy balloons ever see one of these pamphlets after it is printed?

Mr. BEGG. I have two very large factories in my district that do nothing else but that, and they make good money for themselves and keep up good homes and help to keep up good communities.

Mr. TYDINGS. Even granting that the gentleman is correct, how about the pamphlet which deals with how an Indian ward spends her allotment?

Mr. BEGG. I suspect that that has a good deal of interest to some gentleman's colleagues from Oklahoma, although it would not be of interest to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES

Light Station, Cleveland, Ohio: To enable the Secretary of Commerce to provide suitable quarters for the lighthouse keepers in the city of Cleveland, Ohio, including the purchase of necessary equipment and the rental of temporary quarters for the lighthouse keepers, as authorized by section 1 (item 13) of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of certain lighthouse reservations, and increase the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1926, \$50,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to go back to line 18 on page 24 and to offer at that point a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 24, after line 17, insert as a new paragraph the following:

"To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Department of Commerce under the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding \$1,000 in any one case,' approved December 28,

1922, and fully set forth in Document No. 455, Sixty-ninth Congress, \$1,000."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 25, line 2, after the figures "1926," strike out the figures "\$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$60,000."

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, the bill providing for the sale of the old lighthouse residences in Cleveland passed this House and Senate and was signed some months ago. This does not provide any new appropriation.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; this money goes into the Treasury, but it does appear in the appropriation.

Mr. CROSSER. Let me explain the facts. What is actually proposed here is to sell the present lighthouse property which is located near the union depot in such quarters as are really unsuitable for residence purposes for the lighthouse keepers. The property now in use will probably sell for \$75,000 or \$80,000. The Bureau of Lighthouses desire that part of the proceeds of the sale of the old property be used to build new residences and for other equipment necessary for the lighthouse keepers. They say that they require \$60,000. This bill reduces the estimate of the department from \$60,000 to \$50,000. I ask leave to extend my remarks by incorporating the memorandum from the Commerce Department on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CROSSER. It would take too long to read it now. I want to emphasize the fact that this money which is taken for the building of these lighthouse keepers' residences will be obtained from the sale of property that they now have there, but which has become unsuitable because it is surrounded by factories. The people occupying these old dwellings are subject to a great amount of dirt and noise.

These men are required to be on duty night and day. They are required to sleep there and it is not very comfortable to be sleeping near railroad trains with all their noise and dirt. Therefore they need these new dwelling places. They are not asking for more money than will be derived from the sale of the property now in use. In fact it will take much less money than will be received from the sale of the old property. It looks like an appropriation of money, although the money will come out of the proceeds of the sale of the old property. The Lighthouse Bureau says it is not inclined to go on with the sale of this old property if it can not have the \$60,000 required for new buildings. Now, to estimate the cost of the different items required in the construction of new dwellings and boathouse, the department estimates \$10,000 for the site—and I think that is a reasonable amount—two double dwellings, four persons to a dwelling, at \$19,000 each, making \$38,000, and a boathouse, \$20,000; other equipment and rental for temporary quarters, \$2,000, making a total of \$60,000. I do not believe that these estimates are unreasonable when one considers the cost of building.

The memorandum referred to above is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,

BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES,

Washington, June 28, 1926.

Memorandum with reference to quarters for lighthouse keepers in Cleveland, Ohio

With reference to House Document No. 425, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, transmitting supplemental estimate of \$60,000 for quarters for lighthouse keepers in Cleveland, Ohio, and to the second deficiency bill (H. R. 13040, p. 25, line 2) appropriating \$50,000 for this purpose, the following information is furnished:

The present keepers' dwellings, which accommodate four families, are situated in the midst of the wholesale business district of Cleveland, occupying a site that is more valuable and suitable for business purposes, and because of the smoke and dirt and close proximity to a large freight terminal warehouse are far from desirable from a residential standpoint. These men are required to be on duty at night, and for efficient performance of their work should be housed in a less noisy and disturbed district, and it is considered urgent that this condition be remedied as soon as possible. Furthermore, the keepers' dwellings and equipment should be located at a point from which the aids to navigation under their care can be under closer observation. Cleveland Main Light, formerly exhibited on this site, was discontinued at the opening of navigation in the spring of 1893. These keepers care for 7 lights, 3 fog signals, and 1 gas buoy in the approaches to Cleveland, which in 1925 had a marine traffic of over 10,500,000 tons, valued at \$157,000,000, and in addition over 600,000 passengers.

The value of the present property is estimated to be in excess of \$75,000, whereas the needs of the Lighthouse Service can be better

provided for at a cost of not exceeding \$60,000. This legislation, therefore, will result in a saving to the Government, better supervision and operation of aids to navigation in this harbor, improvement in living conditions for the keepers, and advantage to the city of Cleveland.

It will not be practicable for the department to take steps for the sale of this property until other quarters are provided for the keepers, because of the necessity of rendering continuous service.

The appropriation recommended is authorized in the sum of \$60,000 by the act approved May 22, 1926, section 1, item 13.

In a letter dated March 26, 1926, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget advised this department that the legislation authorizing an appropriation of not exceeding \$60,000 would not be in conflict with the financial program of the President. While the matter was pending in Congress this legislation received the consideration and approval of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Senate Committee on Commerce. Because of the recent date of the authorizing legislation, the submission of the present estimate could not have been foreseen in preparing the regular estimates for this fiscal year.

The estimate presented to and approved by the Bureau of the Budget for \$60,000 was a very close figure based on construction costs of several years back. From accurate information and estimates, it is our opinion that it would be unwise to take steps to dispose of the present property with only \$50,000 in view for the construction of new quarters. The sale of the present property for \$75,000 would leave a margin of saving of \$15,000 even if the full \$60,000 were appropriated.

The present property has a frontage of 122 feet, with a depth of 170 feet. According to information obtained from the county auditor's office, the assessed value of this land is \$69,040, to which should be added at least \$15,000 on account of the existing buildings. Reliable information indicates that property in this vicinity is worth about \$600 per front foot, or a total of \$73,200.

The work proposed under the estimate of \$60,000 is as follows:

Purchase of site.....	\$10,000
Two double dwellings, at \$19,000 each.....	38,000
Boathouse.....	10,000
Other equipment and rental of temporary quarters.....	2,000
Total.....	60,000

The size of the new lot will depend on price and location of what is available, and it is proposed to construct thereon two double brick dwellings, furnishing each family with four bedrooms and three living rooms, including kitchen, with other reasonable facilities. Each dwelling will contain approximately 60,000 cubic feet, or 30,000 cubic feet per family, at an estimated unit cost of approximately 32 cents per cubic foot. The boathouse will be on another tract on the water front, and will be needed to care for the station boats now exposed to weather, collision, and molestation. These boats are necessary, as all the lights are located on breakwaters and may be reached only in this manner. The remainder of the estimate will provide for other equipment and rental of quarters authorized by the act of May 22, 1926.

J. S. CONWAY,

Acting Commissioner of Lighthouses.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, the committee deemed the estimate that came before the committee for the purpose of constructing new quarters for lighthouse keepers and employees at Cleveland was too high. It showed the cost per cubic foot would be 56 cents, and the cost of public construction already authorized averages about 40 per cent per cubic foot on estimates furnished by other departments of the Government. So that the entire amount was reduced \$10,000 in order to bring it within what we believed was reasonable bounds.

Now, in providing new lighthouse facilities at Cleveland the items are: Land, \$10,000; boathouse, \$10,000; two double dwellings, \$38,000; contingencies, \$2,000; making \$60,000 all told. The cost per cubic foot of construction, as I said, is 56 cents. The committee believes it can be done at 40 cents and that the reduction of the total amount is entirely reasonable.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized. Mr. BURTON. First, Mr. Chairman, it must be borne in mind that if the \$60,000 is not required the balance will be turned back into the Treasury. I have nothing to guide me in my opinion except the opinion of the Department of Commerce. The Assistant Secretary, in a letter yesterday, says:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, June 28, 1926.

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: In reply to your letter of June 26, asking for information relative to the proposed appropriation of

\$50,000 carried in the second deficiency bill for the construction of new quarters for the lighthouse keepers at Cleveland, Ohio, I am inclosing herewith a memorandum from the Acting Commissioner of the Bureau of Lighthouses, which shows the situation as the department views it.

It would be extremely inadvisable to proceed with the sale of the present property with only \$50,000 in view for the construction of the new quarters as indicated in this memorandum.

Very truly yours,

J. WALTER DRAKE,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

It is to be noted that the act authorizing the sale of the old lighthouse and the purchase of the new, approved May 22 last, fixes the amount at \$60,000. It is to be noted also that the Budget Bureau has authorized \$60,000, and in view of the situation it seems to me the amount as estimated by the Department of Commerce and approved by the Budget should be the amount included in this bill.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfortunate that construction for the Government costs very much more than it costs private individuals. Congress has placed limitations on items of construction wherever it can do so. The Army bill for next year provides a limit on the Quartermaster General in the construction of quarters for officers, including heating and plumbing apparatus, wiring, and fixtures. In the case of a general officer the limit is placed at the sum of \$8,000; in the case of a colonel or officer above the rank of captain it is limited to \$6,000 for his detached dwelling in the barracks, and for an officer of or below the rank of captain, \$4,000.

Here is a proposition submitted by the Department of Commerce for two double dwelling houses to house four families at a cost of \$38,000, and as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] said, the committee thought that 60 cents per cubic foot was entirely too much. I do not think, if you will read the hearings, that you will find it was very seriously insisted upon by Doctor Putnam, the head of the service. I think they could without any particular difficulty put up these residences for less money and in accordance with the act of Congress in the case of other and even more important officers.

Mr. BEGG. Are they going to build on the same ground or on different ground?

Mr. BYRNS. On different ground.

Mr. BEGG. Does not that account for the difference in the comparison the gentleman uses, if he is familiar with the location at all? If it is in the neighborhood of the depot at Cleveland—

Mr. BYRNS. I am not talking about the acquirement of land. I am talking about the construction of the buildings, and it does not matter whether it is in one section or another. Just because you are going to sell the present quarters, and the Government is going to get some money into the Treasury, is no reason why the Government should appropriate more than is required.

Mr. CROSSER. The gentleman, of course, does not claim that this will take all of it, and still less that it will take more? It will probably bring as much as \$80,000.

Mr. BYRNS. But suppose it does bring \$80,000, that is no reason why the Government should put up dwelling houses that cost more than quarters for a general of the Army. If it can be done with less money, and if money can be saved to the Treasury of the United States, we ought to save it.

Mr. MADDEN. Sixty-six cents a cubic foot for this class of building is an outrageous price.

Mr. WINGO. My recollection is that these very expensive and handsome Federal reserve bank buildings that we authorized cost 46 or 47 cents a cubic foot.

Mr. CROSSER. When they were built?

Mr. WINGO. Those authorized for Detroit and one other place at this session of Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. I believe it was 46 cents.

Mr. CROSSER. These must be very well constructed buildings. They have to be down near the water, and they must be built in such a way that they will stand the weather and storms and everything else.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CROSSER. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 12, noes 24.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Absentee Shawnee allottees, Oklahoma: For payment of assessments upon the allotments of certain Absentee Shawnee allottees for a drain-

age ditch connecting Little River drainage ditch No. 1 in Pottawatomie County with Little River drainage ditch No. 2 in Cleveland County, Okla., fiscal year 1927, \$1,200, to be expended and reimbursed under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS: Page 30, after line 3, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"For recopying, repairing, rebinding, indexing, and otherwise preserving records and papers in the office of Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes, Muskogee, Okla., \$10,000."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, in support of this amendment permit me to say that H. R. 10540, which has passed the House, provides for an appropriation of \$10,000 for this specific purpose. Let me say, furthermore, that the bill has been reported in the Senate and is on the Senate Calendar. As soon as it is reached in the Senate there is no question but what it will be passed.

There is a long report from the Secretary of the Interior accompanying H. R. 10540 which justifies this appropriation. Some of these records are extremely old, and they run back for 25, 30, and 40 years. Some of them are old tribal records which were taken into the office of the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes some 25 years ago, but the records themselves are some 50 years old. The report of the department indicates that land titles in many cases are based upon these old records and that the courts all over the eastern part of Oklahoma send to the superintendent's office for the purpose of having these records transcribed and certificates made from them for use in the trial of lawsuits.

It is a very important appropriation and it is a small item. It is an emergency matter and I want to impress its importance upon the House. I sincerely trust the gentleman from Kansas will not insist upon his point of order.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does not the gentleman think that this matter can go over until the next appropriation bill is considered, at which time the money could be made immediately available and still serve the same purpose?

Mr. HASTINGS. That might be satisfactory, but, as I understand, these records are extremely old and the necessity for this work upon these old records has been impressed upon me for the last two or three years, and particularly at this time.

Some of these records are almost illegible, and the report of the department indicates that they are tattered, torn, and almost illegible, so that it is difficult to make a transcription of them. I sincerely trust the gentleman will permit the amendment to be adopted.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, there is no law authorizing this and it is subject to a point of order. I do not think we ought to allow it to pass. I do not think it is important that it should be done at this time, and it is merely a question of whether or not the work is done this year or next year. It is not an emergency; it is not a deficiency, and it can be provided for in the regular annual bill if it is deemed desirable.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, just one word more and then I am through. I thought I could appeal to the good nature and good humor of the gentleman from Illinois. I thought this matter was of enough importance to present it to the Committee on Appropriations and I really think it is an emergency. There is one thing I did not say to the gentleman when I was before his committee, a thing which I think justifies me in presenting it to the House at this time. I do not believe I sufficiently impressed this point upon the committee: That some of these are old tribal records that run back 75 or 100 years. They were transferred to the office of the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes; they have been used during all of this number of years and some of them are in exceptionally bad condition.

Mr. MADDEN. I will accept the amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I will.

Mr. ANTHONY. My attention has been called to the fact that in the amendment offered by the gentleman there is no fiscal year named. Would the gentleman have any objection to naming the fiscal year 1927?

Mr. HASTINGS. I would certainly have no objection to that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by adding, just before the amount of money, the words "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS: On page 30, line 3, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"For recopying, repairing, rebinding, indexing, and otherwise preserving records and papers in the office of Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes, Muskogee, Okla., for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, \$10,000."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Coolidge Dam across canyon of Gila River near San Carlos, Ariz.: For construction of the Coolidge Dam across the canyon of the Gila River near San Carlos, Ariz., as authorized by the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. pp. 475, 476), and under terms and conditions and reimbursable as provided in said act, fiscal year 1927, \$725,000: *Provided*, That said sum shall be available for acquiring rights of way and other purposes provided for in said act.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. ANTHONY: On page 31, after line 9, insert the following:

"Santa Isabel Reservation, Calif.: For the purchase of land and payment of expenses incurred in connection therewith as authorized by the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain lands in California to be added to the Santa Isabel Indian Reservation and authorizing an appropriation of funds therefor,' approved June 3, 1926, fiscal year 1927, \$25,000.

"Crow Indian children, Montana: For surveys and other expenses connected with the allotments authorized by the act entitled 'An act to allot lands to living children on the Crow Reservation, Mont.,' approved May 19, 1926, fiscal year 1927, \$5,000, payable from tribal funds of the Crow Indians.

"Northern Cheyenne Reservation, Mont.: For expenses of making the tribal roll, compiling list of lands, surveys, and classifications, and all other expenses connected with the allotments authorized by the act entitled 'An act to provide for allotting in severalty lands within the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation in Montana, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1926, fiscal year 1927, \$27,500.

"Reno Indian Colony, Nev.: For the purchase of land in accordance with the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain lands in Nevada to be added to the present site of the Reno Indian Colony, and authorizing the appropriation of funds therefor,' approved May 10, 1926, fiscal year 1927, \$4,300.

"Dresslerville Indian Colony, Nev.: For carrying out the act entitled 'An act to provide for an adequate water-supply system at the Dresslerville Indian Colony,' approved May 17, 1926, fiscal year 1927, \$5,500.

"Gagnon & Co. (Inc.): For carrying out the act entitled 'An act for the relief of Gagnon & Co. (Inc.),' approved May 29, 1926, fiscal year 1926, \$3,592.

"O. H. Lipps: For payment to O. H. Lipps in accordance with the act entitled 'An act for the relief of O. H. Lipps,' approved May 29, 1926, fiscal year 1926, \$901.55."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION

For refund to Domingo J. Milord of \$500 furnished as security on bond that Magdalena Pons Roca, a native of Cuba, admitted temporarily to the United States at the port of Key West, Fla., July 31, 1924, should not become a public charge, which amount was inadvertently deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts September 17, 1924, fiscal year 1926, \$500.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: On page 43, after line 17, insert the following: "For compensation of the additional Assistant Secretary of the Navy authorized by section 4 of the act approved June 24, 1926, fiscal year 1927, \$7,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, recently, during the services in this Chamber upon the life, character, and public services of the late John E. Raker, I mentioned briefly 12 important acts of Congress, all enacted during the 13 years that Judge Raker and myself had served together in this body. I mentioned these acts as having been the principal ones in the vital change of our Government. I named these acts as:

The direct election of Senators; the Federal reserve act; the graduated income tax; the Adamson Act; the selective service act, meaning the right to make other similar drafts if necessity should warrant; national prohibition; national suffrage for women; the system of Federal aid for the States; the Budget system; the Esch railway regulation and guarantee act; the beginning of the regulation of such things as aviation, the radio, motion pictures, and so forth; the immigration restriction act.

The remarks made upon that occasion have brought me quite a bit of mail, and a great number of inquiries from Members for the dates, and an elaboration of these particular enactments; and to-day, Mr. Chairman, I shall elaborate my statements somewhat, giving the dates of these principal enactments.

Mr. MADDEN. I think that will be very helpful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We, as Representatives in Congress, are the instruments through which the people change their Government. If we are busy and working under pressure and strain—as we usually are—the days merge one into another, and we do not have time to stop to note the great fundamental changes. One day we vote on some momentous piece of legislation that changes our structure for all time. The next day we vote for an act to add 10 sections to a forest reserve, or to correct the record of a veteran of our wars, or perhaps to provide for the labeling of milk bottles in the District of Columbia.

I have noted 12 great acts. There are others, or course; but these are the ones which, to me, seemed to have brought about the greatest changes. All were brought about by great legislative struggles in both House and Senate. I shall name them again—all enacted within the last 13 years.

1. Direct election of Senators (act of 1914, followed by a constitutional amendment).
2. Federal reserve act (1913, to provide a system of liquid currency).
3. Graduated income tax, 1913.
4. Federal interest in organized labor in interstate commerce, as shown in Adamson Act, 1916.
5. The draft (exercise of the Government's right to require any man or class of men to serve in time of war. This right, having been tested, will be extended whenever necessary to the drafting of capital, labor, and property), 1917.
6. National prohibition, 1919.
7. National women suffrage, 1920.
8. Federal aid to State activities, beginning 1916.
9. Budget system, 1921.
10. Esch-Cummins railway regulation and guarantee, 1920.
11. Regulation of aviation, the radio, the telephone, and the motion picture, beginning about 1920 and some still pending.
12. Immigration Restriction Act, 1924.

This last was a reversal of a policy which had existed from the beginning of our Government. We were an asylum; we are no longer an asylum for very good reasons.

These legislative enactments—there are others, but I have not had the time to search the records—give an idea of how this great free Government of the United States of America—a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people—is ever advancing; how it bends to the voice of the people; how the voice of the people is the voice of God, and why it is to-day the greatest and most successful experiment in Government ever attempted.

But ours is a very young Government. It may go too fast! It may overreach itself! When we have come to be 117,000,000 people we can not move as we did when we were fewer.

I mentioned the selective service, or draft act, as bringing about a fundamental change. I did not mention the declaration of war in 1917, and all of the tremendous legislation brought about by entry in the World War. Those were hard days in Congress, but war is incidental to the struggle of nations for existence.

Gentlemen will notice that I included as the eighth item the extension of the plan of Federal aid to States—now generally called the "50-50 plan." That plan is often spoken of as beginning with the good roads act of 1916, and that was the first, perhaps, of the "50-50's." But the question of Federal aid to States is not quite so new. It runs back to our beginning under the Constitution, and even before. It took three forms, as follows:

1. Direct donations or gratuities to the States for specific purposes.
2. Direct donations or gifts to the States for specific purposes, but upon condition that the State receiving the donation carry out the condition in the grant.
3. Direct donations or gifts to the States for specific purposes, upon condition that the State carry out conditions in the grant, and where one of the conditions required the matching of the Federal gift by at least an equal sum by the State.

Under the first plan Federal land grants were made for educational purposes, internal improvements such as the building of roads, bridges, canals, erecting of State capitols, and other State public buildings.

The second plan was commenced during the days of the Civil War with the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862, wherein land grants were made to the States upon condition that the State use the gift in the establishment and maintenance of an agricultural school. This was followed in 1887 by the Hatch Act, whereby each land-grant college provided for in the Morrill Act was given a certain additional sum conditioned upon the establishment of an agricultural experimental station.

THE ORIGINAL FIFTY-FIFTY

The third plan was first put into effect in 1911. This plan involved the matching of the Federal grant of money by at least a like sum from the State. The idea was that this method would tend to stimulate greater activity on the part of the States. Among the Federal-aid acts which have been passed and which embody this general principle of the matching of Federal funds are the following:

- The Weeks law for forest-fire prevention. Act of March 1, 1911.
- The Smith-Lever Act for agricultural extension work. Act of May 8, 1914.
- The good roads act. Act of July 11, 1916.
- The Smith-Hughes Act for vocational education. Act of February 23, 1917.
- The Chamberlain-Kahn Act for the suppression of venereal disease. Act of July 9, 1918.
- The industrial rehabilitation act. Act of June 2, 1920.
- The Federal highway act. Act of November 9, 1921.
- The Sheppard-Towner or maternity and infant welfare act. Act of November 23, 1921.
- The Clarke-McNary Act for the protection of forest lands, etc. Act of June 7, 1924.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not endeavor to speculate as to the future. Centralization of government is bound to be debated more and more, but even those who oppose centralization are likely to clamor more and more for Federal aid until, lo and behold, we shall have so weakened the States as to create an alarming situation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Administrative expenses, World War adjusted compensation act: The unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$450,000 for administrative expenses, World War adjusted compensation act, contained in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1924, approved December 5, 1924, shall remain available until June 30, 1927.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANTHONY: On page 44, after the year "1927" in line 15, insert a comma and the following: "And shall also be available to cover obligations incurred for such administrative expenses during the period from July 1, 1926, to the date of the approval of this act, inclusive."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft factory, air stations, fleet, and all other aviation activities, testing laboratories, and for overhauling of planes, fiscal year 1927, \$260,000, to be added to and made a part of the appropriation "Aviation, Navy, fiscal year 1927," contained in the naval appropriation act for such fiscal year.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. DAVEY: On page 45, line 13, after the word "year," strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following: "Provided, further, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enter into contract for the procurement of one or both of the rigid airships authorized by the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled 'An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith,' subject to the limitations as to cost and other provisions contained in said act."

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to expedite the building of one or both of the dirigibles which were authorized in the naval aviation bill passed this spring and approved by the President last Thursday.

I would like to call the attention of the committee to the further fact that the authorization which is sought in this amendment does not take the money out of the Treasury any sooner than it would be taken if we waited until the next regular appropriation bill. Presumably, in the course of natural events, there will be an appropriation for the beginning of these dirigibles in the next regular appropriation bill. In the meantime, it will take six or eight months to prepare the detailed plans and specifications before a contract can be let, which means that if we wait until the regular appropriation bill, it will be a year and a half at least before a contract can be let; in other words, before they will be ready to let the contract.

Now, assuming that it is the purpose of Congress, as defined in the naval aviation bill, to build one or both of these great dirigibles, and assuming that there will be provision for it in the regular appropriation bill next winter, this amendment does not interfere with that program. It merely gives the Secretary of the Navy the power to contract, which provides the encouragement that is needed by this particular industry to stay in existence.

I would like to call the attention of the committee to a further important fact—important to the Government. The Goodyear-Zeppelin Corporation, a subsidiary of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., has been in existence for two or three years and represents the faith and enthusiasm and patriotic hobby of President Litchfield. He has brought together from Germany an unusual corps of technical experts under Doctor Arnstein, who appeared before the Naval Affairs Committee. This organization has been carried along for two or three years at an expense of a quarter of a million dollars.

It so happens that Mr. Litchfield himself is very much in earnest about the proposition, but the directors of the company are not very sympathetic. The thing I fear is that unless they get some reasonable encouragement the technical organization available for service to the Government will be disbanded. In other words, if we wait until the regular appropriation bills are passed, it will be a year and a half before a contract can be entered into.

If this amendment is adopted, it will be six or eight months before a contract can be made, during which time the detailed plans and specifications will be prepared.

Here is what concerns me chiefly: This organization, the only one in the country prepared to build a giant dirigible, has no assurance from the Government that they will get the contract even at the end of a year and a half, and there would be no economic justification for maintaining an expensive organization to serve the Government without any assurance that they would get the contract at the end of that long period of uncertainty. If this amendment is passed, they may have the assurance in six or eight months, and they would be justified probably in maintaining this expensive technical organization long enough to find out whether the Government would give them the contract.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. DAVEY. I will yield.

Mr. FRENCH. May I ask the proponent of the amendment—if I understood his amendment—that it leave to the Secretary of the Navy the determination of whether or not he will enter into a contract for one or two dirigibles?

Mr. DAVEY. That is correct.

Mr. FRENCH. Does the gentleman undertake in his amendment to limit the cost?

Mr. DAVEY. It leaves it subject to the limitation in the act authorizing the dirigibles.

Mr. FRENCH. The act provides that each dirigible shall not exceed in cost \$4,500,000. Would the gentleman be in favor

of a ship that cost \$4,500,000, or one that would cost \$2,500,000, or one that would cost \$2,000,000?

Mr. DAVEY. That is within the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy. And I want the committee to understand, further, that if the amendment should pass there is no assurance that the contract will go to my constituents, for that is within the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman would turn over to the Secretary of the Navy the entire question of cost, limited only to the amount indicated in the authorization bill that was recently signed. Does the gentleman have any idea as to the capacity in cubic feet that the dirigible, or either of them, would be?

Mr. DAVEY. May I answer in this way? The Congress, through the naval aviation bill, has already decided to build one or two of these giant dirigibles with approximately 6,000,000 cubic feet capacity. This merely rests upon the law passed this spring from the Naval Affairs Committee, which presumably defines the policy of Congress in this matter.

Now, I would like to bring out another matter if the gentleman will allow me. This I have from one of high rank on the Naval Affairs Committee, that a large dirigible is of greater value from a military standpoint than a scout cruiser, because it costs only about one-third of the cost of a scout cruiser, and, secondly, it only takes 30 or 40 men instead of 300, as in the scout cruiser. Its range of vision is admittedly greater than that of the scout cruiser and probably represents a military value of five or six times that of the scout cruiser.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the answers to the questions I have asked, together with the preliminary statements that the proponent of the amendment makes, indicate that at this time there is no definite plan that has to do with the cost of the dirigible, or the size, or the details of construction that must be worked out before a dirigible should be begun.

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

Mr. FRENCH. It is a good deal like starting work upon the basement of an expensive house without having the architect's plans for the superstructure. We would not do that. So, then, we have an amendment that follows within a week the authorization of the dirigibles; we have an amendment that is uncertain in its terms as to the amount of money that it will place as a charge upon the Treasury; we have an amendment that provides for a program that has not been worked out by the Navy Department, that has not been considered by the Bureau of the Budget, that has not been submitted to Congress by the administration, that has not been the subject of inquiry by the committee of the Congress that is charged specifically with the responsibility of inquiring into the reasons or justifications for a program such as that suggested by the amendment.

What is the situation to-day touching the question of the building of dirigibles? Less than a week ago the measure was signed that authorized the two dirigibles. We have at this time experiments going on at Lakehurst with a dirigible—the *Los Angeles*—of something like 2,000,000 feet capacity, experiments that are being conducted with the special object in view of determining certain factors that will enter into the construction of one or both of the dirigibles to which the gentleman's amendment pertains. Those experiments ought to be carried to a conclusion before a program shall be adopted definitely by this Congress. Those experiments have to do with the structure, with the strength of the materials to be used, with the air pressure upon the different parts of the craft, with many of the factors that concern economies and efficiency of a dirigible of the size of that which is proposed by the gentleman and authorized a week ago by the Congress.

More than that, it is only a matter of a few weeks since the naval appropriation for the coming year was approved by the President. In that bill were carried appropriations for tests and a cooperative experimentation in a metal type of lighter-than-air craft. If that test shall be successful it may revolutionize the entire question of materials used in lighter-than-air building. We do not know. That experiment will be well under way by the time this Congress shall convene next winter.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I trust the gentleman from Idaho will not get it into his head that the metal type which is to be used, for which \$300,000 were appropriated for experimental purposes, will keep the Navy Department from following up the known type of Zeppelin, because the engineers testified that they would never contemplate, even if the metal type proved to be a success, the construction of one as large as a 6,000,000 cubic feet craft, and I will say to the gentleman that I think the committee will agree with him on this matter, and that we should get a vote upon it and make progress with the bill.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman must recognize that we ought to have the benefit of that experiment before we authorize the expenditure of large sums of money.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I trust that the gentleman's committee next December will not hold up the expenditure for the Zeppelins awaiting the experiments on the metal-clad ship, because they are entirely two different propositions. I hope before the gentleman reaches a conclusion along that line he will read the testimony. He will there see that it is never the intention of the metal-clad people to try to construct one along the lines of the Zeppelins.

Mr. FRENCH. It is not my purpose to anticipate what the committee will possibly do at the next session of Congress touching lighter-than-air craft. I simply bring forward to-day these two thoughts, that we are to-day experimenting on a fabric type of ship at Lakehurst, and we have hardly begun on the experiment on a lighter-than-air ship of metal type. Surely we ought not at this time to authorize the construction of a building program without a limit of cost other than that fixed in the general bill, and without the benefits of the experiments that are being made. Further than that, may I say that the committee charged with the responsibility of shaping the appropriation bill initially has had no opportunity of considering the question through holding hearings, or going into the success of the experiments that have been made, or of passing judgment upon the basis of the facts disclosed through an inquiry calculated to bring out the opinions of the officers of the department that is most concerned.

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

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is one point brought out in the remarks of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] that I think ought to be cleared up, and that has to do with this question of the so-called metal covered dirigible. In the first place, the metal-clad ship is entirely experimental. They do not even know how they will get the gas into it yet. It is so far in the field of experimentation that they do not know whether they will be able to do anything with it at all. In the next place if the metal-clad ship proves to be a success, according to the testimony of its own proponents before the Naval Affairs Committee, it will be perhaps 8 or 10 years before they will be able to demonstrate that they can build a metal-clad ship similar in size and carrying power to the known type of dirigible. In other words, according to their own testimony, they are now proposing to build a metal-clad ship of 200,000 cubic feet capacity and the next step will have to be perhaps one of 500,000 cubic feet capacity.

After demonstrating that one of 500,000 cubic feet capacity is successful, if they do, they must go the next step higher, taking two or three years for each successive experiment, and it will be a matter of 8 or 10 years before they can possibly demonstrate anything in reference to the metal-clad ship. In the meantime the fabric-covered ship is the only known quantity in the field of dirigibles. The gentleman who is in charge of the technical organization of the Goodyear Zeppelin Co., brought over from the parent company in Germany, has himself produced over 100 dirigibles of this type, and therefore in the field of dirigibles there is a thoroughly known demonstrated type, which Congress through the naval aviation bill has determined to build after exhaustive hearings. Now the gentleman from Idaho suggests that we wait until the experiments with the metal-clad ship are completed before we determine what we are going to do in reference to dirigibles.

If we wait for that, it will be a matter of 8 or 10 years before we can undertake anything at all, and, according to the law passed this spring, the Navy Department is required to start proceedings on one ship prior to July 1, 1927. It is absolutely impossible, physically impossible, for us to learn anything about the metal-clad ship before we decide to do something with the regular type of dirigible. They can even complete and demonstrate the little experimental one in time. Another thing that ought to be brought out is this, that probably if the metal-clad idea is ever incorporated in a large dirigible, it must be on a basis of the present-known demonstrated type. Why we have in connection with the metal-clad type a very serious practical problem, and that is they have not yet demonstrated how they are going to get the gas into it.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the gentleman's statement from his personal knowledge?

Mr. DAVEY. It is from the testimony of experts who presumably know their business. In other words, it is a practicable problem to get air out of a rigid ship that is nondeflatable and to get the gas in; whereas, with the present-known type of dirigible, they have the internal gas bags that fill the great airships, and they are rolled up and deflated, and the gas is pumped in in a perfectly easy, natural way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT
OUT OF THE POSTAL REVENUES

Damage claims: To pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Post Office Department under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding \$1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922, as fully set forth in House Documents Nos. 301, 346, and 421, Sixty-ninth Congress, \$5,983.39.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 45, line 23, strike out the word "and" and after the number "421" insert the following: "and 460"; and in line 24 strike out the sum of \$5,983.39 and insert in lieu thereof the sum of \$9,985.44.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Payment to Mrs. Margarethe Murphy: For the payment to Mrs. Margarethe Murphy, widow of George Herbert Murphy, late consul general of Zurich, Switzerland, one year's salary of her deceased husband, who died of illness incurred while in the Consular Service, fiscal year 1926, \$9,000.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 49, after line 11, insert: "Payment to Mrs. Lilly O. Dyer; For payment to Mrs. Lilly O. Dyer, widow of the late Francis H. Dyer, formerly consul at Coblenz, one year's salary of the deceased husband, who died of illness incurred while in the Consular Service, and authorized by the act approved June 25, 1926, the fiscal year 1926, \$4,000."

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to make this inquiry. Has an act of Congress been enacted authorizing that expenditure?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; it merely follows out the law.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I knew there were several bills of that kind pending and had passed the House, but I was not sure any had passed the Senate. Unless the act that authorized the payment has been passed, of course, we have no legal authority to appropriate the money.

Mr. FRENCH. This particular act was approved June 25, 1926.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Interparliamentary Union: The unexpended balance of the appropriation for expenses of the Twenty-third Conference of the Interparliamentary Union is hereby made available for the payment of expenses, aggregating \$1,008.37, incurred for printing furnished in connection with such conference contrary to the provisions of the act of March 1, 1919, and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 50, after line 19, insert as a new paragraph the following: "Territory of Hawaii: To reimburse the following fire insurance companies the amount paid by them on account of insurance against fire on property in the Territory of Hawaii, which property was destroyed by the Government in the suppression of the bubonic plague in such Territory in the years 1899 and 1900: Royal Insurance Co., \$25,100; Trans-Atlantic Fire Insurance Co., \$9,500; Prussian National Fire Insurance Co., \$2,870; North German Fire Insurance Co., \$8,000; Hamburg-Bremen Fire Insurance Co., \$10,450; Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Co., \$6,900; New Zealand Insurance Co., \$6,025; Fireman's Fund Insurance Co., \$9,250; National Fire Insurance Co. of Hartford, Conn., \$4,150; Caledonian Insurance Co. of

Edinburgh, Scotland, \$750; North Prussia Mercantile Insurance Co., \$3,000; in all, fiscal year 1926, \$85,975, as authorized by the act approved June 18, 1926.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I do so for the purpose of inserting in the RECORD a statement showing the differences on the bill H. R. 12175, the veterans' bill, as it passed the House, and as it came from the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the statement referred to:

1. Amendment to section 4, increasing the director's salary from \$10,000 to \$12,000.
2. Amendment to section 200, including spinal meningitis as one of those diseases conclusively held to be of service origin where entitled to 10 per cent degree rating prior to January 1, 1925.
3. Amendment to section 202 (3), granting \$50 per month for arrested cases of tuberculosis.
4. Amendment to section 202 (6), authorizing reimbursement of State hospitals for care of ex-service men prior to bureau taking over their care.
5. Add new section authorizing erection of garages and reimbursement from employees for same.

CHANGES IN HOUSE PROVISIONS

1. Amendment to section 21, authorizing the director to restrict number of wards one guardian can act for, restricted by Senate to the District of Columbia.
2. Amendment to section 33, authorizing the bureau to provide courses of instruction and to send professional employees to school restricted by Senate so that not more than 2 per cent of the professional personnel can be sent out to schools.
3. Amendment to section 200, including for the benefits of the act women assigned to the medical department of the United States Army who served overseas, restricted by the Senate to women citizens of the United States who were sent overseas by the War Department and who served in base hospitals over there.
4. Amendment to section 201, in regard to burials. Where House made the decision of the director as to assets binding on General Accounting Office changed to read "binding for all purposes."
5. Amendment to section 202 (7), regarding insane without dependents changed by Senate so that man only has to be maintained by the Government for six months and not by bureau (this makes the provision applicable to men in soldiers' homes). Also reduced amount in House bill from \$30 to \$20, as now in the law.
6. Amendment to section 206, extending time for filing proof of service origin to June 7, 1927. House removed time limit.
7. Amendment to section 209, extending time for filing claims three (3) years. House removed time limit.
8. Amendment adding a new section (308), which provided that if man remitted premium in month following grace period and was killed before furnishing health statement director could waive examination requirement if man was in required state of health. Senate restricted this to seven (7) days following grace period.
9. Amendment to section 406, language clarified so as to permit payment of two (2) months' training allowance following rehabilitation as provided by section 404.

PROVISIONS ELIMINATED BY SENATE

1. Amendment to section 10, authorizing President to transfer to the Veterans' Bureau certain tuberculosis facilities of Battle Mountain Sanitarium and the Northwestern Branch of National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.
2. Amendment to section 21 (3), to allow director to pay temporarily suspended payments to the chief officer of an institution or to the claimant or to his dependents.
3. Amendment to section 202 (3), organic loss of speech made \$150 a month.
4. Amendment to section 202 (10). 1. Out-patient treatment for veterans of all wars without regard to nature or origin of disabilities. 2. Hospitalization without regard to nature or origin of disabilities for contract surgeons and contract dentists. 3. Retroactive payment by bureau to persons from whose pensions have been deducted sums for hospitalization.
5. Section 301, extension of period for conversion of insurance. This section covered in public law of the present Congress.

6. Section 303, covered by Comptroller General's decisions and no longer necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDING FUND

For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the "foreign service building act, 1926," and for each and every object thereof, including the initial alterations, repair, and furnishing of buildings heretofore acquired under specific authorization of Congress for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments in foreign countries, \$435,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, on page 53, line 23, I move to strike out the word "building" and insert the word "buildings," plural.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRENCH: Page 53, line 23, strike out the word "building" and insert in lieu thereof the word "buildings."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRENCH. Then I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to correct the heading in line 21, so that the plural word "buildings" will appear.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to correct the heading in the manner indicated. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRENCH: Page 53, line 21, strike out the word "building" and insert in lieu thereof the word "buildings."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONFERENCE ON OIL POLLUTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS

The appropriation of \$42,000 made by the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1925, approved March 4, 1925, for the purpose of defraying the expenses of a conference of maritime nations to be held at Washington, in accordance with the authorization in Public Resolution 65, approved July 1, 1922, to consider the adoption of effective means for the prevention of oil pollution of navigable waters, shall remain available for the purposes specified in said deficiency act until June 30, 1927.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 57, line 3, after the word "act," insert "and for any further conference or conferences on this subject in Washington and elsewhere, including preparations therefor and expenses in connection therewith."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSULAR BUILDING, AMOY, CHINA

The appropriation contained in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1925, approved March 3, 1925, "for the construction in accordance with the act approved February 17, 1911, of a consular building or buildings at Amoy, China, fiscal year 1926, \$20,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$300,000 for the acquisition of embassy, legation, and consular buildings and grounds, contained in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the year ending June 30, 1922,' approved March 2, 1921," shall remain available until June 30, 1927.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, on page 57, line 6, I move to strike out, after the word "March," the figure "3" and insert the figure "4."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 57, line 6, strike out the figure "3" and insert the figure "4."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRENCH: Page 57, line 16, insert as a new paragraph the following:

"International Road Congress: To enable the United States to accept membership in the permanent association of International Road Congresses, \$3,000, and for the expenses of participation in the meetings of the congress and of the executive committee in the calendar year 1926, including travel and subsistence, \$5,000; in all for the year 1927, \$8,000, as authorized by the public resolution approved June 18, 1926."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Refunds to railroads for interest collected: For refunds to such railroads as made payments of interest, that were covered into the United States Treasury, on overpayments made by the United States under sections 209 (g) and 212 of the transportation act, as amended, to be settled and adjusted by the General Accounting Office, fiscal year 1926, \$48,852.83, to remain available until June 30, 1927.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order against the paragraph just read.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded, and the paragraph goes out. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

For an additional amount for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923, fiscal year 1927, \$15,000.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WATSON. Is this in accordance with the new system of paying the postmasters?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. They are paid by check.

Mr. WATSON. How many?

Mr. MADDEN. All the post offices within certain large cities. It transfers the making of the checks and the cashing of the checks to the office of the Treasurer. This is done to avoid the danger of robbery, and so on. It saves \$100,000 over and above the cost of the work in the Treasury Office.

Mr. WATSON. I knew it must save something, otherwise the gentleman would not have made the appropriation.

Mr. MADDEN. It will save \$100,000 a year.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

For expenses to enforce the provisions of the national prohibition act and the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon, all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," approved December 17, 1914, as amended by the revenue act of 1918, and the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes,' approved February 9, 1909," as amended by the act of May 26, 1922, known as "The narcotic drugs import and export act," including the same objects specified under this head in the Treasury Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1927, \$2,686,760.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GALLIVAN: Page 59, line 23, strike out the figures "\$2,686,760" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$2,500,000: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for so-called under-cover work."

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I have not used any time during the session, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, we have hundreds and thousands of decent American citizens out of work. They hear there is going to be an examination for a civil-service job and the first question asked of them is: Have you ever been arrested? Have you ever been in jail? And if they tell the truth they are barred from taking the civil-service examination.

In this bill an appropriation of \$2,686,760 is recommended, \$183,000 of which is for under-cover work. What happens? The minute the doors close on a man who makes his exit from Sing Sing or Moyamensing or Charlestown Prison, in my home State, or Atlanta or Leavenworth, he hies his way to the prohibition office and he says, "I am just the fellow you want for under-cover work." They say, "Is that so? Have you a record?" He says, "You bet I have; I have just served my bit!" "What have you done?" "Oh, I have committed murder, rape, or arson." They say, "You are the fellow we want for under-cover work." He says, "You bet I am; I know every crook in the country who is dealing in bootlegging." They say, "You are just the fellow we are looking for," and this ex-convict goes through as is for \$3,600 a year, while the veteran in the hospital, who gave his all for humanity, gets 68 cents a day to live on; and these birds who have put on a badge and a pair of wings in the same hour get \$10 per day. Glory to God, where are we getting Federal officials for this work? From the sewers, from the jails, from the penitentiaries, and from the State prisons. Do you want to have to spend the people's money for the prize crooks of America and give them a Roman holiday? Why, Representatives in Congress, it is just one step from Atlanta's prison to the Mayflower Hotel in Washington at Government expense! The under-cover man has his fingerprints in the Department of Justice and all his fingers and both hands in the appropriations for prohibition enforcement. He is the stool pigeon de luxe of the Anti-Saloon League. I repeat, he gets an official badge and a pair of wings in the same hour, if you pass that appropriation.

Now, I ask any man in this House who is listening to me when and where he ever found me, a member of this committee, voting against appropriations for law enforcement? Ever since prohibition has been the law of the land I have been a member of the subcommittee which provides the money to enforce it, and I have never yet made a speech against that appropriation except when they asked me to spend the people's money for this kind of crooked work, and as long as I am here I will take my stand, if I am able, and I shall ever and always oppose my committee, with which I have been in everlasting harmony since I have been a member of it, now 11 years, when they report appropriations for the hiring of stool pigeons. [Applause.]

Think of it! Three thousand six hundred dollars a year for the fellow who has just come out of jail and goes into the Prohibition Unit to turn up his brother crook who served in the same prison with him, got out a little bit ahead of him and got a bootleg connection! He gets \$10 a day and God knows how much for expenses. God knows how much whisky he drinks and God knows how much he steals to sell to others. He is a crook and he can not get away from being a crook, but the prohibition department throws its arms about him when he has established the fact that he has a criminal record, and they say to him, "You are just the man we want."

How do I know? I attended every meeting on the original appropriation bill. I came here on November 15, before Congress met last year, and I sat with my committee day in and day out, and I heard every word of testimony from General Andrews and Prohibition Commissioner Jones and all the others. They admitted before our committee that they hired crooks and that they paid for under-cover evidence. They admitted this before our committee when we were preparing the original appropriation bill in November.

You will remember how I told you from this spot about the prohibition agent who spent \$1,400 of the people's money in staging a banquet at the Mayflower Hotel. He brought loads of liquor with him and bribed a couple of poor "saps" who were on the pay roll of the Mayflower Hotel with liquor, and when his liquor ran out he got them to introduce him to a bootlegger, who brought enough liquor in to supply 13 persons, invited to a banquet at the Mayflower Hotel, at Government expense. The only ones arrested were the two "saps," and when a jury of men here in the District heard their case and these two employees were put on trial, they were acquitted, with the jury in private session but five minutes. But \$1,400

of the people's money was spent, and Chairman MADDEN asked the Prohibition Commissioner, "Do you propose to keep that fellow on the pay roll?" He said, "No; we do not!"

He is still on the pay roll. The man who spent \$1,400, with wine, women, and song, at the Mayflower Hotel, is still on the pay roll despite the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations asked the Prohibition Commissioner, "Do you propose to keep him on the pay roll?" They sent him to Chicago, where he spent \$1,100 raiding a club which had a yacht down on the lake, out in the gentleman's own city—the Fishermen's Club. I do not want to say that the distinguished gentleman, who belongs to everything worth while in Chicago, was ever a member of the Fishermen's Club, but the bird who lived in luxury at the Mayflower Hotel went out there and got membership in the Fishermen's Club and then spent \$1,100 before he pulled his raid, and most of his vouchers—I will not say all of them—as they came into the Prohibition Department were for entertaining women, "for appearances sake," at \$25 a night. Think of it, men of America! Do you have to do that to enforce the law of the land? Do you have to pay \$25 a day and \$25 a night for a prohibition-enforcement agent to entertain a woman, I repeat, in order to enforce the law of the land?

Of course, you men did not hear this stuff, because you did not sit in my committee during those days in November and December when we were preparing the original appropriation for the enforcement of prohibition, but read the record and you will learn about it. Read the record of those hearings and you will know I am telling nothing but the truth, the whole truth, so help me God! [Applause.]

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, there is no evidence in the record of the hearings here or any other place that ex-penitentiary inmates are employed by the Prohibition Enforcement Unit of the Government to enforce the law. There is no evidence here that a man must be a crook to be so employed.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. All you have to do is to read the statement made by General Andrews, read it carefully, and you will ascertain from him that he is determined in the cleanest way to enforce the law. I apprehend it is no part of our business to obstruct the enforcement of the law. On the contrary, I believe it is our obligation as sworn officers of the Government to see to it that there is no discrimination on the part of any administrative officer, so far as we can prevent discrimination, in the enforcement not only of every amendment and of every line of the Constitution of the United States, but of every act passed as a result of the authority granted by the Constitution of the United States. [Applause.]

The appropriation proposed here is to provide means, and to place those means at the disposal of the enforcement officers of the Government, to enforce the law. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman, of course.

Mr. GALLIVAN. The gentleman recalls the evidence given before our committee last fall when we were preparing the main bill. The gentleman remembers that General Andrews admitted he had crooks on the pay roll?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not remember that.

Mr. GALLIVAN. You did at the time. You will recall that in this connection he said, "We have to hire them." [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is asking me if I remember and I say I do not remember.

Mr. GALLIVAN. The gentleman never forgets.

Mr. MADDEN. Whatever may have happened at the time, I do not remember, but I do remember that I am here as a Representative of the Government of the United States, charged with a serious public responsibility. I remember that in the discharge of that public responsibility I am endeavoring to obey the law. I do remember that the most important obligation that is imposed upon us here is to obey and enforce the law. [Applause.] I do remember that as a citizen of the United States I would be ashamed to say that I was not in favor of obeying and enforcing the law.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Of course. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. The gentleman will realize that these men who are trying to interrupt me with their applause, some of whom take a drink on the sneak, forget that I am asking for an appropriation of two and a half million dollars to enforce the law. I am asking you to give them two and a half million dollars to enforce the law. I am asking you to knock out only

\$166,000 to prevent ex-murderers, ex-rapists, and ex-burglars from getting on the pay roll. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. MADDEN. Wait a moment. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for a speech.

I do remember, Mr. Chairman, that the Treasury Department, through General Andrews, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, charged with the enforcement of the law, came before the Committee on Appropriations with a valid case. He showed beyond doubt that they needed two million and nine hundred thousand and some odd dollars for one year's services of nine hundred and some odd men. We showed from the evidence in the case that they would not be able to utilize the total number for the entire year, and we reduced the amount he asked for by one-twelfth. But to reduce that amount further would be to say that we are not in favor of the enforcement of the law. We are in favor of the enforcement of the law if the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations is to be ratified, and you say by your votes here this afternoon whether you believe that we have done our duty; and if you say you believe we have done our duty in presenting this recommendation to you for \$2,686,000 for the enforcement of the law, you will say that the money ought to be appropriated and that we are doing our duty; nothing more and nothing less. [Applause.]

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

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks for a division.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I will withdraw that request.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I renew the demand for a division.

The committee again divided; and there were 15 yeas and 86 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I hope they all take the pledge after that vote. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, line 23, strike out the figures "\$2,686,760" and insert in lieu thereof "\$102,686,760."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the purpose of the amendment is to carry out the suggestion of the chairman of the committee that the law shall be enforced without discrimination, without fear, and without favor, in accordance with our duty to enforce the law. If gentlemen will follow the testimony given before the committee by the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, he will find that he provides for so-called alcohol squads and beer squads to operate only in four points of the United States—Philadelphia, New Jersey, New York, and New England. I submit that the law is not a sectional law. The law is one that should be equally enforced. It is a national law, to be enforced all over the country. In order to carry out our sworn duty, so well pointed out by the distinguished chairman of the committee, we want to establish alcohol and beer squads in the 39 other States. The gentleman who represents the Treasury Department also stated that he is keenly desirous to stop the unlawful importations of alcohol into the country and in establishing these border patrols, but there is insufficient funds provided to do so. I want him to establish real border patrols all along the Atlantic, Canada, Pacific, and Mexico and not a farce and an invitation to bootleggers to import alcohol into the country from all points on the coast and borders. He has 15 agents in San Francisco and 15 at Los Angeles to keep out unlawful imports of liquor over 500 miles of Pacific coast land and from Texas to Mexico over 779 miles. He is going to keep out the importations of liquor with 24 men. On the whole coast of Florida, east and west coast, over 400 miles, he is going to keep liquor from being imported with 25 men, 8 men working on a shift all the time. That is worse than a farce. Any man that will stand up and say that they can keep liquor out of Florida with 25 men is not telling the truth. It can not be done. Apparently it is not intended to be done.

I have offered an amendment for \$102,000,000. That is sufficient as a starter for this year. That amount will enable the beginning of real coast and border patrol. My amendment will permit the department starting a real vigilant and effective liquor blockade. By next year, when we meet here next session, you will have a sufficient basis, so that in 1927-28 they will be able to have a real border patrol that will really stop

alcohol importations over the border, and that it is estimated will cost at least four or five hundred million dollars a year.

Of course you boys are all sincere. I know you want prohibition agents in your State; you want them snooping around your home, such as this bill establishes for New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts, and part of Pennsylvania. Now, show your sincerity. Here is your chance. Vote for my amendment and give the department the power, give them the money, with which to enforce the law. Then we will see how many real dries in favor of prohibition there really are. My amendment would get the beer squads in Kansas and—

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. We do not need them in Kansas.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, I know the gentleman is sincere in wanting to stop beer drinking in Kansas; you have beer in Kansas; you drink beer in Kansas.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I do not drink beer.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, I say "you." I mean the people of Kansas.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. I do not know what the gentleman's amendment covers—I have just come in—but does it contain a provision which would prevent a Senator or a Member of the House from going out on the Chautauqua circuit for the Anti-Saloon League?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. My amendment would provide sufficient funds to the Treasury Department to enforce the law equally all over the country. If there is to be enforcement in the Northeast let there be enforcement in the Southwest, Middle West, Pacific coast, and all over the country.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, lines 7 to 23, inclusive, strike out all.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have the greatest respect for the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I think he is one of the outstanding men in this House, but I think there is a time when we ought to stop. We have already appropriated approximately \$28,000,000 for the enforcement of prohibition, and if we add \$10,000,000 for the cutters for the Coast Guard Service it will bring it up to about \$38,000,000; and then adding two and a half million dollars more it will mean that we appropriate over \$40,000,000 to enforce one law. What about the other laws that are on our statute books? I do not hear anybody crying out loudly to enforce them. Why does not somebody suggest the appropriation of \$40,000,000 to enforce some other law that is violated daily?

Then another point comes up. You are going to pay these undercover men, and you want additional funds with which to pay them. If you want to be really consistent and do something, you should hire another gang of men to watch these undercover men; and then if you want to carry out the plan to its logical end, hire another gang to watch the second gang, because there is no question that you would have to go the entire length of the rope.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Does the gentleman not think it would be cheaper to put in cash registers? Then these people could watch one another.

Mr. BOYLAN. Even then you could not find out where they spent the money, because the records of the Prohibition Department show that within the past year nearly a thousand men have been removed, and for what? For failing to support the prohibition law or enforcing it, by seeing that the requisite emoluments came to them individually. I think we ought to stop somewhere. One way to stop is to cut out this entire section in order that this \$2,600,000 be not appropriated. I am sure that you will get just as much enforcement without these under-cover men as you will with them. I think the entire thing is subversive of our system and theory of government. It is supposed that every man's home is his castle. No longer will it be his castle. First, there are the prohibition men to break into it, and then the under-cover men to come after them, and then a series to come after them, and the Lord knows who will follow the last ones. I think it breaks down the very integrity of the American home. Nothing is sacred any more from the eyes of the seeking, inquisitorial prohibition agents. It seems as if our country is going along on one track, as though

we have no other aspiration in life than to declare whether we are wet or dry. I am sure that the \$40,000,000 spent in the enforcing of prohibition could be used to good advantage as a starter to help the suffering farmers of the West, and I would be willing to vote to rescind the \$40,000,000 appropriated for prohibition enforcement and give the money to help our suffering farmers. Furthermore, the money could be well used in giving increased pensions to the veterans of the Civil War, who need the money badly, and give greater compensation to the World War veterans, together with better hospitalization, and in a thousand other ways that would be beneficial to the people of our country and not expended in the pursuit of a fetish that everybody should be sober. No matter what happens to him, so long as he is sober all is well. He may need food, he may need coal, and the Lord knows he did not have much coal last winter, but that does not make any difference. We do not care what he needs, whether he needs food or coal, so long as he is sober. By all means have him sober. That is the one and only test and criterion of the American Congress.

I think it is time that we got away from this sort of thing. We are all big enough to realize the important problems confronting us and to act upon them. Let us do something constructive, something substantial. I am sure the people of our country will then appreciate our efforts in their behalf, and I trust you gentlemen will vote with me for this amendment. [Applause.]

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLACK of Texas) there were—ayes 11, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, SITES, AND CONSTRUCTION

Under section 3 of the act approved May 25, 1926, Athens, Tenn., post office, etc.: Toward the construction of a suitable building for the accommodation of the post office and other Government offices, \$15,000; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to enter into contracts for the entire estimated cost of such building for not to exceed \$90,000.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of getting some information from the chairman of the committee. The chairman realizes that since the public building bill was passed appropriating \$100,000,000 for the construction of various post offices throughout the United States there has been a general interest all over the country, especially where the sites were bought under the act of 1912. Have the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General adopted any policy as to the expenditure of the \$100,000,000 for the various post-office buildings?

Mr. MADDEN. We are giving them the money in this bill to make a complete survey of the country so that they may be able to ascertain just what the needs are in every location, including the cities where sites have been purchased, and they will be required to make a complete detailed statement of the country's needs by locations at the next meeting of the Congress.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The reason I ask this is that I happen to have a site, not only in my district, but in my home city, Madisonville, Ky., a city of 10,000, bought in 1916, under the act of 1912. It is a growing city, and the site is worth two and a half times the money that the Government paid for it. In that post office there are six or seven rural route mail carriers, six city carriers, and six or eight employees. It is a second-class post office. Could the gentleman give any idea whether a post office of that class will eventually be included in the \$100,000,000 appropriation?

Mr. MADDEN. They will be. Provision is made that not to exceed \$5,000,000 may be expended in any one State, in any one year, and that each State shall be given certain preferential consideration each year according to its urgencies, and it will not make so much difference about the size of the place as it will about the urgency of the case.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Well, will that survey be made in the next year?

Mr. MADDEN. This bill carries the money and it becomes immediately available, and the survey will begin at once.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The reason I ask is that my home city, Madisonville—

Mr. MADDEN. It will cover the whole country.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Is the largest town in Kentucky to-day, so far as I know, that has not a public building, and I was wondering if it would be taken care of.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it will be, sir.

The Clerk read as follows:

Decatur, Ala., post office: For reimbursement to those, or their legal representatives, who contributed toward the cost of constructing the post office of two stories, as first planned, instead of as originally contracted for, in accordance with the authority contained in the act approved May 4, 1926, fiscal year 1926, \$5,656.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, recently we passed the public building bill authorizing the appropriation of \$165,000,000, \$50,000,000 of which was to go to the District of Columbia. I am not complaining, because I believe the Capital of this country should have the finest buildings in the world. I simply want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that in the fourth congressional district of Florida there are now 16 cities that are entitled to and should have and must have public buildings which are not now taken care of. I hope at the next session of the Congress, because of the wonderful growth and the wonderful influx of people from the North, East, and West into that great State, they will appreciate the congested conditions down there. The Post Office Department has cooperated with me, and I have endeavored to cooperate with them, but unless we get buildings we can not give the service.

At Key West, Fla., ever since 1915 we have had the site for a building but no appropriation. At my own home town of Kissimmee we have owned a site ever since 1913, and we only have a small inadequate rented building. Certainly something should be done to give those people the relief to which they are entitled. About two years ago I called the attention of the Post Office Department to the fact that Miami, by an expenditure of \$20,000—now authorized by law, I believe; and if I am wrong, I hope the chairman of this committee will correct me—could complete the open temporary construction there now, and I tried to get them to do so, and thereby double the size of the addition at the Miami post-office building. They practically told me that would be done, but recently I have been down at Miami, and nothing has been done. The mail sacks are out in the open, where the rains can beat in on the mail, and the employees have to work out in the rain, and I sincerely hope that the Post Office Department will see that the \$20,000 now authorized will be spent at Miami and also that like sums at Orlando, Fla., and other cities will be made and give the citizens at least some relief until an adequate public buildings bill can be passed. At West Palm Beach, Fla., we are paying something over \$11,000 a year rent now, as I understand it, for a post-office building. Certainly the Government, when it can borrow money at 3 per cent, can save money by making an appropriation sufficient to build a building at West Palm Beach and also at other cities where post-office buildings are absolutely necessary.

My colleagues will remember some years ago we passed in the House a public buildings and grounds bill, but that bill died in the Senate. In that bill there was an appropriation of \$61,000 to buy a site at West Palm Beach, Fla. Under the guise of economy, and because of a filibuster, the bill was defeated. It will now cost \$75,000 or \$100,000 to buy a site at West Palm Beach, Fla. You therefore see how much the taxpayers lost at the above city because of the failure to pass said bill. The above also applies to Kissimmee and other cities in the fourth congressional district of Florida. There is no district in the country where the mail is more congested, where there is more confusion, where the department has been subject to more trouble and expense than the fourth congressional district of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am having returned to me mail, answers to letters I have received, and I imagine those good people down there imagine I am not attending to my duties because they do not get a reply. It is not the fault of the employees, but it is the fault of new clerks being sent in there, and because of inadequate buildings and crowded and congested conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL

Administrative expenses, World War adjusted compensation act: The unexpended balance on June 30, 1926, of the appropriation of \$3,600,000, administrative expenses, World War adjusted compensation act, 1924 and 1925, is continued and made available until June 30, 1927.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 79, line 15, after the year "1927," insert "and shall also be available to cover obligations incurred for such administrative expenses during the period from July 1, 1926, to the date of the approval of this act, inclusive."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Incidental expenses of the Army: Not to exceed \$15,000 of the appropriation for incidental expenses of the Army, contained in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1927, shall be available for transfer to the Bureau of Standards for tests and experimental development work and scientific research required by the Quartermaster Corps of the Army.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 81, after line 9, insert as a new paragraph the following: "Army transportation: Not to exceed \$225,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation, 'Army transportation, 1926,' is continued and made available during the fiscal year 1927 for the purchase or construction of a ferryboat."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, that is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. No; it is not subject to a point of order. They have two ferryboats down at Governors Island carrying their people across and carrying the freight across from one side to the other. One of these ferryboats has been in the service for a great many years and is obsolete. The other one never was just what it ought to be, and under the requirements of the law this boat has to be out of commission three or four days every month for examination of its boilers and washing the boilers and having other things done that are necessary. You have got to have a substitute boat to take its place. We carry 66,000 people a month across the ferry from Governors Island, people who have business there, and also more than 4,000 tons of freight, if I recall, and all that; and to have the place without the necessary facilities is to say that you can not transact any business.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. We made them save this money out of other things in order to give it to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Roads, walks, wharves, and drainage: For the improvement and repair of roads upon the Fort Canby Military Reservation, Wash., fiscal year 1927, \$4,984.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 81, after line 19, insert as a new paragraph the following: "For carrying into effect the act entitled 'An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to McLennan County, in the State of Texas, the sum of \$9,403.42 compensation for the appropriation and destruction of an improved public road passing through the military camp at Waco, Tex., in said county, by the Government of the United States on June 9, 1926, fiscal year 1926, \$9,403.42.'"

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Memorial to Virginia Dare: For the erection of a tablet or marker at Sir Walter Raleigh Fort on Roanoke Island, N. C., to Virginia Dare, as authorized by the act approved May 29, 1926, fiscal year 1927, \$1,500.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island: Page 81, after line 24, add a paragraph to read as follows:

"Memorial to Roger Williams: For the erection of a tablet or marker at or near the spot in the present city of Providence where Roger Williams first landed in the State of Rhode Island, \$1,500."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Memorials for Revolutionary battle field at White Plains, N. Y.: For the erection and maintenance of tablets or markers upon the battle field of White Plains, N. Y., to indicate the position of the Revolutionary Army under command of General Washington, as authorized by the act entitled "An act for the erection of tablets or markers upon the Revolutionary battle field of White Plains, State of New York," approved May 18, 1926, fiscal year 1927, \$2,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is quite appropriate that this appropriation should be made for this tablet, but I hope the committee will ask the War Department to have their officials in New York learn the history of the Battle of White Plains and the dates, so that when a real estate company wants to pull off a publicity stunt they will not turn out a regiment of infantry, tanks, aviation, and artillery in order to stage the Battle of White Plains and at the same time advertise the sale of lots at so much per square foot.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I very much sympathize with what the gentleman is saying.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman knows that took place.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I know what took place, but that was not, as was reported, a repetition of the Battle of White Plains but it was another engagement which occurred farther down the road.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the dates were wrong and the location was wrong and everything else was all right.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. But it had no relation whatever to the Battle of White Plains itself.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But it would not be a bad thing to inform the War Department that we do not expect them to turn out a regiment and stage a demonstration as a publicity stunt for real estate companies. I am sure the gentleman agrees with me about that.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The War Department certainly should not be criticized for the occurrence.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But they turned out the troops for it, and they admitted they were wrong.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The War Department, possibly, was imposed upon, but I do not think it at all fair to say that the War Department lent itself to any such scheme.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But they actually did.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. As I happen to know, no people were more indignant than were the officials of the War Department when they found out what had been done.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Nevertheless it took place, and it made the Army the laughing stock of the country. Such things should not be done by the War Department.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Scott Field, Ill.: For completing the acquisition of a right of way under the authority contained in the act approved February 28, 1920, fiscal year 1926, \$452.50.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. FRENCH: On page 83, after line 15, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Harrisburg Real Estate Co.: For payment to the Harrisburg Real Estate Co., Harrisburg, Pa., in accordance with the act entitled 'An act for the relief of the Harrisburg Real Estate Co., of Harrisburg, Pa.' approved June 18, 1926, fiscal year 1926, \$32,270.90."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

VICKSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

For resurfacing and paving in accordance with plans and specifications to be approved by the Secretary of War, of the approach road, now owned by the United States, extending from the northern limits of the city of Vicksburg, Miss., at Washington Street, north to the entrance of the Vicksburg National Cemetery, fiscal year 1927, \$50,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended until the State of Mississippi or the county of Warren, of said State, has obligated itself in writing to the satisfaction of the Secretary of War that it will accept title to and maintain said road under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. p. 1104), immediately upon the completion of such improvements as may be made under this appropriation.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: On page 85, after line 17, insert:

"Moore's Creek National Military Park: For every expenditure requisite for and incidental to the examination, survey, marking boundary and battle lines, and preparation of plans for the improvement of Moore's Creek National Military Park, N. C., as authorized by the act approved June 2, 1926, fiscal year 1927, \$1,500: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended until title to the lands to be embraced in such park has been vested in the United States."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee I accept the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAWLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13040) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1926, and June 30, 1927, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put the amendments en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill (H. R. 13040) to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to amend the bill in the manner indicated in the amendment and to report the same forthwith.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TYDINGS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

"Page 59, line 7, strike out all of line 7 and all the paragraph following down to and including the period on line 23."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TYDINGS) there were—ayes 7, noes 68.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote because it does not disclose a quorum present, and I ask that the roll be called.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 31, noes 246, answered "present" 1, not voting 152, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—31

Auf der Heide	Dickstein	Griffin	Lampert
Black, N. Y.	Esterly	Hill, Md.	Lindsay
Boylan	Gallivan	Irwin	Linthicum
Carew	Gambrill	Kindred	MacGregor
Cullen	Gorman	LaGuardia	Mead

Mooney
Norton
Quayle

Schafer
Schneider
Sosnowski

Stephens
Tinkham
Tydings

Voigt
Weller

NAYS—246

Abernethy
Ackerman
Adkins
Allen
Almon
Andresen
Andrew
Anthony
Arentz
Arnold
Aswell
Ayres
Bachmann
Bacon
Bailey
Barbour
Barkley
Begg
Bell
Black, Tex.
Bland
Bowman
Box
Brand, Ga.
Brand, Ohio
Briggs
Brigham
Browning
Bulwinkle
Burdick
Burtness
Burton
Busby
Byrns
Campbell
Cannon
Carpenter
Carss
Chalmers
Chapman
Christopherson
Clague
Cole
Collier
Collins
Colton
Connally, Tex.
Crosser
Crowther
Crumpacker
Curry
Darrow
Davey
Davis
Dempsy
Denison
Dickinson, Iowa
Dickinson, Mo.
Dominick
Doughton
Dowell
Drewry

Driver
Eaton
Edwards
Elliott
Ellis
Eslick
Evans
Fairchild
Faust
Fenn
Fish
Fletcher
Fort
Foss
Frear
French
Fulmer
Furlow
Garber
Gardner, Ind.
Garrett, Tenn.
Gasque
Gibson
Gilbert
Glynn
Golder
Goldsbrough
Goodwin
Graham
Green, Fla.
Green, Iowa
Griest
Hadley
Hale
Hall, Ind.
Hall, N. Dak.
Hammer
Hardy
Hare
Hastings
Haugen
Hawes
Hawley
Hayden
Hersey
Hickey
Hill, Ala.
Hill, Wash.
Hoch
Hogg
Holaday
Hooper
Houston
Howard
Huddleston
Hudson
Hull, Tenn.
James
Jenkins
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, Tex.
Kearns

Kelly
Kerr
Kincheloe
King
Kopp
Kurtz
Lankford
Lazaro
Leatherwood
Leavitt
Little
Lowrey
Lozier
Lyon
McClintie
McDuffie
McFadden
McLaughlin, Mich.
McLaughlin, Nebr.
McMillan
McReynolds
McSwain
McSweeney
Madden
Magee, N. Y.
Magrady
Major
Manlove
Mansfield
Mapes
Martin, Mass.
Menges
Michener
Miller
Milligan
Montague
Montgomery
Moore, Ky.
Moore, Ohio
Morehead
Morgan
Nelson, Mo.
O'Connor, La.
Oldfield
Oliver, Ala.
Parker
Parks
Peery
Porter
Pratt
Quin
Ragon
Ramseyer
Rankin
Rathbone
Reed, Ark.
Reed, N. Y.
Robinson, Iowa
Rogers
Romjue
Rowbottom
Rubey

Sanders, N. Y.
Sanders, Tex.
Sandlin
Scott
Sears, Fla.
Sears, Nebr.
Simmons
Sinnott
Smith
Snell
Speaks
Spearing
Stedman
Strong, Kans.
Strong, Pa.
Strother
Summers, Wash.
Summers, Tex.
Swank
Taber
Taylor, Colo.
Taylor, N. J.
Taylor, Tenn.
Taylor, W. Va.
Thatcher
Thomas
Thompson
Thurston
Tilson
Timberlake
Tincher
Tolley
Tucker
Underwood
Updike
Valle
Vestal
Vinson, Ga.
Vinson, Ky.
Wainwright
Warren
Wason
Watres
Watson
Weaver
Wheeler
White, Kans.
White, Me.
Whittington
Williams, Ill.
Wilson, La.
Wilson, Miss.
Wingo
Winter
Wolverton
Wood
Woodrum
Wright
Wyant
Yates

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Murphy

NOT VOTING—152

Aldrich
Allgood
Appleby
Bacharach
Bankhead
Beck
Beedy
Beers
Berger
Bixler
Blanton
Bloom
Boies
Bowles
Bowling
Britten
Brown
Brumm
Buchanan
Butler
Canfield
Carter, Calif.
Carter, Okla.
Celler
Chindblom
Cleary
Connery
Connolly, Pa.
Cooper, Ohio
Cooper, Wis.
Corning
Cox
Coyle
Cramton
Crisp
Davenport
Deal
Douglass

Doyle
Drane
Dyer
Fisher
Fitzgerald, Roy G.
Fitzgerald, W. T.
Fredericks
Free
Freeman
Frothingham
Funk
Garner, Tex.
Garrett, Tex.
Gifford
Greenwood.
Harrison
Hudspeth
Hull, Morton D.
Hull, William E.
Jacobstein
Jeffers
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ky.
Johnson, S. Dak.
Johnson, Wash.
Jones
Kahn
Keller
Kemp
Kendall
Ketcham
Kiefner
Kies
Kirk
Knutson
Kunz
Kvale
Lanham

Larsen
Lea, Calif.
Lee, Ga.
Lehbach
Letts
Lineberger
Luca
McKeown
McLeod
Magee, Pa.
Martin, La.
Merritt
Michaelson
Mills
Moore, Va.
Morin
Morrow
Nelson, Me.
Nelson, Wis.
Newton, Minn.
Newton, Mo.
O'Connell, N. Y.
O'Connell, R. I.
O'Connell, N. Y.
Oliver, N. Y.
Patterson
Peavey
Perkins
Perlman
Phillips
Pou
Prall
Purnell
Rainey
Ransley
Rayburn
Reece
Reid, Ill.

Robison, Ky.
Rouse
Rutherford
Sabath
Seger
Shallenberger
Shreve
Sinclair
Smithwick
Somers, N. Y.
Sproul, Ill.
Sproul, Kans.
Stalker
Stagall
Stevenson
Stobbs
Sullivan
Swartz
Sweet
Swing
Swoope
Temple
Tillman
Treadway
Underhill
Upshaw
Vare
Vincent, Mich.
Walters
Wefald
Welsh
Whitehead
Williams, Tex.
Williamson
Woodruff
Woodyard
Wurzbach
Zihlman

So the motion to recommit was rejected.
The following pairs were announced:
On the vote:

Mr. Dyer (for) with Mr. Canfield (against).
Mr. Sullivan (for) with Mr. Cramton (against).
Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Tillman (against).
Mr. O'Connell of New York (for) with Mr. W. T. Fitzgerald (against).
Mr. Mills (for) with Mr. McKeown (against).
Mr. O'Connor of New York (for) with Mr. Murphy (against).
Mr. Connery (for) with Mr. Stalker (against).
Mr. Celler (for) with Mr. Shreve (against).
Mr. Doyle (for) with Mr. Perkins (against).
Mr. Cleary (for) with Mr. Rutherford (against).
Mr. Sabath (for) with Mr. Larsen (against).
Mr. Corning (for) with Mr. Butler (against).
Mr. Kunz (for) with Mr. Patterson (against).
Mr. Morin (for) with Mr. Hudspeth (against).
Mr. Oliver of New York (for) with Mr. Reid of Illinois (against).
Mr. Vare (for) with Mr. Crisp (against).
Mr. Bloom (for) with Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin (against).
Mr. Perlman (for) with Mr. Upshaw (against).
Mr. Douglass (for) with Mr. Lee of Georgia (against).
Mr. Ransley (for) with Mr. Blanton (against).
Mr. Newton of Missouri (for) with Mr. Carter of Oklahoma (against).
Mr. Prall (for) with Mr. Brown (against).
Mr. Somers of New York (for) with Mr. Wefald (against).

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. McLeod with Mr. Johnson of Kentucky.
Mr. Kiess with Mr. Bankhead.
Mr. Beers with Mr. Martin of Louisiana.
Mr. Aldrich with Mr. Cox.
Mr. Johnson of Illinois with Mr. O'Connell of Rhode Island.
Mr. Britten with Mr. Drane.
Mr. Kendall with Mr. Pou.
Mr. Johnson of Washington with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Kiefner with Mr. Rayburn.
Mr. Lehlbach with Mr. Morrow.
Mr. Free with Mr. Garner of Texas.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Bowling.
Mr. Luce with Mr. Jacobstein.
Mr. Freeman with Mr. Allgood.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Purnell with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Reece with Mr. Kemp.
Mr. Sweet with Mr. Lanham.
Mr. Treadway with Mr. Moore of Virginia.
Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. Rainey.
Mr. Carter of California with Mr. Garrett of Texas.
Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Rouse.
Mr. Chindblom with Mr. Greenwood.
Mr. Cooper of Ohio with Mr. Deal.
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Jeffers.
Mr. Ketcham with Mr. Shallenberger.
Mr. Frothingham with Mr. Whitehead.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. Smithwick.
Mr. Magee of Pennsylvania with Mr. Williams of Texas.
Mr. Zihlman with Mr. Steagall.
Mr. Sinclair with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Stobbs with Mr. Berger.
Mr. Swing with Mr. Kvale.
Mr. Underhill with Mr. Beck.
Mr. Temple with Mr. Peavey.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I voted no, but I have a general pair with Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.
The question was taken, and the bill was passed.
On motion of Mr. MADDEN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AIRCRAFT

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.
The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 309

Resolved, That notwithstanding previous action of the House relative to the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H. R. 10827, immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall consider said conference report without the intervention of points of order against the same.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, if adopted by the House, simply provides that the conference report on the bill H. R. 10827, commonly referred to as the aircraft bill, will be in order for consideration at this time.

Since the passage of the original bill, H. R. 10827, there were two bills reported out by the Naval Committee and the Military Affairs Committee that were exactly the same and related to the program of aircraft by the Army and the Navy Departments. The bills were unanimously reported and, as far as I know, unanimously approved by all experts in the Navy Department as well as by a majority of the Members in the House. The Rules Committee had granted a special rule for

the consideration of these bills, but before we had time to take them up the Senate passed the original aircraft bill, and they made so many amendments to it that it was thought by members of the committee that those amendments were broad enough to cover everything in the other two bills.

But, as a matter of fact, they did not cover the bill that came from the Naval Committee. They tried to take care of the Navy program in the same way they took care of the Army program by bringing it in in the conference report, which was rightfully ruled out of order.

As far as I know, there is no opposition to either one of these bills on the part of the great majority of the membership of the House, and they have the approval of the executive department. I trust that the rule will be adopted and the conference report considered at this time.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10827) to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes. The statement has been read once, and I ask that the reading be omitted.

Mr. SCHAFER. I object.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10827) to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 13, and 27.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 9, 10, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the Chief of the Air Corps, at least two brigadier generals, and at least 90 per cent of the officers in each grade below that of brigadier general shall be flying officers: *Provided further*, That in time of war 10 per cent of the total number of officers that may be authorized for the Air Corps for such war may be immediately commissioned as nonflying officers: *Provided further*, That as soon as a sufficient number can be trained, at least 90 per cent of the total number of officers authorized for the Air Corps for such war"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "*Provided further*, That any officer who is specifically recommended by the Secretary of War because of special qualifications other than as a flyer may be detailed to the Air Corps for a period longer than one year, or may be permanently commissioned in the Air Corps, but such officers, together with those flying officers who shall have become disqualified for flying, shall not be included among the 90 per cent of flying officers"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That all officers of the Air Corps now holding any rating as a pilot shall be considered as flying officers within the meaning of this act: *Provided further*, That hereafter in order to receive a rating as a pilot in time of peace an officer or an enlisted man must fly in heavier-than-air craft at least 200 hours while acting as a pilot, 75 of which must be alone, and must successfully complete the course prescribed by competent authority: *And provided further*, That in time of war a flying officer may include any officer who has received an aeronautical rating as a pilot of service types of aircraft and also"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "any officer"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Enlisted men of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades in the Air Corps who have demonstrated their fitness and shown that they possess the necessary technical qualifications therefor and are engaged upon the duties pertaining thereto may be rated as air mechanics, first class, or air mechanics, second class, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe. Each enlisted man while holding the rating of air mechanic, first class, and performing the duties as such shall receive the pay of the second grade, and each enlisted man while holding the rating of air mechanic, second class, and performing the duties as such shall receive the pay of the third grade: *Provided*, That such number as the Secretary of War may determine as necessary, not to exceed 14 per cent of the total authorized enlisted strength of the Air Corps, shall be rated as air mechanics, first class, or air mechanics, second class."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the amendment of the Senate insert the following: "the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to assign, under such regulations as he may prescribe, officers of the Air Corps to flying commands, including wings, groups, squadrons, flights, schools, important air stations, and to the staffs of commanders of troops, which assignment shall carry with it temporary rank, including pay and allowances appropriate to such rank, as determined by the Secretary of War, for the period of such assignment"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 5. Air sections of the General Staff. That section 5 of the act entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916, as amended, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding the following paragraph at the end thereof:

"That for the period of three years immediately following July 1, 1926, there is hereby created in each of the divisions of the War Department General Staff an air section to be headed by an officer of the Air Corps, the duties of which shall be to consider and recommend proper action on such air matters as may be referred to such division."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the amendment of the Senate insert the following: "That during the period of seven years immediately following July 1, 1926, any appointment as Chief of the Air Corps shall be made from among officers of any grade of not less than 15 years' commissioned service, and from those who have demonstrated by actual and extended service in such corps that they are qualified for such appointment; and as assistants from among officers of not less than 15 years' commissioned service of similar qualifications"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the numeral proposed by the amendment of the Senate insert the following: "8"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the amendment of the Senate insert the following: ", and the number of enlisted men now authorized by law for the Regular Army is hereby authorized to be increased by 6,240: *Provided*, That the increase in the number of officers and enlisted men herein authorized shall be allotted as hereinafter provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the amendment of the Senate insert

the following: "Is hereby authorized to be increased by 6,240 enlisted men"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the amendment of the Senate insert the following:

"The President is hereby authorized to submit to Congress annually estimates of the cost of carrying out the five-year program authorized herein: *Provided*, That a supplemental estimate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, may be submitted to cover the cost of the first annual increment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the amendment of the Senate insert the following:

"SEC. 9. That section 5a of the national defense act, as amended, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding at the end of said section 5a the following:

"To aid the Secretary of War in fostering military aeronautics, and to perform such functions as the Secretary may direct, there shall be an additional Assistant Secretary of War who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and whose compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the classification act of 1923."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the amendment of the Senate insert the following:

"SEC. 10. (a) That in order to encourage the development of aviation and improve the efficiency of the Army and Navy aeronautical matériel the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, prior to the procurement of new designs of aircraft or aircraft parts or aeronautical accessories, shall, by advertisement for a period of 30 days in at least three of the leading aeronautical journals and in such other manner as he may deem advisable, invite the submission in competition, by sealed communications, of such designs of aircraft, aircraft parts, and aeronautical accessories, together with a statement of the price for which such designs in whole or in part will be sold to the Government.

"(b) The aforesaid advertisement shall specify a sufficient time, not less than 60 days from the expiration of the advertising period, within which all such communications containing designs and prices therefor must be submitted, and all such communications received shall be carefully kept sealed in the War Department or the Navy Department, as the case may be, until the expiration of said specified time, and no designs mailed after that time shall be received or considered. Said advertisement shall state in general terms the kind of aircraft, parts, or accessories to be developed and the approximate number or quantity required, and the department concerned shall furnish to each applicant identical specific detailed information as to the conditions and requirements of the competition and as to the various features and characteristics to be developed, listing specifically the respective measures of merit, expressed in rates per cent, that shall be applied in determining the merits of the designs, and said measures of merit shall be adhered to throughout such competition. All designs received up to the time specified for submitting them shall then be referred to a board appointed for that purpose by the Secretary of the department concerned and shall be appraised by it as soon as practicable and report made to the Secretary as to the winner or winners of such competition. When said Secretary shall have approved the report of said board, he shall then fix a time and place for a public announcement of the results and notify each competitor thereof; but if said report shall be disapproved by said Secretary, the papers shall be returned to the board for revision or the competition be decided by the Secretary, in his discretion, and in any case the decision of the Secretary shall be final and conclusive. Such announcement shall include the percentages awarded to each of the several features or characteristics of the designs submitted by each competitor and the prices named by the competitors for their designs and the several features thereof if separable.

"(c) Thereupon the said Secretary is authorized to contract with the winner or winners in such competition on such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the Government for furnishing or constructing all of each of the items, or all of any one or more of the several items of the aircraft, or parts, or accessories indicated in the advertisement, as the

said Secretary shall find that in his judgment a winner is, or can within a reasonable time become, able and equipped to furnish or construct satisfactorily all or part, provided said Secretary and the winner shall be able to agree on a reasonable price. If the Secretary shall decide that a winner can not reasonably carry out and perform a contract for all or part of such aircraft parts, or accessories, as above provided, then he is authorized to purchase the winning designs or any separable parts thereof if a fair and reasonable price can be agreed on with the winner, but not in excess of the price submitted with the designs.

"(d) After contract is made, as authorized by any provision of this section, with a winner in such design competition for furnishing or constructing aircraft, aircraft parts, or aeronautical accessories in accordance with his designs and payment is completed under said contract, and after the purchase of and payment for the designs or separable parts thereof of a winner, as authorized herein, with whom a contract shall not have been made for furnishing or constructing aircraft, aircraft parts or aeronautical accessories in accordance with his designs, then in either case any department of the Government shall have the right without further compensation to the winner to construct or have constructed according to said designs and use any number of aircraft or parts or accessories, and sell said aircraft or parts or accessories according to law as condemned material: *Provided*, That such winner shall, nevertheless, be at liberty to apply for a patent on any features originated by him, and shall be entitled to enjoy the exclusive rights under such patent as he may obtain as against all other persons except the United States Government or its assignee as aforesaid.

"(e) The competitors in design competition mentioned in this section shall submit with their designs a graduated scale of prices for which they are willing to construct any or all or each of the aircraft, aircraft parts, and aeronautical accessories for which designs are submitted and such stated prices shall not be exceeded in the awarding of contracts contemplated by this section.

"(f) If the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall find that in his judgment none of the designs submitted in said competition is of sufficient merit to justify the procurement of aircraft, aircraft parts, or aeronautical accessories in accordance therewith, then he shall not be obligated to accept any of such designs or to make any payment on account of any of them. If the Secretary of the department concerned shall decide that the designs submitted by two or more competitors possess equal merit, or that certain features embodied in the designs of any competitor are superior to corresponding features embodied in the designs of any other competitor and such features of one design may be substituted in another design, the said Secretary shall in his discretion divide the contracts for furnishing and manufacturing the aircraft, parts, or accessories required, equitably among those competitors that have submitted designs of equal merit, or he may select and combine features of superior excellence in different designs in such manner as may in his judgment best serve the Government's interests and make payment accordingly to the several competitors concerned at fair and reasonable prices, awarding the contract for furnishing or constructing the aircraft, parts, or accessories to the competitor or competitors concerned that have the highest figures of merit in said competition.

"(g) In case the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall be unable to make contract as above authorized with a winner in said competition for furnishing or constructing aircraft, aircraft parts, or aeronautical accessories covered by the whole or part of the designs of such winner, or shall be unable to agree with a winner in the competition on a reasonable purchase price for the design of such winner with whom a contract may not be made, as aforesaid, he may retain such designs and shall advertise according to law for proposals for furnishing or constructing aircraft, or parts or accessories, in accordance with such designs or combinations thereof as aforesaid and, after all proposals are submitted, make contract on such terms and conditions as he may consider the best in the Government's interests, with the bidder that he shall find to be the lowest responsible bidder for furnishing or constructing the aircraft, parts, or accessories required, but the said Secretary shall have the right to reject all bids and to advertise for other bids with such other and different specifications as he may deem proper.

"(h) If within 10 days after the announcement of the results of said competition, any participant in the competition shall make to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy a reasonable showing in writing that error was made in determining the merits of designs submitted whereby such

claimant was unjustly deprived of an award, the matter shall at once be referred by the Secretary of the department concerned to a board of arbitration for determination and the finding of such board shall, with the approval of the said Secretary, be conclusive on both parties. Such board of arbitration shall be composed of three skilled aeronautical engineers, one selected by the said Secretary, one by the claimant, and the third by those two, no one of whom shall have been a member of the board of appraisal in that competition.

"(i) Any person, firm, or corporation that shall complain that his, their, or its designs hereafter developed relating to aircraft or any components thereof are used or manufactured by or for any department of the Government without just compensation from either the Government or any other source, may within four years from the date of such use file suit in the Court of Claims for the recovery of his reasonable and entire compensation for such use and manufacture after the date of this act.

"(j) Only citizens of the United States, and corporations of which not less than three-fourths of the capital stock is owned by citizens of the United States, and of which the members of the boards of directors are citizens of the United States, and having manufacturing plants located within the continental limits of the United States shall be eligible to be awarded any contract under this section to furnish or construct aircraft, aircraft parts, or aeronautical accessories for the United States Government, except that a domestic corporation whose stock shall be listed on a stock exchange shall not be barred by the provisions of this section unless and until foreign ownership or control of a majority of its stock shall be known to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, and no aliens employed by a contractor for furnishing or constructing aircraft, or aircraft parts, or aeronautical accessories for the United States shall be permitted to have access to the plans or specifications or the work under construction or to participate in the contract trials without the written consent beforehand of the Secretary of the department concerned.

"(k) The Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy may at his discretion purchase abroad or in the United States with or without competition, by contract, or otherwise, such designs, aircraft, aircraft parts, or aeronautical accessories as may be necessary in his judgment for experimental purposes in the development of aircraft or aircraft parts or aeronautical accessories of the best kind for the Army or the Navy, as the case may be, and if as a result of such procurement, new and suitable designs considered to be the best kind for the Army or the Navy are developed, he may enter into contract, subject to the requirements of paragraph (j) of this section, for the procurement in quantity of such aircraft, aircraft parts, or aeronautical accessories without regard to the provisions of paragraphs (a) to (e), inclusive, hereof.

"(l) The manufacturing plant, and books, of any contractor for furnishing or constructing aircraft, aircraft parts, or aeronautical accessories, for the War Department or the Navy Department, or such part of any manufacturing plant as may be so engaged, shall at all times be subject to inspection and audit by any person designated by the head of any executive department of the Government.

"(m) All audits and reports of inspection, made under the provisions of this section, shall be preserved by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, for a period of 10 years, and shall be subject to inspection by any committee of Congress, and the said Secretaries shall annually make a detailed and itemized report to Congress of all of the departments' operations under this section, the names and addresses of all competitors, and of all persons having been awarded contracts and the prices paid for aircraft purchased and the grounds and reasons for having awarded such contracts to the particular persons, firms, or corporations, and all such reports shall be printed and held subject to public distribution.

"(n) Every vendor of designs to the War Department or the Navy Department under the provisions of this section, and every contractor for furnishing or constructing for the War Department or the Navy Department, or both, aircraft or aircraft parts or aeronautical accessories, shall deliver to the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy, or both, when required by either or both, a release in such form and containing such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or both, of claims on the part of such vendor or contractor against the United States arising out of such sale or contract, or both.

"(o) All or any appropriations available for the procurement of aircraft, aircraft parts, or aeronautical accessories,

for the War Department or the Navy Department shall also be available for payment of the purchase price of designs and the costs of arbitration as authorized by this section.

"(p) Any collusion, understanding, or arrangement to deprive the United States Government of the benefit of full and free competition in any competition authorized by this section, or to deprive the United States Government of the benefit of a full and free audit of the books of any person, firm, or corporation engaged in carrying out any contract authorized by this section, so far as may be necessary to disclose the exact cost of executing such contract, shall be unlawful, and any person, firm, or corporation that shall, upon indictment and trial, be found guilty of violating any of the provisions of this section shall be sentenced to pay a fine of not exceeding \$20,000, or to be imprisoned not exceeding five years, or both, at the discretion of the court.

"(q) In the procurement of aircraft constructed according to designs presented by any individual, firm, or corporation prior to the passage of this act, which designs have been reduced to practice and found to be suitable for the purpose intended, or according to such designs with minor modifications thereof, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, when in his opinion the interests of the United States will be best served thereby, may contract with said individual, firm, or corporation, at reasonable prices for such quantities of said aircraft, aircraft parts, or aeronautical accessories as he may deem necessary: *Provided*, That the action of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy in each such case shall be final and conclusive.

"(r) A board to be known as the patents and design board is hereby created, the three members of which shall be an Assistant Secretary of War, an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and an Assistant Secretary of Commerce. To this board any individual, firm, or corporation may submit a design for aircraft, aircraft parts, or aeronautical accessories, and whether patented or unpatentable, the said board upon the recommendation of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics shall determine whether the use of such designs by the Government is desirable or necessary, and evaluate the designs so submitted and fix the worth to the United States of said design, not to exceed \$75,000. The said designer, individual, firm, or corporation, may then be offered the sum fixed by the board for the ownership or a nonexclusive right of the United States to the use of the design in aircraft, aircraft parts, or aeronautical accessories and upon the acceptance thereof shall execute complete assignment or nonexclusive license to the United States: *Provided*, That no sum in excess of \$75,000 shall be paid for any one design.

"(s) The terms 'winner' or 'winners' as used in this section shall be construed to include not more than three competitors having the highest figures of merit in any one competition.

"(t) Hereafter whenever the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, shall enter into a contract for or on behalf of the United States, for aircraft, aircraft parts, or aeronautical accessories, said Secretary is hereby authorized to award such contract to the bidder that said Secretary shall find to be the lowest responsible bidder that can satisfactorily perform the work or the service required to the best advantage of the Government; and the decision of the Secretary of the department concerned as to the award of such contract, the interpretation of the provisions of the contract, and the application and administration of the contract shall not be reviewable, otherwise than as may be therein provided for, by any officer or tribunal of the United States except the President and the Federal courts."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the amendment of the Senate insert the following:

"SEC. 11. Under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe the President is hereby authorized to present, but not in the name of Congress, a medal to be known as the soldier's medal, of appropriate design, with accompanying ribbon, to any person who, while serving in any capacity with the Army of the United States, including the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, shall hereafter distinguish himself, or herself, by heroism not involving actual conflict with an enemy.

"No more than one soldier's medal shall be issued to any one person; but for each succeeding deed or act sufficient to justify the award of the soldier's medal the President may award a suitable bar, or other suitable device, to be worn as he shall direct."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the amendment of the Senate insert the following:

"SEC. 12. Under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 14 of this act, the President is hereby authorized to present, but not in the name of Congress, a distinguished flying cross of appropriate design, with accompanying ribbon, to any person who, while serving in any capacity with the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, including the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, or with the United States Navy, since the 6th day of April, 1917, has distinguished, or who, after the approval of this act, distinguishes himself by heroism or extraordinary achievement while participating in an aerial flight: *Provided*, That no person shall be eligible for the award of the distinguished flying cross for any act performed prior to November 11, 1918, except officers or enlisted men who have heretofore been recommended for but have not received the congressional medal of honor, the distinguished service cross, or the distinguished service medal and except those officers or enlisted men who displayed heroism while serving as instructors or students at flying schools. No more than one distinguished flying cross shall be issued to any one person, but for each succeeding act or achievement sufficient to justify the award of a distinguished flying cross the President may award a suitable bar or other suitable device to be worn as he shall direct. In case an individual who distinguishes himself shall have died before the making of the award to which he may be entitled, the award may nevertheless be made and the cross or the bar or other device presented to such representative of the deceased as the President may designate, but no cross, bar, or other device hereinbefore authorized shall be awarded or presented to any individual whose entire service subsequent to the time he distinguishes himself has not been honorable."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed by the amendment of the Senate insert the following:

"SEC. 13. Each enlisted or enrolled man to whom there shall be awarded the distinguished flying cross or the soldier's medal shall be entitled to additional pay at the rate of \$2 per month from the date of the act of heroism or extraordinary achievement on which the award is based, and each bar, or other suitable device, in lieu of the distinguished flying cross or the soldier's medal, as hereinbefore provided for, shall entitle him to further additional pay at the rate of \$2 per month from the date of the act of heroism or extraordinary achievement for which the bar or other device is awarded, and said additional pay shall continue throughout his active service, whether such service shall or shall not be continuous."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the numeral proposed by the amendment of the Senate insert the following: "14"; and the Senate agree to the same.

W. FRANK JAMES,
JOHN PHILIP HILL,
HARRY M. WURZBACH,
PERCY E. QUIN,
JOHN J. McSWAIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

J. W. WADSWORTH, JR.,
HIRAM BINGHAM,
MORRIS SHEPPARD,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House on the bill H. R. 10827 state with reference to the amendments of the Senate as follows:

On No. 1: Agreed to with an amendment, provides that the Chief of the Air Corps, at least two brigadier generals and at least 90 per cent of the officers in each grade below that of brigadier general shall be flying officers, but in time of war the 10 per cent of nonfliers out of the total number of officers that may be authorized for the Air Corps for such war may be immediately commissioned; however, as soon as fliers can be trained the ratio of at least 90 per cent fliers to 10 per cent nonfliers must be reestablished.

On No. 2: Agreed to with an amendment, provides that officers who may possess special qualifications other than as fliers may be detailed to the Air Corps or permanently commissioned therein upon the specific recommendation of the Secretary of War, but that such officers, together with those flying officers who shall have become disqualified for flying, shall not be included among the 90 per cent of flying officers in each grade below that of brigadier general provided in amendment No. 1, thus insuring that there shall be at least 90 per cent effective flying officers in the Air Corps at all times except during the early stages of a war.

On Nos. 3 and 4: Agreed to with amendments, clarify the definition of a flying officer, and establish a standard in time of peace for all pilots of heavier-than-aircraft similar to that established in H. R. 9690 for similar ratings in the Navy. These amendments also provide that in time of war a flying officer may include any officer who has received an aeronautical rating as a pilot of service types of aircraft and also any officer who has received an aeronautical rating as an observer.

On No. 5: Strikes out language that is in conflict with language in section 6 of this bill. This language was carried over from section 13a of the national defense act which section 2 of this bill is designed to replace, but is now no longer necessary, in view of the additional language placed in section 6 of this bill.

On No. 6: Provides with regard to the use of enlisted pilots in tactical units of the Air Corps that the provision shall be applicable in time of peace only, as sufficient experience has not been gained to warrant establishing this principle in law for time of war.

On No. 7: Agreed to with an amendment, provides for the four (4) lower grades of enlisted men in the Air Corps to receive ratings as air mechanics, first class, and air mechanics, second class, when they possess the necessary technical qualifications therefor and are engaged upon the duties pertaining thereto, and when so rated shall receive the pay of the second and third grades, respectively. Not to exceed 14 per cent of the total authorized enlisted strength of the Air Corps are to be so rated. This matter of mechanics' ratings was considered worthy of special consideration in the Air Corps as it involved the safety of men's lives as well as the preservation of most valuable Government property.

On Nos. 8, 9, and 10: Agreed to with amendments; provide for a limited number of officers of the Air Corps to receive temporary higher rank, including pay and allowances appropriate to such rank, when assigned to certain special duties, and for this temporary rank to be limited to two (2) grades above the permanent rank of the officer concerned. The last amendment simply clarifies the language.

On No. 11: Agreed to with an amendment; provides for the next three (3) years following July 1, 1926, for the creation of air sections in the War Department General Staff to be headed by an officer detailed from the Air Corps. This is necessary in order to take care of the present shortage of officers of suitable rank and qualifications for membership on the General Staff. It is estimated that sufficient Air Corps officers will be available in three years to place this branch on a parity with other branches in this respect and thus remove the necessity at that time for this special provision.

On Nos. 12, 13, 17, and 34: Simply affect the numbering of the sections.

On No. 14: Agreed to with an amendment; provides for the appointment of the Chief of the Air Corps for the next seven (7) years to be made from among officers of any grade of not less than fifteen (15) years' commissioned service who have demonstrated by actual and extended service in the Air Corps that they are qualified for such appointment. This is necessary because flying ability is one of the chief requisites for an officer to properly fill the office of Chief of the Air Corps. Also because of the provisions of the national defense act and the shortage of officers under that act with flying ability, it is considered necessary to change the requirements from those prescribed at the present time. It is believed at the end of seven (7) years, however, there will be sufficient officers in the Air Corps with flying ability and other qualifications to remove the necessity for this special provision.

On Nos. 15 and 16: Were agreed to as the subject matter of the two sections regarding encouragement of commercial aviation, and the establishment of prohibited areas is covered in the civil aviation bill, approved by the President, May 20, 1926. This, therefore, makes unnecessary a repetition of that legislation in this bill.

On Nos. 18, 19, and 20: Agreed to with amendments, merely clarify the language of the personnel section of the five-year program as passed by the House.

On Nos. 21 and 22: Agreed to with amendments, permit 90 per cent of Air Corps Reserve officers to be placed on active duty for any period of a year or less, and 10 per cent for a period of two years or less, in order that they may have an opportunity to qualify as pilots.

On Nos. 23, 24, 25, and 26: As agreed to make minor changes in the bill.

On Nos. 27 and 28: Agreed to with amendments, provide that the five-year program shall become effective July 1, 1926, as agreed upon by the House, the same date that the House and the Senate agreed upon for a similar air program for the Navy, and authorizes the President to submit the necessary estimates to cover the cost.

On No. 29: Agreed to with an amendment, provides for an Assistant Secretary of War to assist primarily in the performance of functions with regard to military aeronautics, but he may be given such additional functions as the Secretary of War may direct. It is believed that the Secretary of War should not be restricted in the assignment of duties to this assistant, nor should it be determined by law except in a general way. The creation of this office for an additional Assistant Secretary is in accordance with the recommendations of the President's Aircraft Board.

On No. 30: Agreed to with an amendment, covers very thoroughly the subject of procurement of aircraft, aircraft parts, and aeronautical accessories. It is the result of thorough study made by the House Military and Naval Affairs Committees and will not only encourage the aircraft industry but permit the purchase of aeronautical matériel in a much more satisfactory manner than can now be done under the present law, and at the same time it completely safeguards the interests of the Government. The language of this amendment is almost identical with that of H. R. 12471 (by Mr. McSWAIN) and H. R. 12472 (by Mr. VINSON of Georgia), reported favorably by both the Committees of Military Affairs and Naval Affairs of this House. These two bills represent the labors of a subcommittee of said committees in almost daily conference and hearing for several weeks and are fully explained by Reports No. 1395 and No. 1396, respectively.

On Nos. 31, 32, and 33: Agreed to with amendments, provide for a soldier's medal and a distinguished flying cross, and for enlisted men \$2 per month additional pay for each such award. The necessity for a soldier's medal has long been felt in the War Department to reward acts of heroism not involving actual conflict with an enemy, and the necessity for a distinguished flying cross where acts of heroism or extraordinary achievement are accomplished while participating in aerial flights, is at once apparent when considering such accomplishments as the round-the-world flight and the flight to the North Pole. It is the practice now in the case of an enlisted man who receives the distinguished service cross to award him additional pay at the rate of \$2 per month. A similar provision is carried in this bill.

W. FRANK JAMES,
JOHN PHILIP HILL,
HARRY M. WURZBACH,
PERCY E. QUIN,
JOHN J. McSWAIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

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

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this involves amendment No. 30, which is lengthy, and introduces new matter into the Senate and House bill. Will the gentleman yield to some Member to explain amendment No. 30.

Mr. JAMES. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN].

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, in order to make it plain just how we approached this problem I should go back and say that since the armistice there have been 24 separate and independent investigations for the purpose of trying to ascertain what was wrong with aviation in the Army and Navy. You remember this House appointed a special committee known as the "Lampert Committee," that made an exhaustive inquiry extending through months and covering thousands of pages of printed matter, and among the 23 separate recommendations of that committee was one to the effect that the general laws regulating the manner of procuring aircraft, to wit, by advertising to the world for bids and letting the contracts for the purchase to the lowest cash bidder be eliminated, so that in purchasing aircraft an officer of the Government with an officer of the aircraft company, without any previous notice to anybody, could sit down in a room in the presence of nobody else and draw up a contract.

A few months later the President appointed an aircraft board, known as the Morrow Board, which reaffirmed that recommendation.

Gentlemen will remember that on several occasions I have taken the floor here and bitterly inveighed against that particular proposition and have warned the House of the dangers of following the recommendations of these committees with regard to that particular proposition, and when the Navy's five-year air program was under consideration I offered amendments to the bill which are in heart and substance the bill which was later unanimously reported by both the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee of this House, and which constitute the change known as amendment No. 30 of this conference report.

Here is the sum and substance of the whole proposition: We have all heard complaint, bitter complaint, against what are called in popular parlance the "flying coffins" of the Army and the Navy, and the excuse has been that this deficient aircraft has been due to the fact that they, the Army and Navy, were obliged to take the planes offered at the lowest cash dollar, irrespective of their quality, irrespective of their efficiency, irrespective of their safety, irrespective of the ability of that plane to perform either in time of peace or in time of war. Now, the whole sum and substance of this proposed change in the law is this: That we have exchanged for the lowest cash dollar of the price of purchase, we have changed this basis and standard, and we have adopted a measure by which to award the contract to the highest quality of efficiency and performance in accomplishing that which an airplane is intended to perform. So that we have shifted from the basis of a low-dollar plane to that of a high-performance plane. Gentlemen say all right, but how is one going to ascertain which plane gives the highest performance and who is going to be vested with the discretion of determining that very important, and at the same time very difficult, question of the highest quality of performance? That discretion necessarily is vested in the head of the department which has the responsibility. He who is responsible for doing the thing must have the power by which to accomplish the thing sought to be done. So that it rests with the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be.

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

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. McSWAIN. A brief recital of the legislative history of this particular provision might be informing. When this proposition of accomplishing the recommendations of the Lampert committee and of the Morrow Board came before the Military Affairs Committee, the committee was practically evenly divided upon the question. I think the vote was 11 to 10. The matter was not included in the aircraft 5-year program bill and was supposed to be reserved for later action.

It was left out of the Navy aircraft five-year program proposition and in order to get the committee together, so that we might have something to come before this House, having the combined recommendation and judgment of both committees, the Military Affairs Committee voluntarily, without any authority from this House, appointed a subcommittee of five to act with a subcommittee of five from the Naval Affairs Committee, and these two committees met day after day for weeks taking additional testimony, consulting in free conference with experts of the Navy and the War Departments, and conferring with one another. When we started out it seemed as though we were as far apart as the north pole from the south pole. The records will show that my friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and I in the hearings that were had were approaching the subject from entirely different angles, and it seemed to me that I would never be able to get on a common platform with him and be able to stand here and sign the same report word for word and letter for letter. His report from the Committee on Naval Affairs and the one that I signed from the Committee on Military Affairs are identical. But we did get together and I think I can explain all the long provisions of the 15 or 16 sections with this thought. Rather than eliminate publicity, rather than cut out competition and bidding, as was the recommendation of the Lampert and Morrow committees, we have not doubled it merely, but we have multiplied it by at least 10, so that now the light is to be turned on from every angle. It is true that there is discretion in the Secretary to decide which is the lowest responsible bidder, which one can best build the aircraft for the safety of the lives of the men who are to fly them in time of peace and time of war.

Mr. GRIFFIN. But you eliminated that.

Mr. McSWAIN. The discretion still rests with the Secretary of War to decide that question, and there is publicity from the very first proposition of inviting competition in the matter of design contest, competition in the building and construction contract, and there is light turned on in this, that if a single competitor in a design contest can make a satisfactory and reasonable showing that there has been injustice in the award, then the Secretary orders an arbitration and three disinterested arbitrators pass upon the question. Of course, that must be confirmed by the Secretary, because he is responsible.

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

Mr. McSWAIN. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Did not the reports of these various investigating committees show conclusively that there was favoritism in the granting of contracts for aircraft and air materials?

Mr. McSWAIN. I do not think that either of those committees studied that question at all. Personally, I have always thought that there was, and that was the angle from which I approached this whole question. I have sought to build up the bill in such a way that favoritism can not be practiced unless somebody goes to the penitentiary for doing so. [Applause.]

Mr. GRIFFIN. As I recollect the findings of the committees, the War Department entered into an arrangement with the two great aircraft producers, Curtiss and the Wrights, and presented them with an endowment of several hundred million dollars for questionable patents which they had sold Great Britain for \$30,000,000.

Mr. McSWAIN. Let me recommend to the gentleman that he read the reports of those two committees again, because, of course, they did not deal with that question at all.

Mr. GRIFFIN. It does seem to me, if the gentleman will permit, this gives a very dangerous and unprecedented authority to any Secretary of War to permit him to make purchases of aircraft material in a developed industry like aircraft production without competition.

Mr. McSWAIN. I understand the gentleman's point of view, and I had the same point of view, but I submit that this bill here safeguards and protects this Government against graft, and at the same time it protects the aviators who are to go miles in the air against the possibility of having unfit and inefficient aircraft in which to fly. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Right there on that point I have the greatest confidence in the gentleman's judgment, and I would like to ask the gentleman, or some other member of the conference committee, to tell us why it was necessary to provide in the conference report that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy should have exclusive authority to pass upon and interpret the provisions of the contract, and to deny, by so doing, the Comptroller General of the United States the power and authority to interpret those contracts. In other words, if the gentleman will pardon me—

Mr. McSWAIN. Certainly.

Mr. BYRNS. The effect of that, as I consider it, is this: That it really denies the Comptroller General the authority to audit the accounts.

Mr. McSWAIN. All right.

Now, I have safeguarded in my humble and feeble efforts, as far as I could as a member of the conference committee, the Government's interest in that respect from every angle of this. This bill gives the Comptroller General not only the right to audit the contract but the plant. The Attorney General or any department of the Government gets a chance to send men there to go over that aircraft plant to see how many pounds of this, that, and the other are used in constructing and how much time, and also audit the books and ascertain the true costs.

Mr. BYRNS. But when you say the Comptroller General shall have no authority to pass upon or interpret the contract, are you not in effect depriving him of the power to audit?

Mr. McSWAIN. Oh, maybe so, as I understand that; but here is the proposition. If we are assured that the Navy Department and the War Department will be honest, then we are as safe in their hands as we are in the hands of the Comptroller General. Listen. Of course, we will assume they are just as honest, but in this law we have proposed to make them honest or put them in the penitentiary if they are dishonest. I put teeth in this where there never were teeth there before.

Mr. BYRNS. If the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. McSWAIN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. I do not think it is a question of honesty on the part of members of the Cabinet, the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, but here is the Comptroller General who has been delegated by law to do this work and holds a peculiar relation to Congress, the appropriating body. He has a force for that purpose. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of Navy do not personally audit accounts or

interpret contracts. Now, pursuing the matter further I want to say to the gentleman—and if his time expires I am sure it will be extended—my fear is this: Only the other day the House passed a bill taking from the Comptroller General certain powers to audit, and so forth, in reference to the Internal Revenue or Customs Service. Now we are asked to take from the Comptroller General the authority vested in him by law with reference to contracts carrying nearly \$200,000,000. It seems to me that it is just an effort upon the part of these departments with whom the Comptroller General is not very popular—their attitude is a real compliment to him—I say, it seems to me that it is the purpose of these various departments piece by piece to eliminate his authority and finally to emasculate the Budget law, and I do not think Congress ought to stand for it, because the Comptroller General was delegated by the Budget law as in a sense the personal representative of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. JAMES. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. McSWAIN. Make it brief, please.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would like to ascertain from the gentleman from Tennessee, in whose judgment I have confidence, who would be better qualified to pass upon a contract—the man who made it or a third party who has nothing to do with it?

Mr. BYRNS. The Comptroller General has nothing to do with making the contract, but when it comes to a legal interpretation of what the contract means, as to whether the contract shall do this or that, I take it the Comptroller General, who is the legal authority and who has a legal force, is better fitted and more capable to pass upon it than the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Comptroller General is not the legal authority. Does not the gentleman know that? That is the very thing that the Comptroller General has been doing, asserting his right when it is the legal authority of the Department of Justice to do that.

Mr. BYRNS. That is the contention of the Navy Department and of the War Department, but I have not yielded to that contention, as the gentleman evidently has, because the Comptroller General is the legal authority to pass upon contracts and audit claims, and there is no appeal from him. That is the reason why the departments want to get out from under him, because he is independent of them and will not listen to them in construing contracts and passing upon their accounts.

Mr. McSWAIN. In reply to what the gentleman from Tennessee says, I want him to understand that I am not one of those who have any criticism to make of the Comptroller General. I feel down in my heart just as the gentleman from Tennessee does. But we have not taken away any power from the Comptroller General, because it is reserved to the President, or any department, in express language, and the President can designate the Comptroller General to go in the factory as his special agent and find out everything with reference to the contracts.

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

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two minutes more.

Mr. McSWAIN. Two minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Now, of course, gentlemen, some of you find trouble here. I want to say in all candor and sincerity that I have found trouble; but when 10 men get together every man out of the 10 can not have his own way, and I was only one out of 10.

Listen: What have we saved you from? If you will read section 9, as it passed the Senate, you will see. We have saved you from the recommendations of the Lampert committee and of the Morrow committee, which would, if adopted, as I say, have closed the doors and let nobody know who was going in, and what they are doing in there, and what they are going to sign. Here is what the Senate voted to put in. Here is what we escape from by reason of the fact that we insert in conference the provision that "in all cases the decisions of the Secretary shall be final and conclusive in the absence of fraud." So that we pulled something out of the fire.

Gentlemen, when we came here in December there was an organized program to put the Morrow recommendation over.

The War Department was behind it, and the Navy Department was behind it, and the White House was behind it. Every power and influence seemed behind it. A few little fellows, however, have stood at Thermopylae and have brought in here a bill that will promote aviation and stimulate inventive genius, and put this country foremost, in my humble judgment, over all the world in the development of the aircraft industry to come. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES] yield the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN] two additional minutes to answer some questions.

Mr. JAMES. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. On page 14 of the bill I notice in section 9 the following language:

That in placing contracts for any or all of such material preference shall be given to contractors who maintain engineering and design staffs of reasonable size and keep them active.

Does not the gentleman consider that this is an unfair and excessive power to put into the hands of the Secretary of War? Mr. McSWAIN. The gentleman is reading from the Senate bill. That is what we saved you from.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is that language I have just read excluded from the Senate amendment in the conference report?

Mr. McSWAIN. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The conference report creates a new Assistant Secretary, does it not?

Mr. McSWAIN. It does.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFFER)—ayes 148, noes 3.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote. There is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-five Members are present—not a quorum. As many as favor agreeing to the conference report will, when their names are called, answer "yea." Those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 256, nays 12, not voting 162, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—256

Abernethy	Curry	Hammer	McMillan
Ackerman	Darrow	Hare	McReynolds
Adkins	Davey	Harrison	McSwain
Allen	Davis	Hastings	McSweeney
Almon	Dempsey	Haugen	MacGregor
Andresen	Denison	Hawes	Magee, N. Y.
Andrew	Dickinson, Iowa	Hawley	Major
Arentz	Dickinson, Mo.	Hickey	Manlove
Arnold	Dickstein	Hill, Ala.	Mansfield
Aswell	Dominick	Hill, Md.	Mapes
Auf der Heide	Doughton	Hill, Wash.	Martin, La.
Ayres	Douglass	Hoch	Martin, Mass.
Bacharach	Drewry	Hogg	Mead
Bachmann	Driver	Hooper	Menges
Bacon	Eaton	Houston	Michener
Balley	Edwards	Howard	Miller
Barbour	Elliott	Hudson	Montgomery
Barkley	Esterly	Hull, Morton D.	Mooney
Begg	Evans	Hull, William E.	Moore, Ky.
Bell	Fairchild	Irwin	Moore, Ohio
Black, N. Y.	Faust	James	Morehead
Boles	Fenn	Jeffers	Morgan
Bowman	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Jenkins	Morrow
Boylan	Fletcher	Johnson, Ind.	Murphy
Brand, Ga.	Fort	Johnson, Tex.	Norton
Briggs	Foss	Kearns	O'Connor, La.
Brigham	Frear	Kerr	Oldfield
Britten	French	Ketcham	Oliver, Ala.
Browning	Fulmer	Kincheloe	Parker
Bulwinkle	Furlow	Kindred	Parks
Burdick	Gallivan	King	Peery
Burtness	Gambrill	Kopp	Porter
Burton	Garber	Kurtz	Pratt
Butler	Gardner, Ind.	LaGuardia	Purnell
Byrns	Garrett, Tenn.	Lampert	Quayle
Carew	Gasque	Lankford	Quin
Carss	Gibson	Lazaro	Ragon
Chalmers	Gilbert	Leatherwood	Ramseyer
Chapman	Glynn	Leavitt	Rankin
Christopherson	Golder	Lehbach	Rathbone
Clague	Goldsborough	Lindsay	Reed, Ark.
Cole	Goodwin	Linthicum	Reed, N. Y.
Collier	Gorman	Little	Robinson, Iowa
Colton	Green, Fla.	Lowrey	Robison, Ky.
Connally, Tex.	Green, Iowa	Lyon	Rogers
Cox	Griest	McClintic	Rowbottom
Crosser	Griffin	McDuffie	Rubey
Crowthier	Hadley	McFadden	Sanders, N. Y.
Crumpacker	Hall, Ind.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, Tex.
Cullen	Hall, N. Dak.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sandlin

Scott	Summers, Wash.	Tilson
Sears, Fla.	Sumners, Tex.	Tincher
Sears, Nebr.	Swank	Tolley
Seger	Swartz	Tydings
Simmons	Swing	Underwood
Sinnott	Taber	Updike
Snell	Taylor, Colo.	Upshaw
Sosnowski	Taylor, N. J.	Vestal
Speaks	Taylor, Tenn.	Vincent, Mich.
Spearing	Taylor, W. Va.	Vinson, Ga.
Stedman	Temple	Vinson, Ky.
Stephens	Thatcher	Voigt
Strong, Kans.	Thomas	Wainwright
Strong, Pa.	Thurston	Wason

Watres
Watson
Weller
Wheeler
White, Kans.
White, Me.
Whittington
Williams, Ill.
Wilson, La.
Wilson, Miss.
Wingo
Winter
Wolverton
Wright

NAYS—12

Black, Tex.	Cannon	Huddleston	Nelson, Mo.
Box	Collins	Lozier	Romjue
Busby	Eslick	Milligan	Schafer

NOT VOTING—162

Aldrich	Ellis	Lee, Ga.	Sinclair
Allgood	Fish	Letts	Smith
Anthony	Fisher	Lineberger	Smithwick
Appleby	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Luce	Somers, N. Y.
Bankhead	Fredericks	McKeown	Sproul, Ill.
Beck	Free	McLeod	Sproul, Kans.
Beedy	Freeman	Madden	Stalker
Beers	Frothingham	Magee, Pa.	Stegall
Berger	Funk	Magrady	Stevenson
Bixler	Garner, Tex.	Merritt	Stobbs
Bland	Garrett, Tex.	Michaelson	Strother
Blanton	Gifford	Mills	Sullivan
Bloom	Graham	Montague	Sweet
Bowles	Greenwood	Moore, Va.	Swoope
Bowling	Hale	Morin	Thompson
Brand, Ohio	Hardy	Nelson, Me.	Tillman
Browne	Hayden	Nelson, Wis.	Timberlake
Brumm	Hersey	Newton, Minn.	Tinkham
Buchanan	Holaday	Newton, Mo.	Treadway
Campbell	Hudspeth	O'Connell, N. Y.	Tucker
Canfield	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connell, R. I.	Underhill
Carpenter	Jacobstein	O'Connor, N. Y.	Valle
Carter, Calif.	Johnson, Ill.	Oliver, N. Y.	Vare
Carter, Okla.	Johnson, Ky.	Patterson	Walters
Celler	Johnson, S. Dak.	Peavey	Warren
Chindblom	Johnson, Wash.	Perkins	Weaver
Cleary	Jones	Perlman	Wefald
Connery	Kahn	Phillips	Welsh
Connolly, Pa.	Keller	Pou	Whitehead
Cooper, Ohio	Kelly	Prall	Williams, Tex.
Cooper, Wis.	Kemp	Rainey	Williamson
Corning	Kendall	Ransley	Wood
Coyle	Kiefner	Rayburn	Woodruff
Cramton	Kiess	Reece	Woodrum
Crisp	Kirk	Reid, Ill.	Woodyard
Davenport	Knutson	Rouse	Wurzbach
Deal	Kunz	Rutherford	Wyant
Dowell	Kvale	Sabath	Yates
Doyle	Lanham	Schneider	Zihlman
Drane	Larsen	Shallenberger	
Dyer	Lea, Calif.	Shreve	

So the conference report was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following additional pairs: Until further notice:

Mr. Madden with Mr. Crisp.
 Mr. Cramton with Mr. Montague.
 Mr. Mills with Mr. Warren.
 Mr. Shreve with Mr. Corning.
 Mr. Morin with Mr. Buchanan.
 Mr. Newton of Missouri with Mr. Larsen.
 Mr. Kelly with Mr. Blanton.
 Mr. Dyer with Mr. Lea of California.
 Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Bloom.
 Mr. Reid of Illinois with Mr. Carter of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Dowell with Mr. Shallenberger.
 Mr. Smith with Mr. Rutherford.
 Mrs. Kahn with Mr. Tucker.
 Mr. Gifford with Mr. Connery.
 Mr. Graham with Mr. Drane.
 Mr. Wood with Mr. Woodrum.
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Hayden.
 Mr. Wyant with Mr. Kunz.
 Mr. Hersey with Mr. Somers of New York.
 Mr. Ransley with Mr. Weaver.
 Mr. Aldrich with Mr. Lee of Georgia.
 Mr. Beers with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
 Mr. Stalker with Mr. Prall.
 Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Canfield.
 Mr. Vare with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Perkins with Mr. Tillman.
 Mr. Perlman with Mr. Sullivan.
 Mr. Ellis with Mr. Hudspeth.
 Mr. Coyle with Mr. Doyle.
 Mr. Brand of Ohio with Mr. O'Connell of New York.
 Mr. Campbell with Mr. Hull of Tennessee.
 Mr. Anthony with Mr. Cleary.
 Mr. Sproul of Illinois with Mr. Sabath.
 Mr. Thompson with Mr. Bland.
 Mr. Fredericks with Mr. McKeown.
 Mr. Hardy with Mr. Oliver of New York.
 Mr. Magrady with Mr. Wefald.
 Mr. W. T. Fitzgerald with Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Holaday with Mr. Kvale.
 Mr. Tinkham with Mr. Browne.
 Mr. Valle with Mr. Peavey.
 Mr. Sproul of Kansas with Mr. Schneider.

The result of the vote was announced, as above recorded. On motion of Mr. JAMES, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting petitions from Civil War veterans and sons of veterans in behalf of increased pensions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing petitions from Civil War veterans and sons of veterans in behalf of increased pensions. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how long are the petitions?

Mr. MORGAN. There are about half a dozen names signed to the petitions.

Mr. SNELL. I think, Mr. Speaker, I will have to object to petitions going into the Record. I have an office full of them and several others have. I think for the present I shall have to object.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, on May 14 I obtained unanimous consent to revise and extend remarks I made on preceding day on farm legislation. The time has expired and I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the time for extending his remarks on farm legislation be extended. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11603) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] desire to offer an amendment at this time?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I have a perfecting amendment which I desire to offer to the McLaughlin amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS: Page 1, line 4, of the amendment, after the word "commodity," insert the words "and a majority of the producers thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee upon the point of order that this is substantially the same as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota which has just been voted down.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, as I understood it, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON] was directed to a sufficient number of cooperative associations or other organizations to represent a majority of the producers of a given commodity. My amendment, if adopted, would provide as follows as read into the McLaughlin amendment:

That a substantial number of cooperative associations or other organizations representing the producers of such commodities and a majority of the producers thereof are in favor of the commencement by the board of operations in such commodity, etc.

In other words, my amendment has reference to the sentiment prevailing among the producers generally, those in and those out of farm organizations, whereas the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota deals alone with the organizations and provides that if a sufficient number of the organizations that represent a majority of the producers shall be in favor thereof the law shall become operative.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman has correctly stated the difference between the two amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is the first time I have had occasion to say anything on the floor upon this very important legislation. I represent almost strictly an agricultural district. I think I fully appreciate the very unsatisfactory condition of agriculture, and I am sincerely in favor of taking such course as will best promote the important agricultural interests, and employing my best judgment I shall pursue that course which I deem best for the farming interests. I hope that the Haugen bill may be perfected so that I can vote for it. The amendment which I have in mind in my opinion would not only not impair the usefulness of the Haugen bill but on the other hand would increase its usefulness and effectiveness and render it more popular in the final analysis and operation of the law if enacted. The amendment which I offer simply provides that the board shall ascertain to the best of its ability not only that a substantial number of farm organizations favor the producers of a certain commodity being brought under the provisions of the bill but also that a majority of the producers of such commodity are in favor of that

action being taken. Now it is suggested with some force that it is impossible to definitely ascertain how a majority of the producers of a certain commodity stand upon the proposition. Of course it can not be determined with mathematical accuracy. Neither can it be determined with mathematical accuracy whether there is or is going to be a surplus. There are other discretions given to the board under this bill action upon which must depend upon an investigation and the best judgment which they can apply. But I respectfully submit if there is a substantial majority of the producers of any commodity in favor of coming in under the provisions of the bill it will not be a difficult matter to ascertain with reasonable certainty that sentiment; and if there is only a minority of the producers in favor of it, or if the sentiment pro and con is so equally divided that this board would be unable to determine whether there was a majority in favor of it, I respectfully submit that from the standpoint of the friends of the bill and from the standpoint of the farmers themselves it would be a very unwise thing indeed, to bring the producers of the commodity in under the provisions of the bill. There is nothing that would render this bill more odious and more quickly destroy its usefulness and bring about its repeal than to undertake to impose its provisions upon the producers of any commodity against the wishes of a majority of such producers. We are conferring upon this board very extraordinary powers, but because of the conditions of agriculture I am willing to go further than I would feel like going if I were to determine it alone upon economic grounds, governmental grounds. But let us see what we are doing.

The Congress in delegating to a board of 12 men the right to impose this equalization fee, when we know its operation and its effect is nothing more or less than a species of tax, and the only condition which we prescribe, the only restriction upon the imposition of the operation of the law and the operation of this equalization fee, is that the board shall find that a substantial number of farm organizations or other organizations shall be in favor of it.

Mr. MANLOVE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. For a question.

Mr. MANLOVE. The thing that occurs to my mind now is with the language of the gentleman's amendment as inserted in this amendment to the bill, by what method is the farm board going to be able to ascertain if a majority of the producers are in favor of it?

Mr. DAVIS. I will state to the gentleman that, of course, their finding would necessarily mean the exercise of their conscientious judgment and opinion.

And I wish to state to the gentleman from Missouri that, while I had this amendment prepared for some time before any discussion of this feature of it, I was preparing another amendment somewhat changing the phraseology, and I ask consent of the committee, if the chairman please, to withdraw my amendment so as to propose an amendment at the end of the McLaughlin amendment, after the words "food supplies," as follows:

And the board is satisfied that a majority of the producers of such commodity are in favor of such action.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment and to offer the one which the Clerk will report.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the McLaughlin amendment, after the words "food supplies," insert:

"And the board is satisfied that a majority of the producers of such commodity are in favor of such action."

Mr. MANLOVE. That would leave it in the discretion of the board?

Mr. DAVIS. That would leave it to the best judgment of the board as to the sentiment of the producers of any commodity.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I will.

Mr. MOREHEAD. I desire to credit the gentleman with the best of intentions, but I know of no corporation, and that is what we assume when we undertake to establish these organizations, that would make it possible to transact business by appealing to all the stockholders or a majority of them.

No railroad company, no packing company, no banking company, or any other company could do that and remain in operation.

Mr. DAVIS. In the first place, the gentleman from Nebraska does not state an analogous case. In the second place, my amendment does not require or imply a referendum or consulting each and every producer, but it simply provides in

effect that before applying the provisions of this bill, including the imposition of an equalization tax, with respect to any commodity, the board shall employ such sources of information as may be at their command to fairly ascertain the sentiment of the producers of such commodities, and shall act accordingly. If there is anything like a strong sentiment one way or the other among such producers that fact could be reasonably ascertained without any great difficulty. On the other hand, if there should be such a division of sentiment that the board could not satisfy themselves as to how a majority collectively stood on the proposition that in itself should be sufficient ground for declining to make the law operative with respect to such commodities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DAVIS. There are certain other provisions in this bill which should be eliminated or changed, not only in the interest of the more efficient and successful operation of the plan but also in order to smooth the passage of the bill.

For instance, all references to the tariff should be eliminated from the bill. In the first place, it is manifestly unnecessary and unfair to try to commit us Democrats to a policy of a high protective tariff in order that we may vote for farm-relief legislation. This bill should be strictly nonpartisan and the references to the tariff have no place whatever in the bill. In the second place, the so-called "tariff yardstick" is arbitrary, unscientific, unfair, and inequitable. It can not apply at all to cotton or to tobacco, such as we produce, nor to certain other commodities which may be dealt with under the provisions of the bill. It would be infinitely better to substitute for such provisions as a yardstick for the price of the commodity sought to be attained to provide that operation should begin with respect to a commodity, when desired by the cooperatives and the producers of such commodity, and when the market price thereof is below a fair price, or below the cost of production plus a fair profit, or below the average price level of all commodities, or it could be left to the discretion of the board.

The Dickinson bill did not employ the tariff as a yardstick or contain any reference to the tariff; the same is true with respect to the revised Senate bill, which was agreed upon and submitted by the farm leaders. I am informed that the farm leaders generally do not favor the tariff yardstick. Not only do the Democrats naturally favor the elimination of the tariff references, but many of the Republican Members who are sincere friends of farm relief are in favor of such elimination. However, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] himself and a few other Republicans have steadfastly opposed its elimination. They simply want us to pull their chestnuts out of the fire; they represented to their farmers that the tariff duties on farm products would bring the farmers prosperity, and, it having failed utterly to do so, they want to bolster the tariff and justify their position in this bill. They are apparently willing to sacrifice the welfare of the farmer in order to further their own political ends. No pride of authorship or personal interest should be permitted to defeat farm aid legislation. In my opinion, if the amendments to the bill which I suggest are adopted, the bill will pass; otherwise it will be defeated. If the author of this bill and his lieutenants are sincerely in favor of farm relief legislation, they should certainly be willing to make concessions which will insure the passage of the bill and at the same time improve the bill from the standpoint of the farmers.

As a matter of fact, the present deplorable condition of agriculture is largely due to the operation of the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act, which has contributed more than all else combined to the reduction in the purchasing power of the farm dollar. The prices of all farm products have been deflated, but the prices of manufactured articles have been maintained at almost war levels because of the fact that the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act practically prevents the competition of foreign manufactured goods, and the American manufacturers generally prevent competition among themselves through the means of monopolies and combines. The farmers are compelled to sell in the world market, but are compelled to buy in a highly protected market. They, both as producers and consumers, are unfairly victimized by special legislation and favoritism to other classes fostered by the party now in power.

Of course, the logical and sensible way to aid agriculture and increase the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar would be to greatly reduce the tariff rates on farm products and upon at

least the necessities of life which the farmers are compelled to buy. In other words, the most natural and most effective relief would be to remove the cause of the farmers' troubles rather than to employ a palliative or antidote. However, as there is no possibility of such a course being pursued under the present administration and while the Republican Party is in power, I am in favor of such other reasonable measures as may be possible of enactment to relieve the deplorable condition of agriculture.

Furthermore, I do not believe that the benefits and appropriations provided in this bill should be extended to processors and manufacturers of food products, especially in view of the fact that the authorized appropriations are to be greatly reduced, and in view of the further fact that the bill does not provide that equalization fees shall be paid by such processors and manufacturers. The prices at which the packers and millers and other manufacturers of food products sell bear no just relation to the prices at which the farmers sell the raw products. Not only should this bill be solely for the relief of the farmers, but the packers and millers and other manufacturers of food products should have no voice or control in the operation of the provisions of the bill. I am unable to conceive why such provisions were ever injected into the bill, and I sincerely hope that they may be eliminated. If retained, the processors and manufacturers of food products should certainly be required to pay the equalization fee. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the committee, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I beg to submit the following additional observations:

My prediction that unless the bill was changed as I suggested, as did others, has been fulfilled, and the Haugen bill has been defeated. My desire to do whatever I could for the relief of agriculture was so intense that I voted for the Haugen bill in spite of the objectionable features, but there were many who voted against the bill who would not have done so but for those objectionable features. Not only President Coolidge and Secretary Jardine and other administration leaders did all they could to defeat the bill, both in the House and the Senate, but Secretary Mellon threw his powerful influence against such legislation in a statement which he issued and which was given wide publicity. One of the reasons urged against the proposed legislation by Secretary Mellon was that—

it provides higher agricultural prices at the expense of the rest of the people.

This is exactly what a protective tariff does. In fact, every argument made by Secretary Mellon against farm-aid legislation applies with even greater force to a protective-tariff system, and yet he is strongly in favor of a high tariff for the aid of manufacturers. He has lectured the farmers for asking what he and his associates have demanded and secured. By reason of the high tariff rates on aluminum products he is one of the greatest beneficiaries under the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act. Steel, aluminum, and other products sell abroad, freight paid, cheaper than they sell in this country, and yet Secretary Mellon thinks this perfectly all right. Secretary Mellon, President Coolidge, and other administration leaders are unwilling to help the farmers organize and protect their prices, but, according to their philosophy, it is perfectly all right to permit and help manufacturers to do the same thing.

Another matter which has greatly militated against the farmer is the high railroad freight rates on agricultural products as well as on other necessities of life, and yet the Interstate Commerce Commission has been so packed in favor of "big business" that it is quite evident that at least a majority of the members of that commission have no sympathy with the plight of the farmers and are not concerned in even according them simple justice.

The administration prates much about the present prosperity. This country is only prosperous in spots and among certain classes. The so-called present prosperity is all right for certain favored interests, but it is exceedingly hard on the farmers and the consumers generally. The very prosperity of which they boast is largely a product of the unfair treatment and discrimination against the farmers.

It is quite evident that any substantial relief for agriculture depends upon the result of the elections this fall and that any permanent relief depends also upon the results of the elections

in 1928. It remains to be seen whether the farmers will employ the voting power which they possess and help to elect officials who will be willing to accord them the consideration to which they are justly entitled.

ADDRESSES OF HON. KNUD WEFALD, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. CARSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by my colleague [Mr. WEFALD] on the farm situation, and also an address delivered by him at the Norwegian Centennial in Minneapolis on June 8, 1925.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing addresses delivered by his colleague [Mr. WEFALD]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARSS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEFALD]:

HOW THE FARMER IS "PROTECTED" BY THE TARIFF

Mr. WEFALD. Mr. Speaker, "by a vote of 45 to 39 the Dawes-McNary-Haugen bill was defeated in the Senate yesterday." So ran the comment in the newspapers one morning. There is much significance for the Middle West in these words. Coming so soon after Secretary of the Treasury Mellon's pronouncement to the effect that the principles underlying the Haugen bill were not "sound," it clears the atmosphere in the West. It means that there will be few Mellon-Coolidge Republicans from that part of the country in the next Congress. The West will not take the Mellon view of the farm situation. The West believes that a man must be of sound mind in order that his word shall carry any weight when he pronounces any doctrine as being unsound. The West has long believed that Mr. Mellon is money mad, and his recent utterances upon the justification of corruption and a money orgy in the recent Pennsylvania primary campaign have convinced those who were previously not quite ready to believe this. No sane man with any regard for the opinions of church people would justify such wholesale scandal and degradation as has come to light in Pennsylvania by saying that money contributed toward such a purpose by way of campaign contributions was spent for as holy a cause as money given to the church. The church has often been slandered and slurred, but seldom so brazenly slandered by a man who occupies such a high and exalted a public position. The church will stand, however, when the Mellon gold will be scattered in the dust. The slam on the church was also a slam on the farmer, the downtrodden, and the struggling who seek consolation in the church.

The three wise men who put the Haugen bill up to Mr. Mellon for an analysis should from this floor analyze the Mellon answer for the benefit of the western farmers. The burden of his song was that the Haugen bill seeks to make the tariff effective for the farmer, but this can not be done, for to his mind farming and manufacturing are as far apart as the poles and fundamentally different. Says Mr. Mellon, "Farming differs from most industries in that the output largely fixes the price, whereas in manufacturing the price largely controls the output." There you have it, Mr. HAUGEN. It can not be changed.

The tariff gives the manufacturer a chance to fix the price on his goods and by being able to fix the price he is enabled to control the output. Could the manufacturer not fix the price he would be hopelessly unable to control his output, and he would be fixed just as the farmer is now. But Mr. Mellon has some hope for the farmer. He says, "I believe there is a large field for the improvement of our farm condition in the improvement of world conditions."

Then he goes on to tell what the present Republican administration has done for the farmer. "It is in the real interest of the American farmer that the American Debt Commission has negotiated settlements with the debtor nations clearly within their ability to pay," and he further on says, "It does represent a great constructive work and one which the administration has now practically concluded."

What a consolation it must be to American farmers who do not get their debts funded, who are required to pay to the last cent and to the last drop of blood to know that our European debtors have effected settlements that will lift from their shoulders half of their debt to America and place that debt burden so lifted upon the shoulders of the American taxpayers! And to think that this was done in the interest of the American farmers!

Through the whole analyses of the Haugen bill Mr. Mellon speaks only as the tariff-protected industrial magnate and as the investment banker whose heart is in Europe, speaks because there is a great, new field for exploitation. He would never have known of the Haugen bill nor heard of a farm crisis if the three western leaders had not taken it into their heads to have our modern King Midas lay his hands upon the Haugen bill so that it might be transmuted into gold.

But he had no blessing for the orphan from the Corn Belt. If he had blessed it, that would have hurt the fat boys who are nursed by

the tariff, the mother of monopoly. How can he be expected to bless the Haugen bill, he who was the father of the present high protective tariff law, designed only for the protection of industry! While the farmers since the coming into control of the Republican Party under Mr. Mellon as czar have lost over \$30,000,000,000, the corporations of America under the ægis of Mr. Mellon, through high protective tariff and tax laws and administration of tax laws, are said to be evading surtax payments on probable undivided profits of \$30,000,000,000.

Personally, Mr. Mellon has fared well in these matters. To mention but one of his many tariff-fostered financial darlings, the Aluminum Trust. This is said to have grown from an original cash investment of \$20,000 until now, through reinvestments, its capital and surplus is more than \$110,000,000. During the four years of Mr. Mellon's régime refunds and abatement of taxes have totaled more than \$1,500,000.

Why should he have any sympathy for the farmers who have been going broke all the time, while he and the rest of the 2 per cent of the population of the United States have been piling up the billions?

The eyes of the world will be upon the farmers of the West until the next election is over. The New York Herald-Tribune, commenting on the fact that none of the three men who asked Mr. Mellon's opinion of the Haugen bill did publicly answer his criticism, said that the farmers "took their licking lying down." I predict that this will not happen. The farmers will strike back next November—there will be a mid-western group here that will hold the balance of power and who will exercise that power without regard to party. The farmer, having failed to get relief from the Republican Party, by having extended to them tariff protection along the same lines as industry, will have to join hands with the Democrats, if they offer a sane program in taking away from monopoly its undue advantage.

The Republican Party, just the same, sets out to preach more tariff to the farmer. The distinguished gentleman from Oregon, Mr. HAWLEY, made a remarkable speech on the blessings of the tariff for the farmer on this floor, June 24, and the Hon. Mr. BEGG, of Ohio, made a fully as startling speech over the radio, which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 18. I wish to touch on one of these two speeches, which will be very likely spread as Republican campaign documents.

The farmers like strong statements, but only an imagination like that of the gentleman from Ohio would dare to try to hypnotize them as he does.

I quote from the RECORD part of his remarks:

"If the tariff is not benefiting the farmer, why is it that under free trade Canadian wheat outsells American wheat an average of 5 cents a bushel, while under the present tariff American wheat outsells Canadian wheat an average of 20 cents a bushel? That makes a differential in favor of the tariff of 25 cents. Who gets it? The man who produces the wheat or the farmer, and any farmer who sold a thousand bushels of wheat last fall received 25 cents per bushel more for it, or a total of \$250. To-day he has \$250 more assets than he had one year ago directly due to the tariff.

"Now, let us take wool, which is one of the standard products of the farm. The average price of wool under free trade is not above 15 cents per pound, while the average price of wool of the same grade under the Fordney-McCumber tariff law has been 40 cents a pound. That makes a differential of 25 cents a pound in favor of the tariff, and, again, the farmer who sold 1,000 pounds of wool has \$250 more in the bank than he would have had under a Democratic administration if they had lived up to their former record of free wool.

"Now, let us consider cattle. I will take the concrete example offered by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, Mr. HAUGEN. Last fall he went to Canada and purchased 800-pound steers at 4½ cents a pound and shipped them to his farm in Iowa to feed. At that time the same grade of steer was selling in Chicago and Kansas City markets for 7½ cents. Why was it, I ask you, that steers in Canada were 4½ cents and in Chicago they were selling for 7½ cents? The answer is simple. The tariff is from 1½ to 2 cents per pound, and the freight from Canada down to these markets makes up the difference. Now, my question is, Who gets the difference between 4½ cents and 7½ cents if it is not the farmer who grew the steers? So any farmer in the United States who sold 10 head of steers weighing from 800 to 1,000 pounds received last fall \$20 per steer more than he would if there had been free trade, a difference of \$200.

"One could go on indefinitely, almost, with farm products protected by the present Fordney-McCumber tariff and show an advantage in farm prices directly chargeable to the tariff. The little item of eggs on the farm has a 5-cent duty per dozen; in fact, practically every product produced on the farm is protected. But when we add the total of just the three items discussed in detail you will find that the farmer is better off by \$700 because of the tariff.

"I will submit to my listeners that any 80 acres of land in the United States that is strictly agricultural can produce what I have mentioned."

The gentleman from Ohio makes the positive statement that "any 80 acres of land in the United States that is strictly agricultural" can produce for sale in one year 1,000 bushels of wheat, 1,000 pounds of wool, and 10 steers.

This struck me as a wonderful speech, and I began to study to find out how true it could be. Ohio sends great men to Congress. Ohio is a great State and a great farm State, but I never knew any 80 acres of land that could produce like this. I began to look it up, and I find that in the year 1924 the yield of wheat in Ohio was 16.8 bushels per acre, in 1923 it was 18.2, in 1922 it was 14 bushels, and in 1921 it was 12.4 bushels, making an average of 15.35 bushels per acre for the four years. On the basis of this yield it will take 65 acres to produce 1,000 bushels, even in Ohio. This leaves 15 acres of the 80-acre farm for a place for the buildings, pasture, and acreage for production of forage crops. The weight per fleece of wool in Ohio was 7.3 pounds in 1923 and 1924 and 7.4 pounds in 1921. To produce 1,000 pounds of wool there it will take about 150 sheep.

I was curious to know what amount of land it would take to feed this number of sheep and 10 steers, so I addressed an inquiry to the Department of Agriculture on this and other questions, and I received a reply bearing on this question as follows:

"With reference to the question regarding the number of acres of pasture required to carry steers and sheep, it is difficult to make a general statement. Taking southeastern Ohio as a specific locality, it can be estimated, roughly, that 100 acres would provide pasturage for 150 sheep and 50 to 75 acres for 10 steers. Of course, this statement is subject to the variations of local conditions."

According to this information it would take from 200 to 240 acres to produce the wheat and pasture the sheep and steers that Mr. BEGG thinks can be produced on 80 acres. How many acres additional it will take to raise hay and feed for winter feed I leave to the farmers who heard the radio speech to figure out.

Having made such a wrong guess in one direction, it follows that he is wrong in other directions.

The gentleman from Ohio states that the farmer selling 1,000 bushels of wheat gains on account of the tariff schedules under the Fordney-McCumber law to the extent of \$250. The Agriculture Yearbook for 1924 gives cost of production of wheat in Ohio and sales value of wheat per acre in 1923. The sales value was \$21.51 and the net cost per acre was \$23.74, a net loss of \$2.23 per acre, and this was in a year of better than average crop—namely, 21 bushels per acre. Whatever the wheat farmer gains by the tariff he loses on the operation of his farm to produce the wheat, and he goes in debt for the pleasure of raising it. The gentleman from Ohio figures a tariff gain for the American farmer over the Canadian farmer of 25 cents per bushel. There is no such gain for the American farmer. There is rarely any difference between Minneapolis and Winnipeg prices on wheat, and the price of wheat constantly stays below the tariff level by nearly the full amount of the tariff as disclosed by market prices. Farmers are always paid much less than terminal market prices and railroad freight charges are higher in the United States than in Canada. On June 21, this year, July wheat closed at Minneapolis at \$1.49½ and at Winnipeg at \$1.49¼. On June 24, the Minneapolis cash price was \$1.54 for No. 1 northern wheat, and the Winnipeg price the same day was \$1.51½ for the same grade. Had on that day the American farmer received the benefit of the full tariff protection and freight charges the Minneapolis price would have been \$2.10 per bushel. Based on the tariff protection extended to industry that taxes the farmer to the full amount of tariff and freight, the farmer, instead of being protected to the extent of \$250 on the sale of 1,000 bushels of wheat, is losing about \$500 by not obtaining the tariff protection due him and by having to pay the tariff tax to everybody else.

The American farmer does not gain 25 cents a pound on wool on account of the tariff. The tariff on wool in the grease is 12 cents per pound; most wool sold by farmers is of this kind. On washed wool it is 18 cents. It is inconceivable how the farmer, through the tariff, gains more than the amount of the tariff. Such has not been intended, anyway. The most the farmer can expect here is the increase in price to the extent of the tariff. The many dealers and middlemen absorb any differences in price over and above the tariff protection, and most of the time dealers and middlemen eat heavily into the tariff protection also.

The business of wool raising has not been such a profitable business as the Republicans would make us believe. The high protective tariff is based upon the difference in cost of production between the United States and the rest of the world. In 1919 the Tariff Commission investigated the cost of raising wool. The average United States cost for production per pound of wool was \$0.4503, including interest and \$0.3723 excluding interest. In Argentina, a wool-producing country, the production cost of wool was 17½ cents per pound, in the grease, less, including interest. The tariff protection is 12 cents per pound, between 5 and 6 cents less than actual difference in production costs. The tariff on wool is effective sometimes—once in a while—for that reason the woolgrower must be better off than the wheat grower, but the woolgrower has not rolled in wealth, as Mr. BEGG and other Republican leaders would have us believe.

For about a year after the passage of the tariff act of 1922 the difference between Boston and London prices was about the difference of the tariff plus freight. In 1923 there was a slump and the price difference fell below the tariff level. The price received by American

growers in 1924 and 1925 was 5 to 6 cents per grease pound, or 10 to 12 cents per scoured pound less than in 1923, and for the greater part of this time the difference between Boston and London prices was substantially less than the duty. This is gathered from the "Tariff on Wool," by Mark A. Smith. In June and July the domestic and foreign price was substantially the same. For the year 1925, while the domestic price ran stronger in the latter half of the year, the difference in favor of the domestic price averaged about 10 cents higher than the foreign price, but 2 cents lower than the tariff protection.

The Republican tariff experts in Congress seem to have a habit, handily, to confuse the price of washed wool with that of wool in the grease, for the edification of the farmers, to make a good, strong showing for the tariff and the Republican Party. All the statistics on the price of wool are misleading. The wool tariff was designed primarily for the wool manufacturers; incidentally it helps the farmer, but the farmer does not get the quoted Boston prices by a long way. The tariff schedules on woolen manufactures are effective. There is little fluctuation in the price of such goods, but the price of wool depends on prosperity and demand in the woolen manufactures. When there is no wool coming in, domestic prices tip downward, and when wool is re-exported from here the domestic price sags.

The gentleman from Ohio has miscalculated again. It is doubtful if the farmer has received much benefit from the tariff on wool that has not fallen as a crumb from the table of the woolen manufacturer.

The gentleman from Ohio also considers cattle. He takes for his illustration the story told on the floor of the House last winter by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHE], in which he depicted how the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] beat the tariff in order to gain the benefit of the tariff. This is the story that helped kill the Haugen bill, for Mr. TINCHE made the credulous ones believe that if everybody were as shrewd as Mr. HAUGEN there would be no corn crisis in Iowa. The illustration used by the gentleman from Ohio has no point. Mr. HAUGEN had corn to feed and went to buy cattle to feed it to. He went to Chicago, but did not like the price, \$7.50, at Chicago. So he sets out to find some place where he can buy cheaper, and finds that in Canada he can buy at \$4.50. Adding the tariff of \$1.50 per 100 pounds, the steers cost him \$6 per 100 pounds. He buys and ships the steers to Iowa, and when freight is paid, 58 cents per hundredweight from Winnipeg to Chicago, the steers cost \$6.58. With the additional charges for freight, etc., to bring the steers to Mr. Haugen's farm, they cost as much as if he had bought steers in Chicago, but he has a delightful experience of seeing the country and discovered that the tariff on cattle worked both ways, if we shall believe Mr. TINCHE, who first told the story. First, it is high enough to keep cattle out of the United States from other countries, and thereby raises the price to the farmer. Secondly, it is low enough to allow the farmer to ship in steers that he can feed his corn to and get the start over his neighbors who do not know about this wonderful scheme. Not a word has been said about how Mr. HAUGEN profited by his investment, except Mr. BEGG says he made \$20 per steer on the buy, and he thereby concludes that in a mysterious way, unbeknown to the farmer, on every steer a farmer sells by reason of the tariff there is a \$20 bill put into his pocket which the farmer puts into the bank. I have shown here that Mr. HAUGEN made nothing on his cattle transaction except the thrill it gave him to think he could beat the tariff.

In this House sits a real dirt farmer, who, besides, is an intelligent and broad-minded man, Mr. MENGES, of Pennsylvania. From a speech made by him on May 20, 1926, I take the liberty to quote to show just how the tariff on cattle puts money into the pocket of the farmer. Last November, due to information sent out by the Department of Agriculture, he bought cattle to feed.

I quote from Mr. MENGES's speech:

"I thought it was a good time to buy a bunch of cattle and feed into them low-priced corn, and I did. I paid \$8 a hundred for those cattle in the market in my neighboring city of Lancaster. I turned them over to my farm and fed them, and I want to leave it to the cattlemen here as to the result. We increased the weight from 840 to 1,224 pounds, or nearly 400 additional weight on every steer. I leave it to the cattlemen if that is not a fair increase. We started in the 1st of December to feed them, and fed them until the beginning of May, so that they gained nearly 3 pounds a day.

Well, I had to sell the cattle; they had to get off the farm because I had not the labor to keep them there. It was necessary to put the crops in and I had to sell the cattle, and what do you think I got? I got exactly what I paid—\$8 a hundred. They cost me \$124.40 a head just for the grain and hay and feed, with nothing for the labor, and I sold them for \$96.46 a head. Now, do not you think it is time I had a redeemer? [Laughter and applause.]

"I want every farmer in this Nation to have a chance to look up in the future and say, 'I know that my Redeemer liveth.'" [Applause.]

From this I gather that the steers' weight, 840 pounds apiece, bought at 8 cents a pound. They cost Mr. MENGES \$67.20. He fed each one "grain, hay, and feed" that cost \$124.40, making the cost to Mr. MENGES of each steer (not counting labor) \$191.60. He sold them at

\$96.46 a head, which means that Mr. MENGES lost on each steer he fed, \$94.96.

This raises a question I would like to have explained—why does the tariff work for the benefit of Mr. HAUGEN and not for Mr. MENGES?

To sum up, I admit that the tariff would benefit the farmer if it was made effective. This we asked to have done in the Haugen bill, but we were turned down hard. Instead of a farmer gaining \$700 by reason of tariff protection in the raising of 1,000 bushels of wheat and the production of 1,000 pounds of wool and 10 steers, the farmer loses, because the tariff does not function, on the wheat at least \$500, on the steers, according to Mr. MENGES's figures \$949.60, besides six months of hard labor. On the wool the profit is problematical so we can state the proposition in round figures and say that, instead of the farmer making \$700 as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio maintains, he loses \$1,500, due to a tariff protection that does not function and does not protect. This is more in keeping with the real farm situation and squares up more closely with the statistics on bankrupt farmers and busted banks in agricultural communities.

The farmers want no more of such tariff that does not protect. They demand a readjustment that will take away protection for monopoly and extend the helping hand to those who need it.

Mr. CARSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to-day, I insert herewith the following speech prepared by Hon. KNUD WEFALD, of Minnesota, for the Norwegian-American Centennial Celebration held at the State fairgrounds, Minnesota, June 8, 1925.

The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

THE LAND WE FOUND

We who celebrate during these days are a branch of the great Norŕna family. The inheritance that we brought with us when we came to this land had been laboriously built up and garnered out of the lean but sacred soil of Norway.

From time to time, down through the ages, there were young and adventuresome men who could not find a proper field for their activities there at home, so they struck out to seek new lands, found new homes, and to carry Norway's honored name over the earth. When they left the old nest they exercised good judgment as to where they settled; if the soil was good and the country fair they would fight a desperate fight to gain possession of it; once in possession they never relinquished their hold. Some founded kingdoms in Ireland; others took earldoms in England; early they took the Scotch isles and got a firm foothold on the north and west coast of Scotland. Norsemen founded the Dutchy of Normandy, from where again they conquered the Kingdom of England. They were the leaders and the initiators of the crusades. Italy saw the prowess of Norman warriors when, returning from the Holy Land as pilgrims, a handful of them chased the Saracens out of the land.

Wherever the Norsemen came they put their impress upon the country. Heathen as they were, such men had never been seen before; they defied men and the gods; they struggled with fate; yet in the end they calmly resigned themselves to the decrees of fate. Whether such men won or lost they stood out apart from the rest. First they put the defenses of the country in order, next they organized trade and commerce and delved into the peaceful pursuit of the people they were cast among, in keen competition in every field of endeavor. They were pupils and teachers at once. Truthfully we can say with the poet Vinje that they taught the French to fight and find the worth of chivalry and the English to write poetry and love the sea. At the same time they learned the milder ways of Christianity and the peaceful pursuits of industry.

But those men from Norway, that boldly struck out into the unknown to find new lands that were uninhabited and settled them with people of their own blood, inhospitable as these lands were, they were the men that wrote the headline to the greatest chapter of the history of modern times, "Free America."

With swords they wrote it upon the stony soil of Norway. Haughty and proud men wrote it with the sword when they made their stand against Harald the Hairfair and said, "We will know no masters; we will be free men." Out in the mists of dreamland they sailed and found Iceland, settled it, built it, and made it a republic, the home of poetry, the seat of dreams. To some of the Icelandic chiefs even the light restraint of the Icelandic Republic was irksome; so Greenland came to be found and settled. The memory of the homeland beckoned, the wealth, the fame, the glory of the homeland grew apace. So impatient became Lief, son of Erick the Red, to meet King Olav Trygvason, whose fame filled all the north, that he did what no man ever had done before, he sailed in a straight line across the Atlantic Ocean to Norway, not intending to stop in at Iceland and the other northern isles on the way, as had been customary up until that time. Going home to Greenland again with the friendship of King Olav and with the King's priest to carry the message of the "White Christ" to that utmost corner of the earth, he again set out in a straight line across the ocean, for strengthened in his new faith he had more courage still. He was the first ocean sailor and the boldest man that ever sailed a ship.

Storm tossed he battled with the waves for a long time and was driven so far south that he came upon the mainland of America. The time had come when men's eyes should behold the promised land. There was nothing of the accident in the finding of America. In his mysterious way God had decreed that the land that was to be "the land of the free" should be first seen and found by free men; that the "home of the brave" should have its soil first trodden by the bravest of the brave. Free men's desire to be free drove them into the unknown West. It does not seem mysterious that the first stepping stone on the way from the Old World to the New should be the stony island Republic of Iceland nor that the gates that opened into the "land of plenty" should be the icebergs of Greenland. When, during these festivities, we consider ourselves a part of the Norŕna family, when we know that Lief and his men in their day were more Norse than we are to-day, we might well say that "we found this land."

The Norse struck out west to find land, to found homes, to live, to die, to be themselves, not to exploit nor to find shorter trade route, not to bring the silks nor the spices of the Orient home to make life more luxurious. They were pushing the boundaries of the earth farther out into the unknown.

Well might Lief be called the "Lucky" who found the land where luck dwells.

The most wonderful stories of the saga's are those which tell of the settlements in Vinland. The facts of the story are varnished over with fable in order that the truth should keep better and be more fascinating. Thorŕn Karlsefne was the first homesteader in America of white men; no covered-wagon story was ever so interesting as was his and the other homesteaders, nor were there ever any stories more full of action. The first white child born in America was born to them, and they put the first white person into an American grave. Surely our kinfolks found this land.

That these settlements did not become permanent were due to natural causes. The voyage to Vinland was a dangerous one; not all of those who started out to go there got through. Iceland and Greenland could not spare many of their number for such a colonization. The Norse in the homeland had other great things to accomplish. First, to unite and build their own country. They could much more easily attain wealth and fame by going into the service of their kinfolks that were busy building new thrones in the richer countries of Europe; then came the crusades and they had to be along there.

With the close of the Viking period the Norsemen had performed their mission as a race of explorers and as the harbingers of a new age; they had awakened France and the British Isles to new life and had given these countries so much of their strong, red blood that Norway had no more to give. It had given strength to the world, but now it began to tear its own house down; it bled in internal strife and its best men slew each other. Then came pestilence and decay with the resultant poverty and lack of ambition; evil days fell upon Norway and its possessions as well. Providence could not use these men any further in its scheme to build the model country in the New World. Like Moses, they had seen the promised land, but like him they should not lead the multitude in there. Yet they were allowed to retain the vision of it and allowed to show the way to a new race of men, men with much of their own blood in them, men who should become the next world conquerors—the English.

There was a faint flicker of the old-time Norse spirit of adventure just before its dark and long night set in. The last expedition to Greenland and Vinland was led by Didrik Pining and John Kolp and was fitted out in Norway in 1472. Two Portuguese noblemen were with them and they bear historical testimony to the fact that they came as far south on the mainland of America as Newfoundland. This was just 20 years before Columbus set out from Palos and 24 years before John Cabot set out from Bristol on the voyage that took him to the mouth of the St. Lawrence River. For more than a hundred years before the sailing for the New World of Columbus and Cabot, Englishmen had sailed on Iceland to buy fish. Pining's expedition had left by way of Iceland. It does not require much imagination to surmise that knowledge of the New World came into England by way of Iceland.

We are not now celebrating for the purpose of taking any honors away from others nor to ask any especial honors for ourselves or for men of our race, but when we take stock of ourselves we bring historical facts out in the daylight.

Speaking as representatives of the Norŕna family, as apart from Anglo-Saxon, Germans, or others, we can truly say that we found this land.

About the time of Pining's expedition to America the Danish King of Norway mortgaged the Hebrides, the Shetland Isles, and the Orkneys to the King of Scotland and they were thereby forever lost to Norway. The dark night settled thick and fast over Norway. The people went to sleep, politically, intellectually, and culturally, only to wake up to national and racial consciousness in 1814.

Our second finding of America was different.

Individual adventuresome Norsemen had from time to time found their way to America, especially in the settlements of the Hollanders,

but also in the English settlements, but it was first with the sailing of the "Sloop folks" that we again began to rediscover America.

Slowly Norway again began to have surplus strength to give to others and the God that down through the centuries in such a mysterious way had allowed the Norse to do great deeds, to help build up great countries, and help found enduring governments, had decreed that this the most beautiful land he had ever created and where he intended to let men fashion the noblest government that men's minds would ever conceive, should not lack that strength of character in its fiber or in its moral make up that Norse blood would give it.

And so we came from mountain and from valley, from the sea. Came from the ice and the snow of the northland, out of the darkness of the polar night and out of the smiles of the midnight sun. Our new land welcomed us.

We came with the physical strength of the bear, ready and willing to do a day's work, was it ever so hard. Came with a brain that was clear and rested after a sleep of four centuries; came imbued with the principles of liberty, because our own liberty was so new found; of justice, because we had, like others, suffered injustice and of equality because we all were poor. We could understand the Declaration of Independence as soon as it was read to us. We came full of hope, full of faith in God, ready and willing to obey the laws of the land, to build it, and to defend it. We came not proud and haughty, like when our forebears of old came into other lands to levy tribute; but yet we came with heads erect, with confidence in ourselves and in our ability to carve out for ourselves homes in the wilderness and eventually a position in the social structure of the State on a par with the best of those that had come here before us.

We did not expect to find a "paradise"; we came not in search of "the fortunate isles"; we came to eat our bread in the sweat of our brow, and we have honestly done so. We have paid the full price for every foot of land that we own, for every honor we have attained, for all we have, for all we are.

It is so pleasant, however, to-day to remember that the gates were thrown wide open for us and that we were asked to step right in.

When we came here in numbers, our kinfolks, the English, Scotch, Irish, Germans, French, and the Swedes, had been here for years. The Vinland that Lef had found and that Karlsefne had made an attempt to settle, but had left as untouched by the hand of man as they found it, had become a great country, teeming with strength and hope and youth. A new Nation had arisen that were destined to become the most powerful among the nations of the earth, a Nation that had built a Government that stood foursquare upon the cornerstones of truth, liberty, justice, and equality, a Government that should shame the governments of the Old World and under which should grow up a new social order, by which the powers of government should flow to the Government from the people and the blessings of government flow back to the people again, contrary to the ideas of government in the Old World, where the fallacious notion had prevailed that the king was ordained as ruler from on high in order that he might exploit the people.

Greater and more far reaching in its consequences than the finding of America was the finding of this new theory of government, but this new theory of government could only be discovered in America. It had been sealed with the blood of the men that so boldly had proclaimed it. Only the fertile soil of America could sustain it in the days of its greatest trial. The young Hercules of the West had defied the mother country and fought it to a finish, as England when she finished her mission in bringing up the coming master of the world until he became of age, baptized him in blood.

That was accomplished before we came here; it cost us nothing; I often wonder if we realize what a gift we received when we were invited to come in and share the blessings that were bought with the blood of the revolutionary fathers. When we find it a task to keep the flame of liberty burning as it should, I wonder if we realize what it cost those men to light it in the first place.

Rawboned, courageous men and gentle and patient women had pushed the frontier of civilization, in spite of savages and other dangers, across the Alleghenies and into the fertile plains when we came. And we went West.

When I speak of the land we found I think of it as that part of the land that we have settled, that we own, and that we are primarily responsible for the welfare of, more so than any other part of the country. This is not the place to tell of its limitless natural resources, of its millions of people, of its gold and its treasure, of its wide domain, of its limitless possibilities, its inventive genius, nor of its financial sway over the world to-day.

We are full of wonder when we see the skyscrapers of our big cities, and we feel proud of the inventive genius of America that could conceive the idea and could furnish the strength to rear the habitations of man higher than the tower of Babel. We can feel the magic spell of California and Florida with their everblooming summer, and we are proud that these earthly paradises are part of our land, but they are no part of the new Normandy that we are building, they are not in the zones where our people are best fitted to dwell and to do their

best. On the plains of the Mississippi Valley and in the adjoining States most of us have settled.

The old spirit of adventure that drove our kinsmen of old out and away from home awoke in us again. Out in the vanguard of civilization they saw us for years and that was where the country needed us. The freedom of the frontier appealed to us—deep, black soil had always fascinated men of our race, possibly because the soil of the homeland was meager. We were more individualistic than perhaps any other people that came to these shores; we needed more room than others. The factory was no place for us; the mine did not appeal to us. To our mind such work was only for the slave or for the unfortunate ones. Westward we swarmed, ever westward, and in the wide expanses of land that became ours we have had a chance to ripen into citizenship in our own way. Lucky indeed have we been!

While we have tried our hand at any kind of honest labor that came our way, farming became our chief calling. From the little Kendal colony we went to Fox River, to Muskego, to Jefferson Prairie, to Koshkonong, on and on where soil was to be had upon which grain will grow as the fruit of honest toil. We have made the country bloom and blossom like the rose. To-day farm homes of Norsemen in America are places of abode that might well be envied them by people of almost every other land. Now we are becoming rooted in this land; our hardest pioneering work is over; soon we will have time to reflect on what we have accomplished and to speculate on what is to come. We have been in work up above our ears. After a little we will begin to sing of home, of the beauty of this land of ours, of the grandeur of its moral victories and achievements.

What can be fairer than a summer day in Minnesota or in Wisconsin or in Iowa or in the Dakotas? What slight is there in the world that at the same time holds in it beauty, hope, wonder, and sentiment like the prairie when on a summer day it rolls on, boundless as the ocean, when its silken waves of growing grain in the changing play of light and shadow out of the amber and gold of sunrise into the misty blue of night? Yet has no man or no woman among us been able so far to paint in song or story these scenes so that they have gripped our hearts. But the time will come when we shall sing of home with the warmth that Ivar Aasen sang, when we shall through art interpret our land and our people's deeds and aspirations as well as it has even been done in the land we came from, where they have not had to break so much new soil or build as many new homes as we have built since we came here.

The Western Plains States will be our second home; from here will our descendants spread over the whole land, for this is the heart of the country. Here we have our greatest holdings. No people listed in the census as being of foreign stock own as much of American soil, in proportion to their numbers, as do we. There are in our country to-day more than 50,000 farmers born in Norway; about 44,000 of these are farm owners, and they own nearly 11,000,000 acres of farm lands, or more than four times all the land in crop and wild meadow in Norway at the beginning of this century. Only the Germans own more land than we do, but they are three times as many as we are. We own more acres in Minnesota, North Dakota, and Montana than people of any other nationality. We come second in Wisconsin and in South Dakota, third in the State of Washington, and fifth in Iowa. We own acres in every State in the Union except in Delaware. According to the census figures, the average Norseman's farm here is worth about \$15,000. This, of course, does not take account of debt nor of after-war deflation of values; but it is evident that we own a goodly share of America's virgin soil.

The free homestead act appealed especially to the Norsemen, and from the time that this law came into operation dates our heaviest immigration into this country. The 160 acres has been the goal of the Norseman, but the Norse farmer has exceeded his ambition. The average Norse farm here to-day is 240 acres. The day laborer, the "husmand," the impoverished farmer, came here from Norway and obtained a farm of his own, a farm among the best in the world, on condition that he should be a good citizen and help bear the burden of building up the country. The price in money that he paid was only nominal as long as there were free acres to be had. That he has made good and paid the full price of citizenship is attested to by the fact that the Chief Executive of this Nation has graced these festivities with his presence and voiced the appreciation of our Government.

Indeed, has this second viking exodus from Norway, the greatest one that ever occurred, been a wonderful period in the life of our race. Upon the prairies of America live now as many Norsemen as among the mountains of Norway. From now on it will be a close race between them to see who accomplish the bigger and the better things. While racially the same, we are now two separate and distinct people; our task is not to try to fashion this land more and more like Norway, which in the beginning we thought it was our duty to do, but to make it more unlike any other country, a country for others to fashion after, a country that shall attain the ideal.

There were not so many of us here when Lincoln called on the people to come to the defense of the Constitution, but we were among the

first to answer the call; they said of us that we fought with reckless daring. We have shirked no obligation or no call to battle since. Yet so far we have, perhaps, received more than we have given. We did not find this land only to take and to receive, but to give as well. Now we have material wealth, and we have freely given of it when called on; we might give of that until it becomes exhausted, but we shall yet have boundless and limitless love and devotion to give to our country. For we have come into possession of the land that God showed men of our race and let them tell the world about. He kept us out of it for eight centuries in order that when we reached it we should love it the more. Surely no people in history ever had reason to bear stronger love to the country that they found, the country of their choice.

Ten thousand years from now when history speaks of the share that the Norse had in the finding and settlement of America, it may read about like this: "Of white men, Leif was the first one that found it, Karlsefne was the first homesteader, Snorre the first child born there; later men from Norway settled in the heart of the country and found good homes there."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 10827

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, at this time we have under consideration the conference report on the Army air bill, H. R. 10827. Upon a former day we discussed the provisions of this measure as it passed the House. In the main, the conference report preserves the integrity of the measure as it passed the House, and it is not my purpose to discuss the various features contained in the original bill. We will direct our attention to section 10 of this bill as it was agreed upon in conference, which is substantially the language agreed upon by the Joint Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs in measures which were introduced on May 27, 1926, by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. The bills were H. R. 12471 and H. R. 12472, respectively, and were identical in language except that the former affected the policy of the War Department whereas the latter pertained to the Navy Department. These measures were considered by the full committees to which they were referred and were unanimously reported to the House for passage by the gentlemen who introduced them.

Subsequently the Committee on Rules held hearings upon them and granted a rule for their consideration. After the granting of the rule, on account of the nearness to the end of the session it was thought best to put these measures on as amendment to the Army air bill (H. R. 10827) in conference, and by coupling up the two departments, War and Navy, we to-day consider H. R. 12471 and H. R. 12472 in all substantial respects as section 10 of the Army air bill (H. R. 10827) as reported to the House by its conferees.

We will discuss this section as it applies to the War Department, but should state that it will have the same application to the Navy Department, which is one of the strong reasons for such or similar legislation.

THE HISTORY OF THE BILL

Since the signing of the armistice, with characteristic perseverance patriotic men have been endeavoring to throw the searchlight of truth upon our aircraft situation. There have been since the close of the war more than 21 major investigations and studies of this subject. Charges have been made by gentlemen having official status in the Government and those in civil life. Hundreds and hundreds of witnesses have testified upon the various aspects of the subject; thousands and thousands of pages of testimony written; many recommendations made. Before this Congress convened there had been little if anything done by way of legislation to obviate just criticism in which our country found itself in respect of aviation.

Heretofore on this floor I have paid my respect and tribute to the President's Aircraft Board (Morrow Board) and to the select committee of this House commonly known as the Lampert committee. This country is in their debt. Their work has been and will continue to be of tremendous benefit to all students of this problem. The work of the Lampert committee was particularly comprehensive. They took some 3,500 pages of testimony; they studied this problem for more than 11 months;

and the recommendations of this committee, as well as those of the Morrow Board; certainly have been helpful to those of us engaged in the preparation of this legislation. Of course, the reports of these boards did not submit the form of legislation. They made the diagnosis of the disease and submitted the matter to Congress to prepare the medicine.

The Committee on Military Affairs held hearings over a period of months upon the general subject of aviation and its relation to the other armed forces. But these hearings were mainly concerned with the increase of our air forces both in equipment and personnel. The committee could not, because of the time element, give all this period to the particular subjects of design and procurement.

It was thought best to have joint hearings before the Committees on Naval Affairs and Military Affairs upon a bill changing the existing law as to the procurement of new designs and aircraft therefrom. Many days were spent in these hearings. The testimony was confined to the betterment of conditions affecting designs, the encouragement of inventors, and the procurement in quantity production. All viewpoints were presented. Everyone appearing before this committee conceded that the existing laws pertaining to design and procurement were so inflexible that the Government could not readily obtain the best to be had in aircraft, and all recognized the need to stimulate not only the industry in this country but the inventive genius of our land. As was usual, there was practically unanimity relative to the condition of the patient, but the prescription had yet to be written and the medicine prescribed.

This responsible task was intrusted to a smaller group of men who composed a joint subcommittee of the two committees aforesaid, with five members from each committee. The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee [Mr. BUTLER] designated the following gentlemen to this important assignment: Mr. VINSON of Georgia; Mr. STEVENS, of Ohio; Mr. COYLE, of Pennsylvania; Mr. WOODRUFF, of Michigan; and Mr. GAMBRIEL, of Maryland; and the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. JAMES] appointed Mr. WAINWRIGHT, of New York; Mr. FROTHINGHAM, of Massachusetts; Mr. GARRETT of Texas; Mr. McSWAIN, of South Carolina; and myself.

Immediately upon creation of this joint subcommittee we entered upon our duties. We had at our disposal the entire forces of the War and Navy Departments. Representatives from the office of the Judge Advocate of the Army and Navy were present throughout our sittings; these gentlemen kept us constantly informed of the legal side involved. Supply officers from both the Army and Navy were at all times present, presenting the practical side of the problem. Inventors of distinction impressed upon us the conditions under which they had attempted to function in the days gone by. Representatives from the air forces of the Army and the similar branch of the Navy sat in with us. Toward the conclusion of our deliberations General Patrick gave us the benefit of his views upon the subject. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy appeared before the joint subcommittee expressing their views on various phases of the proposed legislation.

Draft after draft was prepared, carefully considered, attacked from all the angles we could conceive; sometimes shot to pieces beyond repair; at other times patched up to be the center of renewed attack. In short, a most conscientious effort has been made by this joint subcommittee, representing all points of view on the subject, to arrive at legislation which will, it is hoped, effectually benefit the Government in its air strength and the industry which must be kept alive.

Subsequent to the introduction of the bill in the House and the report of the committee filed, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Navy have given further careful consideration to these measures and have expressed their approbation thereof in letters submitted to the respective committees.

It is but proper that a word of appreciation should be recorded relative to the handwork of the acting chairman of our committee, Mr. JAMES, in the preparation of this bill. As the chairman of our committee he was active in the initiation of the idea to designate the joint subcommittee to undertake the preparation of this legislation. While not a member of the joint subcommittee during the last two weeks he actively participated in the drafting of the bill. Early in the action of the joint subcommittee, so violently opposed were the views held by the members of the joint subcommittee that it seemed that the storm of discussion had blown into a hurricane and that the different points of view could not be reconciled. His calm, steady hand did much toward continuing the efforts to submit legislation of this character. I feel that it is fitting that his service in this connection should be noted and appreciated.

It is hoped that the proposed legislation will mark a new era in the history of aviation in America. If it does, the efforts of FRANK JAMES aforesaid should always be remembered, but the reward that goes with duty well performed should not be confined alone to the legislation prepared by the subcommittee, but it also comes from his splendid fight for improved conditions in the Air Corps growing out of his labors in the preparation of the five-year building program, to which this subcommittee bill was attached in conference. In the quietude of the conference room, away from the public's gaze, the gentleman from Michigan [FRANK JAMES] fought a most courageous fight for the improvement of conditions in matters pertaining to aviation. He fought a grim, desperate fight. Backed with a clear knowledge of his subject and conscious of the right, he maintained the dignity of the House and preserved the integrity of the Army air bill. His work as acting chairman of our committee stamps him as one of the strong men of the House.

THE PURPOSE OF THE BILL

In the eight years preceding 1916 our Government had purchased only 59 airplanes. Shortly thereafter the war came upon us, and naturally we had no opportunity to consider well-defined plans for the future of the aircraft industry. Naturally the policy then was: "Get planes and get them now." Since the war every student of the subject has realized that we have no policy that will either permit the departments to obtain the best in aircraft or to stimulate the genius of the country; there is nothing in the existing law that permits any encouragement to the industry, rather it tends toward the destruction of it.

It is commonplace to state that the art of flying and the aviation industry is in its infancy. No one will contradict that statement. Since the war, there has been a stupendous impetus in the art; in the future, it will advance in enormous strides. But, in this stage of its development, we have been pursuing the same course in the purchase of our planes as if it were a fully developed art. The existing law is inflexible, and under its operation the departments have no discretion in the manner in which our aircraft must be procured (and by aircraft in this discussion I include aircraft parts and aeronautical accessories). The existing law relative to the subject of purchase of our aircraft is interwoven with and builded upon the statutes which relate to the purchase of all other material and supplies for the Government. One may inquire why the same rules of law governing in such matters would not be applicable in respect of aircraft. There is a material difference. In the matter of supplies, we have a standardization. In aviation, standardization has not arrived, and, as yet, does not exist. It is a changing art; an art in which the best to-day is mediocre to-morrow.

I attempted to discuss the vital importance of aircraft in time of war in a speech delivered May 6th of this year, so I will not, at this time, discuss in detail the necessity of aircraft to this country. I am proceeding upon the assumption, which, in my opinion, is incontrovertible, that it is essential to this country's welfare to keep pace with the world in development of its aircraft and that it is mandatory to have an aircraft industry in this country that can present to us, after reasonable explanation, our war-time needs in this respect.

The purpose underlying this measure is to permit our Government to secure the most highly developed types of aircraft obtainable, and, what may be even more important in time of national stress, to encourage the inventive minds of our country and the industry itself. These ends are sought by the removal of certain legislative restrictions in which the Government finds itself entwined in the purchase of its aircraft. We are setting up new machinery for this purpose. The liberalization of the existing law relative to aircraft procurement has been deferred, due probably to some extent to the hesitancy, inherent more or less in us all, to make a change. It is the dread of the new. The demagogue might assert certain principles of economics might have been laid aside in order that the industry might receive benefit. We respectfully challenge the accuracy of such charge, but, assuming it, for the sake of argument, to be true, it would be well justified in the instant case, in virtue of the fact that a stable aircraft industry is essential in the defense plan of this Nation; and particularly would it be justified now in virtue of the weakened condition of this industry.

THE AVIATION INDUSTRY

In the early part of 1919, the American Aviation Mission, of which Benedict Crowell, then Assistant Secretary of War, was chairman, was sent to Europe to make a study of the air problems. They visited France, Italy, and England. After

exhaustive study at home and abroad, on July 19, 1919, they submitted to the Secretary of War, a very pretentious report. In the very beginning of the report we find a most startling statement. It is—

Ninety per cent of the American industry created during the war has been liquidated. Unless some definite policy is adopted by the Government, it is inevitable that the remaining 10 per cent will also disappear.

Further in their report we find:

That no sudden creation of aerial equipment to meet a national emergency already at hand is possible. It has been proven within the experience of every nation engaged in the war that two years or more of high-pressure effort have been needed to achieve the quantity production of aircraft, aircraft engines, and accessory equipment. * * *

Later, in April, 1923, the Lassiter Board made a very clear study of the air problem, including the industry end of it, and they said in part:

The aircraft industry in the United States at present is entirely inadequate to meet peace and war requirements; it is rapidly diminishing, and under present conditions will soon practically disappear. It depends for its existence almost wholly upon orders placed by governmental services. * * * The development of commercial aviation must be depended upon, at least for the immediate future, if this industry is to be kept alive. Should a national emergency confront this country within the next few years, the Air Service would not be able to play its part in meeting it.

It was to this statement of the report of the Lassiter Board to which the Lampert committee referred in this statement:

That contracts given to aircraft builders have not resulted in excessive profits, but, on the contrary, the aircraft industry, dependent on Government contracts, has been liquidating and going out of business to such an extent that the statement in the Lassiter Board report that "it (the aircraft industry) is rapidly diminishing under present conditions and will soon practically disappear" is justified.

At this point it might be well to insert the findings of the Lampert committee relative to the condition in which the industry has arrived at its present weakened condition. We submit that this measure proposes to rectify, to some degree, the conditions referred to as (b), (d), and (e) thereof. The statement of this committee is as follows:

The committee found unanimity of opinion from all sources—military, naval, commercial, and industrial—that the aviation industry is an essential part of national defense and must be maintained. The committee finds as follows:

(1) That the aviation industry in the United States has dwindled and is dwindling; and that the principal causes of the weakness of the industry are as follows:

- (a) Lack of continuity in Government orders.
- (b) Losses on Government contracts, both experimental and production.
- (c) Direct competition by Government plants.
- (d) Failure to recognize and protect design rights.
- (e) A destructive system of competitive bidding.
- (f) Discouragement of enterprise and individual efforts as the result of more than 20 investigations of various sorts in a period of eight years.
- (g) Lack of confidence and mutual understanding among contractors themselves.
- (h) Failure of the industry to develop commercial and export trade.

This brings the condition of the industry down to December, 1925, but we have even later evidence of the serious condition in which we find the industry to-day. We will quote from the testimony of Mr. MADDEN, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, before the joint committee which was considering this particular subject on the 21st day of April, 1926. In part Mr. MADDEN said:

Our aircraft industry to-day is just a shell. It has no substance, and the reason that it has no substance lies in the policies which have been followed by our Army and Navy purchasing authorities under the restrictions of existing law. I do not blame the Army and Navy for carrying out those policies. We perhaps are as much to blame as they, though I am sure that they have not exercised the foresight and the vision that I sometimes think they should.

In the face of this sort of treatment of the aircraft industry in England our treatment of the aircraft industry in the United States is, it seems to me, rather unusual. Here we have a struggling industry, a mere shadow of what we ought to have, existing, I might say, in spite of the Government—and I wish to interpolate here that if there is any one thing in which the Government should exercise a wise influence it

is in the development of our aircraft service, to keep it up to the standard of the aircraft service of other countries.

We really wish and need an aircraft industry in the United States, not particularly for what it may do for us in peace time, because we do not really need it in time of peace so much, but for what it may do for us in time of war.

In the days gone by it has been popular to charge that the concerns manufacturing aircraft have been in collusion with corrupt purchasing agents in both the Army and Navy. It was such charges that brought into existence the Lampert Committee, but their findings of fact did not substantiate these accusations. In their exhaustive search into this question they found that there had been no corruption in either the Army or Navy of the officers controlling the purchase of aircraft; they found that instead of vast profits being made in the manufacture of aircraft quite the reverse was true. We have already noticed what their views were relative to the languishing condition in which to-day the industry finds itself.

THE BILL

This is new legislation. It is the adoption of a new policy, which, it is hoped, will permit the departments to procure both highly improved types in design, and the quantity production required to fill our needs therefrom. We submit this measure as a stimulus to the inventive genius of the country and which we believe will be of benefit to the industry.

Performance, rather than price, is the foundation stone upon which this proposed legislation is built. In the matter of design, the fullest competition which our minds could evolve, is provided. A monetary incentive is provided the designing talent and the inventive genius of our Nation, together with the reasonable certainty that proper recognition will be given his efforts. In our judgment, the interests of the Government relative to the most of the aircraft produced is fully protected.

COMPETITION IN DESIGNS (Subsection a to g, inclusive)

We are aware of no better manner in which to discuss the workings of these sections than to assume the case that would put the machinery in motion.

A new design is desired by the Secretary of War. It is necessary for the department to advertise when the design competition will be held. The advertisement shall be for a period of 30 days in at least three of the leading aeronautical journals, and in such other manner as the Secretary may deem advisable. Of course, the kind of aircraft and the quantity desired is contained in the advertisement. All persons interested receive identic information as to the conditions, requirements, and specifications. There must be listed specifically the respective measures of merit, expressed in rates per centum, to be used in determining the merits of the design. These measures of merits must be adhered to throughout this entire competition. The competitors submit their designs in sealed communications which must be kept intact until 60 days from the expiration of the advertising period shall have elapsed. With the designs there must be submitted a graduated scale of prices for which they will construct such aircraft, or any part thereof. It shall also contain the price to the Government of the design should purchase be desired.

A statement of the procedure to this point makes it obvious that favoritism to any appreciable extent will be eliminated. The measures of merit, the grades which must be given to the features involved, determine beyond question the justice of the award, which will now be discussed.

The day for opening the bids arrives. The designs are referred to a board appointed by the Secretary of War, who grade the papers in accord with the measures of merit heretofore referred to. As soon as practicable, they shall report to the Secretary. The time is fixed when, after notification, the competitors may appear and hear the public announcement of the result. In this announcement the percentages awarded to each of the features of the design submitted, as well as the price therefor, is made public.

In the event the Secretary of War deems it advantageous to the Government, the new design may be forthwith put in actual production. There are three ways under this machinery in which the new design may be reduced to the finished product.

In the first place, if the competitor is capable of manufacturing, within a reasonable time, the aircraft design, and a reasonable price therefor can be agreed upon, the Secretary may contract with the winner of this competition for the aircraft, or any separable part thereof. In no event shall the contract price exceed the amount submitted in the bid.

Should it happen that the designer can not produce the finished product the Secretary is authorized to purchase from him the design in question for the use of the Government, provided a reasonable price can be agreed upon.

However, a case may arise in which the designer and the Secretary are unable to agree upon a reasonable price for the design. In that event this legislation would authorize the Secretary to retain and use the design and to advertise for bids and let the contract for the construction of the aircraft in accordance with the design to the lowest responsible bidder. In the event this latter method is pursued, we would have secured for the Government that which they desired in the way of the new type. Also, we have provided the means whereby the inventor will be taken care of and compensated, which we will consider later on.

PURCHASE FOR EXPERIMENTAL PURPOSE (Subsection k)

This is a change from the existing law. It would permit the purchase for experimental purpose of aircraft either at home or abroad. We submit that this is a signal development of the aircraft obtainable for our Government, a signal step in the history of air development in this country.

In virtue of this section aircraft may be procured for experimental purposes. It would permit the skilled minds of this country to keep apace with the strides of the world in aviation; furthermore, it presents the opportunity for American genius not only to become familiar with the most advanced types known but even to improve upon them.

In the event that the Secretary should determine that the type purchased under this section is that which is desired, either in its original state or after improvements may be suggested, he may, in his discretion, contract for the production of this plane under competitive conditions with manufacturing concerns located within the continental United States and subject to the further conditions found in section 6 of this bill.

DESIGNS REDUCED TO PRACTICE (Subsection q)

This section of the bill changes existing law; it enlarges the scope of procurement. This section would authorize the Secretary, when in his opinion the best interests of this Government would be served, to contract for quantity production of aircraft upon designs submitted to him which had been reduced to practice and found suitable for the purpose intended.

In order to make ourselves clear, we will assume a hypothetical case under existing law. A manufacturing establishment has developed the design of an airplane and from this design has constructed the finished product. This particular plane far surpasses any known type. It may have 25 miles per hour more speed than any existing plane; it might have a ceiling of 5,000 feet more than any existing plane. Naturally the Government is highly desirous of purchasing it. Under existing law it can not do it. Under existing law it can not contract for quantity production of it. There is only one course open to the Government. It must take this particular plane, dissect it, work up its specifications that bring about these marked results, and advertise to all the industry for the construction of this plane. The design of this plane, together with the cost of production, may stand its owners several hundred thousand dollars; but, in the competition which ensues, the manufacturing concern which did not develop it does not have to consider the development costs in the bid which it submits to the Government. The history of aviation in this country is full of cases of this character in which the originator of the superior plane fails in not being able to submit the lowest price. With this procedure in vogue, it has happened that the plane when constructed by the stranger to its origination does not have the performance of the designer's own plane. With such a condition prevailing, it is not strange that there is little or no incentive to the industry to develop a new design and reduce it to actual practice.

It is the purpose of this section to obviate this condition and to permit the Secretary to contract for quantity production when the new design has been reduced to practice and meets his approbation. The Secretary is charged with the responsibility of purchasing these planes at a reasonable price. In this way, we submit that the Government again secures the best obtainable, and protects the originator of the advanced idea.

COMPENSATION FOR DESIGN RIGHTS (Subsections i and r)

At the present time, there is no cause of action for the taking of a design right. The Lampert committee was most emphatic in their objections to the Government taking valuable design rights of individuals and permitting them to be used by others

without compensation. One of the reasons which they assign for the present condition of the industry is this policy which has been pursued by this Government. In the language of this committee, there has been a "failure to recognize and protect design rights."

It is the thought of your committee that the designers would be protected in their efforts to improve the art of aviation. It may be difficult to establish to the satisfaction of the court that they are entitled to compensation for the use by the Government, but certainly the difficulty in proving their case should not be a conclusive argument against the remedy. The complainant must prove his case.

In this bill, we set up two modes whereby compensation may be obtained from the Government for the use and manufacture of such design rights. In section 5 thereof, a complainant may within four years from the date of such use institute an action in the Court of Claims. The compensation herein allowed is limited to the use of the design after this bill becomes law. In the bill as reported from the committee, the forum for this relief was in either the Federal Court of the District of Columbia, or in the District Court of the United States for the district in which the claimant resides. The conferees thought that this would incur too much trouble and expense in behalf of the Government in defending such litigation and they selected the same forum in which claims for compensation growing out of the use of patented articles by the Government may be bought.

Relating to designs, another remedy has been offered. In section 14 of the bill, a board composed of the Assistant Secretary of War, and Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and an Assistant Secretary of Commerce shall evaluate designs for aircraft submitted to it and determine whether the use thereof by the Government is desirable or necessary. Authority is conferred upon them to pay any sum, not in excess of \$75,000, for any one design to the said designer for the ownership or the nonexclusive right of the United States to the use of the design.

This latter section, in our opinion, will dispense with considerable litigation and presents a fair method in which matters of this kind may be adjusted.

AUDITS (Subsection l)

We provide that the plant and books of any contractor furnishing or constructing aircraft for the Government shall at all times be subject to inspection and audit by any person designated by the head of any executive department of the Government. These audits and reports of inspection shall be preserved for a period of 10 years, and shall be subject to inspection by any committee of Congress.

In virtue of this inspection and audit the department can be fully advised relative to the manufacturing costs. With this information he certainly should be in position to determine what would be a reasonable price for the aircraft purchased and thereby protect the Government against excessive profits and, incidentally, protect the contractor against financial ruin. Several companies have been forced out of business because of huge losses sustained on governmental contracts.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY (Subsection m)

The Secretary shall annually make a detailed and itemized report to Congress of all of the department's operations under this act. He must set forth names and addresses of all competitors and of all persons having been awarded contracts, together with the price paid therefor and the reasons for his awarding such contracts to such persons. It is the thought of the committee that such provision will be an added reason for the very best execution of the proposed legislation.

MISCELLANEOUS SECTIONS

We have endeavored to discuss what we consider to be the major sections of the bill. There are several others which are closely related to the primary purpose of the bill. They clearly show on their face their purpose without need of elaborate elucidation.

It is not our purpose to minimize their importance, but, as we view it, they are ancillary to the major purposes heretofore discussed. We will discuss these sections at this time.

Subsection h (Arbitration). In the event a reasonable showing of error in the announcement of the design competition is presented to the Secretary, then a board of arbitration is set up to determine whether the error actually exists. The decision of the arbitration board shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary and will in no wise upset any contract made in conformity with the original announcement. It is thought that this machinery will cause the closest possible scrutiny of the designs submitted.

Subsection j (American ownership and control of the manufacturing plants). Only manufacturing plants located within the continental limits of the United States which are owned by citizens thereof, or if a corporation, not less than three-fourths of its capital stock is owned by citizens thereof, are eligible to secure any contract under this act. Further, it requires the board of directors to be composed of citizens of the United States.

In the case of a corporation and the ownership of its stock, the Secretary must have knowledge of the status.

A further provision herein forbids any aliens engaged in this character of work to have access to the plans and specifications of the work under consideration or to participate in a contract trial.

Subsection n (Release of claim). The vendor of designs and any contractor under the provisions of this act are required to execute a release of any and all claims against this Government arising out of the sale or the contract aforesaid.

Subsection o (Appropriations). This section provides that all appropriations made for the procurement of aircraft or the components thereof shall be available for the payment of the purchase price of designs and the costs of arbitration herein authorized.

Subsection p (Collusion in competition). This is a penal statute and makes it an offense for anyone by collusion, understanding, or arrangement, express or implied, which deprive the Government of the benefits of full and free competition provided for in this act.

FAILURE TO PERMIT FULL AUDIT

Likewise, the deprivation of the Government of the benefit of a full and free audit of the books of any person receiving a contract under this act, so far as may be necessary to disclose the exact cost of executing such contract is made unlawful.

The penalty for the violation of either of the foregoing paragraphs is a fine not exceeding \$20,000 or imprisonment not exceeding five years, or both, in the discretion of the court.

LOWEST RESPONSIBLE BIDDER (Subsection t)

We will quote it in full:

Hereafter whenever the Secretary of War or any chief of bureau of the War Department duly authorized by him shall enter into a contract for or on behalf of the United States, said Secretary or chief of bureau is hereby authorized to award such contract to the bidder that the Secretary or chief of bureau shall find to be the lowest responsible one that can satisfactorily perform the work or the service required to the best advantage of the Government's interests; and the decision of the Secretary of War as to the award of such contract, the interpretation of the provisions of the contract, and the application and administration of the contract shall not be reviewable, otherwise than as may be therein provided for, by any officer or tribunal of the United States except the Attorney General and the Federal courts.

Subsection s defines the terms "winner" or "winners" mentioned in the act to be not more than three competitors having the highest figures of merit.

IN CONCLUSION

This section, affecting the policy to be pursued by the War and Navy Departments, bears the approbation of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. However, it should be stated that subsections h and p, which relate to arbitration procedure, and the penal section, respectively, are not enthusiastically received. Even with their views upon these particular sections, they heartily indorse the bill as a whole. The members of the joint subcommittee, as well as the members of the full committee, have worked assiduously upon this proposed legislation. We offer it to you in the best of motives. We submit it to the House for passage.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on January 19 the Military Affairs Committee of the House began hearings on a "department of defense" and "unification of the Air Service." These hearings began with H. R. 46, a bill to reconstitute the War Department as it originally existed by the restoration to it of all those defense functions now carried on by the Navy Department, to reorganize the War Department as thus reconstituted, to change the name of such department to the department of defense, and for other purposes. I introduced this bill on the opening day of this Congress, such bill being the amplification of a similar measure which I proposed in the Sixty-eighth Congress, as the result of hearings on the subject of air defenses before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House.

The hearings thus began on January 19 were continued to March 9, and covered the whole subject of national defense, with special reference to reorganization of the Air Service.

The result of these hearings, which occupied nearly 1,400 pages, and which take up all recommendations made by the Lassiter Board and various other air boards, since the war, was H. R. 10827, providing for a five-year building program for the air forces of the Army and creating the Air Corps of the Army.

This bill passed the House, and after certain amendments by the Senate a conference committee was appointed, which sat for several weeks in almost daily session in order to perfect the law for air defenses of the Army of the United States.

The conferees on many occasions sat throughout the day. The managers on the part of the Senate were Senator WADSWORTH, Senator BINGHAM, and Senator SHEPPARD. The managers on the part of the House were Representatives JAMES, WURZBACH, QUIN, McSWAIN, and myself. The conference went over fully all question involved, and I think that the House should know the most useful work that was done by the acting chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee [Mr. JAMES], who was chairman of the House managers, and by Senators WADSWORTH and BINGHAM. The House should also know what was done in the conference by Mr. McSWAIN, with especial reference to procurement of aircraft. A few days ago the Senate passed the conference report, and when you pass it this afternoon, as you undoubtedly will do, you will complete the legislation on the air defenses of the United States. It is not necessary to place before you at this point the whole of the conference report, but I think it will be of value to call particularly to your attention the statement on behalf of the managers of the House, which is as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House on the bill H. R. 10827 state with reference to the amendments of the Senate as follows:

Amendment No. 1, agreed to with an amendment, provides that the Chief of the Air Corps, at least two brigadier generals and at least 90 per cent of the officers in each grade below that of brigadier general shall be flying officers, but in time of war the 10 per cent of nonflyers out of the total number of officers that may be authorized for the Air Corps for such war may be immediately commissioned; however, as soon as flyers can be trained the ratio of at least 90 per cent flyers to 10 per cent nonflyers must be reestablished.

Amendment No. 2, agreed to with an amendment, provides that officers who may possess special qualifications other than as flyers may be detailed to the Air Corps or permanently commissioned therein upon the specific recommendation of the Secretary of War, but that such officers, together with those flying officers who shall have become disqualified for flying, shall not be included among the 90 per cent of flying officers in each grade below that of brigadier general provided in amendment No. 1, thus insuring that there shall be at least 90 per cent effective flying officers in the Air Corps at all times except during the early stages of a war.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4, agreed to with amendments, clarify the definition of a flying officer and establish a standard in time of peace for all pilots of heavier-than-air craft similar to that established in H. R. 9690 for similar ratings in the Navy. These amendments also provide that in time of war a flying officer may include any officer who has received an aeronautical rating as a pilot of service types of aircraft and also any officer who has received an aeronautical rating as an observer.

Amendment No. 5 strikes out language that is in conflict with language in section 6 of this bill. This language was carried over from section 13a of the national defense act which section 2 of this bill is designed to replace but is now no longer necessary in view of the additional language placed in section 6 of this bill.

Amendment No. 6 provides with regard to the use of enlisted pilots in tactical units of the Air Corps that the provision shall be applicable in time of peace only, as sufficient experience has not been gained to warrant establishing this principle in law for time of war.

Amendment No. 7, agreed to with an amendment, provides for the four lower grades of enlisted men in the Air Corps to receive ratings as air mechanics, first class, and air mechanics, second class, when they possess the necessary technical qualifications therefor, and are engaged upon the duties pertaining thereto, and when so rated shall receive the pay of the second and third grades, respectively. Not to exceed 14 per cent of the total authorized enlisted strength of the Air Corps are to be so rated. This matter of mechanics' ratings was considered worthy of special consideration in the Air Corps as it involved the safety of men's lives as well as the preservation of most valuable Government property.

Amendments Nos. 8, 9, and 10, agreed to with amendments, provide for a limited number of officers of the Air Corps to receive temporary higher rank, including pay and allowances appropriate to such rank, when assigned to certain special duties, and for this temporary rank to be limited to two grades above the permanent rank of the officer concerned. The last amendment simply clarifies the language.

Amendment No. 11, agreed to with an amendment, provides for the next three years following July 1, 1926, for the creation of air

sections in the War Department General Staff to be headed by an officer detailed from the Air Corps. This is necessary in order to take care of the present shortage of officers of suitable rank and qualifications for membership on the General Staff. It is estimated that sufficient Air Corps officers will be available in three years to place this branch on a parity with other branches in this respect and thus remove the necessity at that time for this special provision.

Amendments Nos. 12, 13, 17, and 34 simply affect the numbering of the sections.

Amendment No. 14, agreed to with an amendment, provides for the appointment of the Chief of the Air Corps for the next seven years to be made from among officers of any grade of not less than 15 years' commissioned service who have demonstrated by actual and extended service in the Air Corps that they are qualified for such appointment. This is necessary because flying ability is one of the chief requisites for an officer to properly fill the office of the Chief of the Air Corps. Also because of the provisions of the national defense act and the shortage of officers under that act with flying ability, it is considered necessary to change the requirements from those prescribed at the present time. It is believed at the end of seven years, however, there will be sufficient officers in the Air Corps with flying ability and other qualifications to remove the necessity for this special provision.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16 were agreed to as the subject matter of the two sections regarding encouragement of commercial aviation, and the establishment of prohibited areas is covered in the civil aviation bill, approved by the President May 20, 1926. This, therefore, makes unnecessary a repetition of that legislation in this bill.

Amendments Nos. 18, 19, and 20, agreed to with amendments, merely clarify the language of the personnel section of the five-year program as passed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22, agreed to with amendments, permit 90 per cent of Air Corps Reserve officers to be placed on active duty for any period of a year or less, and 10 per cent for a period of two years or less, in order that they may have an opportunity to qualify as pilots.

Amendments Nos. 23, 24, 25, and 26 as agreed to make minor changes in the bill.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28, agreed to with amendments, provide that the five-year program shall become effective July 1, 1926, as agreed upon by the House, the same date that the House and the Senate agreed upon for a similar air program for the Navy, and authorizes the President to submit the necessary estimates to cover the cost.

Amendment No. 29, agreed to with an amendment, provides for an Assistant Secretary of War to assist primarily in the performance of functions with regard to military aeronautics, but he may be given such additional functions as the Secretary of War may direct. It is believed that the Secretary of War should not be restricted in the assignment of duties to this assistant, nor should it be determined by law, except in a general way. The creation of this office for an additional Assistant Secretary is in accordance with the recommendations of the President's Aircraft Board.

Amendment No. 30, agreed to with an amendment, covers very thoroughly the subject of procurement of aircraft, aircraft parts, and aeronautical accessories. It is the result of thorough study made by the House Military and Naval Affairs Committees and will not only encourage the aircraft industry but permit the purchase of aeronautical matériel in a much more satisfactory manner than can now be done under the present law, and at the same time it completely safeguards the interests of the Government. The language of this amendment is almost identical with that of H. R. 12471 (by Mr. McSWAIN) and H. R. 12472 (by Mr. VINSON of Georgia), reported favorably by both the Committees of Military Affairs and Naval Affairs of this House. These two bills represent the labors of a subcommittee of said committees in almost daily conference and hearing for several weeks and are fully explained by Reports No. 1395 and No. 1396, respectively.

Amendments Nos. 31, 32, and 33, agreed to with amendments, provide for a soldier's medal and a distinguished flying cross and for enlisted men \$2 per month additional pay for each such award. The necessity for a soldier's medal has long been felt in the War Department to reward acts of heroism not involving actual conflict with an enemy, and the necessity for a distinguished flying cross where acts of heroism or extraordinary achievement are accomplished while participating in aerial flights is at once apparent when considering such accomplishments as the round-the-world flight and the flight to the North Pole. It is the practice now in the case of an enlisted man who receives the distinguished service cross to award him additional pay at the rate of \$2 per month. A similar provision is carried in this bill.

W. FRANK JAMES,
JOHN PHILIP HILL,
HARRY M. WURZBACH,
PERCY E. QUIN,
JOHN J. McSWAIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

As the culmination of all investigation and all interest that has been taken in air defense since the war, this Congress has passed three air bills, one for aviation in the Department of Commerce, one for Navy aviation, and the pending measure. Mr. JAMES, the acting chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, in 1919 was chairman of the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee of the House for air defense. The particular bill should be considered by him one of his most valuable contributions to the national defense of the country. Under the three air bills enacted by this session, including this one, the recommendation of the Morrow report for an Assistant Secretary of War, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and Assistant Secretary of Commerce in charge of air coordination, has been effected. I at first opposed the addition of these secretaries, but I came to realize that the coordination thus effectuated means a large step toward the ultimate unification of all of the defenses of the United States under one department of defense.

I consider that the principles contained in H. R. 46 have been very largely effectuated by what this Congress has done for the air defense of the United States, and I desire to congratulate the House and the Senate committees on the production of the bill which, in a few moments, will become law through the pending conference report.

The air defenses of the United States are made certain by these bills, and the encouragement of commercial aviation is made secure. In the next session I hope we shall pass a bill for a vital and effective council of national defense, but this bill provides all needed air defenses for the Army.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, for a period of approximately four months, starting the middle of December, 1925, the House Military Affairs Committee has held hearings in an effort to determine the proper legislation that should be passed by Congress at this time to increase the efficiency of the air forces of the Army. These hearings were very extensive and considered principles of national defense and the organization of the defense forces at considerable length. Everything from a department of national defense to leaving the air forces on their present status was discussed.

The consideration at this time of the idea of a department of national defense was rejected by the committee by a vote of only 11 against 10. In fact, all bills that had been suggested, from whatsoever source, were rejected by the committee and it proceeded to formulate its own bill. On May 5, 1926, the House passed the committee bill with only a couple of amendments. On June 2, 1926, the Senate passed this bill, but with several amendments. After much discussion among the conferees appointed by the House and by the Senate and a final agreement on the report to be made, the Senate agreed to the conferees' report on June 22, 1926, and the House agreed to the conferees' report on June 29, 1926.

The bill as finally agreed to contains 14 sections and embodies practically all of the recommendations made by the President's Aircraft Board, together with certain other legislation which seemed appropriate at this time

CHANGE OF NAME

Section 1 of the bill changes the name from Air Service to Air Corps, for the purpose of avoiding confusion of nomenclature between the name of the Air Service and certain phases of its duties. The President's Aircraft Board stated:

The distinction between service rendered by air troops and their auxiliary rôle and that of an air force acting alone on a separate mission is important.

COMPOSITION OF AIR CORPS

Section 2 deals with the composition of the Air Corps and is designed as a substitute for section 13a of the national defense act. Except for the change from one to three assistants to the Chief of the Air Corps there is no change in the basic strength of the Air Corps as prescribed in the national defense act. The organization of the strength authorized is changed so as to permit the formation of bands. It is very desirable that at the larger Air Corps stations bands be authorized; and although the five-year program authorized in section 8 of this bill does not carry any bands in the limited number of personnel provided, it is nevertheless believed desirable that the authority exist for their organization should any reorganization of the Air Corps make available the required personnel.

FLYING OFFICERS

The national defense act expresses in a somewhat negative manner the number of officers who may be nonflyers in the Air Service. To express this in a positive manner "that at least 90 per cent in each grade shall be flying officers" is much to be preferred. Furthermore, the wording of the national defense act does not carry out the probable intent that was

desired when it was passed, in that, instead of having "not more than 10 per cent of officers as nonflyers" the wording really excludes 90 per cent of those who failed to qualify as flyers.

It is highly desirable, however, that in so far as possible all officers of the Air Corps shall be flyers, and consequently the legislation prescribes "that the Chief of the Air Corps, at least two brigadier generals, and at least 90 per cent of the officers in each grade below that of brigadier general, shall be flying officers." The legislation is, however, designed "to insure that the commissioned personnel of the Air Corps shall be properly qualified flying officers, by giving the officers of the Army an opportunity to so qualify" and not permitting them to "remain detailed to the Air Corps for a period in excess of one year or be permanently commissioned therein unless they qualify as flying officers." However, if an officer is a technical expert in some line properly affecting the Air Corps, the Secretary of War may detail him to the Air Corps irrespective of his flying ability so long as the number of nonflyers authorized is not exceeded. The President's Aircraft Board stated with regard to the transfer of officers from other branches to the Air Corps: "Such officers, of course, should qualify in flying."

This provision of the law is particularly important, because in time of peace it is necessary to build up a service, if possible, of 100 per cent flyers, for the first requirements of the next war will involve combat in the air, and a highly trained and skilled personnel must be available. Nonflying positions can be far more readily filled and, furthermore, can be far more efficiently administered by officers who for one reason or another have become unfit for flying duty, although they may have rendered excellent service as flyers. It would be a great mistake to encourage the influx of a large number of officers in the Air Corps who had no desire to learn to fly, who in many cases might have a great fear of the air, and who without aerial experience would be considerably handicapped in the administration of the positions to which they might be assigned.

It is a fundamental principle in military organizations that officers in direct command shall be versed in the principal activities of the unit which they command. In the case of flying units this is recognized by the national defense act when it prescribes, "Flying units shall in all cases be commanded by flying officers." In the Infantry we expect officers to be able to shoot a gun and fire a pistol; in the Artillery officers must know the fundamentals of firing fieldpieces; in the Cavalry we surely expect officers to be able to ride a horse; no less now should we expect officers of the Air Service to be flying officers.

It takes a year to train an officer to be a flying officer. It is hoped to shorten this time during an emergency to five months. It is in time of peace, however, that training of the regular establishment must bring its officers to the maximum possible efficiency. The famous Lassiter Board, whose findings were approved by the Secretary of War in the spring of 1923, stated, "We can not improvise an air service, and yet it is indispensable to be strong in the air at the very outset of a war." This at once dictates that the peace establishment of the Air Service must, if possible, be 100 per cent flying officers in order that at the very outset of a war, even within the first few days, we should be strong enough in the air to "get the jump" on our enemy.

This Lassiter Board also stated, "Should a national emergency confront this country within the next few years, the Air Service would not be able to play its part in meeting it." This is due to two deficiencies: First, lack of flying personnel; second, lack of sufficient equipment. A well-trained air force, though small, is the greatest possible insurance a country can have against foreign aggression.

Marshal Foch has said, "The potentialities of aircraft attack on a large scale are almost incalculable, but it is clear that such attack, owing to its crushing moral effect on a nation, may impress public opinion to the point of disarming the government, and thus becoming decisive." General Groves, an English officer, said, "Those not in close touch with the enormous progress in aviation since the armistice are inclined to underestimate air power and are prone to judge it by the pin-prick air raids of the past."

President Coolidge is quoted as having said, "The development of aircraft indicates that our national defense must be supplemented, if not dominated, by aviation." It is clear that world authorities recognize the potential striking force of the airplane, but it must also be clear that without personnel trained to the highest possible state of efficiency as flying officers in time of peace, this country is liable to be on the defensive in the air instead of on the offensive, and thus lose its opportunity to bring a possible speedy termination to the war. There is little place for nonflyers in a peace-time air service,

except that they be men who have outlived their usefulness as combat flyers and their flying experience has made them the more valuable in administrative positions.

This proviso now encourages officers of the Army to qualify as flying officers and, furthermore, requires that when they are detailed to the Air Service they shall start this flying training immediately. It is not expected under peace-time conditions that officers who may desire to transfer to the Air Service will care to be nonflying officers or, in other words, not versed in the principal activity of the corps to which they propose to transfer. Surely those officers who transfer to the Air Corps and are going to fill positions of great responsibility in command of flying activities would want to be flying officers. When Mr. Perkins, the chief investigator of the Select Committee of Inquiry into Operations of the United States Air Services, appointed by this House, was before the House Military Affairs Committee he stated:

The man who is flying through the air ought to be commanded by some one who has flown and who knows what a difficult thing that is.

In order, however, to train the greatest number of officers of the Army, of all grades, as flying officers the legislation provides for the maximum number of officers on this status within the total authorized for the Air Corps.

NONFLYING OFFICERS

With regard to the nonflying officers that it is possible to secure under this bill, it is clear that they shall be kept to the minimum and not in any case exceed 10 per cent, except during the initial stages of an emergency when the number of non-flyers may be increased above this percentage, but the proportion reestablished as soon as a sufficient number of flyers can be trained. The War Department figures for nonflying officers required in time of war are shown in the following table. It is evident that the requirements for nonflying officers in time of peace will never exceed 10 per cent, and in view of the fact that it is practically axiomatic that flying officers are more valuable in the Air Corps than nonflyers, it is the evident intent of Congress to keep the number of nonflyers to a minimum.

Statement of officers of the Air Service in W. D. G. M. plan classified as flyers and nonflyers

Unit of installation	Nonflying officers	Flying officers	Total officers
Units for theater of operations.....	862	12,331	13,193
Units of the zone of the interior.....	1,407	7,232	8,639
Overhead of the zone of the interior.....	83	1,327	1,410
Overseas garrisons and reinforcements.....			
Total.....	2,352	20,890	23,242

NOTE.—The above figures do not include replacements. Submitted.

J. K. PARSONS,
Colonel, G. S., Chief Mobilization Branch, G-3.
DEFINITION OF FLYING OFFICER

That there may be no mistake as to what Congress means by a flying officer, a definition has been incorporated in the language of the act. A flying officer is "one who has received an aeronautical rating as a pilot of service types of aircraft," and then we have gone a little further to show exactly what we mean by a pilot. He must have had "at least 200 hours while acting as a pilot, 75 of which must be alone, and must successfully complete the course prescribed by competent authority." This definition applies in time of peace, and a flying officer may include in time of war "one who has received an aeronautical rating as an observer."

In time of war, of course, under the urgency of the situation, a flying officer might be one who has been trained only as an observer, but who naturally has had many hours of flying experience in order to receive his observer's rating. The definitions of flying personnel contained in H. R. 9690, the Navy bill recently passed by the House, contemplate a total flying time of not less than 200 hours in the air, 75 of which must be alone. It is thus seen that the requirements for flying officers in both the Army and the Navy are practically the same.

When it is considered that it is indispensable to be strong in the air at the very outset of a war, all officers of the Air Corps should, if possible, be pilots of service types of aircraft.

FLYING UNITS COMMANDED BY FLYING OFFICERS

The provision that "flying units shall in all cases be commanded by flying officers" appears in the national defense act and is repeated in this bill. The President's Aircraft Board stated with regard to this matter, "All must conceive the justice and propriety of putting only experienced flying men in the immediate command of flying activities."

FLYING PAY

The provision incorporated in section 2 of the bill with regard to flying pay clarifies very considerably the former legislation which has been passed on this subject and shows clearly that it is the intent of Congress that flying pay shall only be granted when officers or enlisted men are required to fly "by orders of competent authority" and when they actually "do participate in regular and frequent aerial flights." A similar provision is carried in section 6 of the bill to cover all other governmental activities than the Army where flying pay is granted.

ENLISTED PILOTS

The use of enlisted pilots in certain positions in the Air Corps, such as alternate pilots in the larger types of machines, where two pilots are required, is a principle which has been recognized to such an extent that tables of organization for the various units of the Air Service are now undergoing revision so as to include a number of enlisted pilots. Furthermore, there are other duties in the air, such as aerial gunners, radio men, and so forth, which can be performed by enlisted experts in this line of work. It would greatly enhance the value of these men to the service if they could also be trained as pilots. In fact, it has been a recognized principle for some time that practically every man, both commissioned and enlisted, who goes into the air should be a pilot, the principal pilot becoming a casualty would not necessarily mean under these conditions the destruction of the plane and the probable loss of lives to the other occupants of the plane.

The insertion of the phrase "in time of peace" with reference to the number of enlisted pilots employed in the Air Corps is very desirable. It might be practicable to secure in time of war not less than 20 per cent enlisted pilots, but it might cause considerable embarrassment to the successful prosecution of a war to have to use them. However, this is a contingency upon which experience is lacking; and since this country does not have the system of universal service prevalent in France and some other countries, where higher-caliber men may be secured in enlisted positions, it would seem that the legislation should be restricted to time of peace.

AIR MECHANICS

At the present time the Air Service suffers a very great loss in expert enlisted mechanics, because after they have been educated at the technical school of the Air Service and acquired valuable experience in the maintenance of aircraft, they are attracted to positions in civil life which offer much greater remuneration than they can obtain in the Army. This loss to the Air Service is so serious as to be one of the possible causes for casualties to flying personnel.

It is, therefore, very appropriate that this Congress has provided some recognition for the skill and ability of enlisted men in the maintenance of aircraft. The granting of ratings as air mechanic, first and second class, with the pay of the second and third grades, respectively, although in many instances not meeting the high rates of pay offered in civilian occupations, will provide at least in part an appropriate corrective measure for this situation at the present time.

The report of the Select Committee of Inquiry into the Operations of the United States Air Service recommended—

that additional compensation necessary to secure an adequate number of competent mechanics to maintain airplanes in efficient operation be provided; that such mechanics should be relieved of routine military duties.

A War Department study made on the same subject states:

This question is one of vital importance in that it is almost impossible to retain the services of competent mechanics when every one of them well knows that as soon as he acquires a reasonable degree of efficiency in his work he can get out of the Army and earn two or three times his pay in the automotive industry.

The Secretary of War when appearing before our committee on May 10, 1926, stated in part:

I think it is important that some plan be worked out by which mechanics can be paid an adequate sum in the Air Service * * *. I think that this is particularly important, however, in the Air Service where the safety of the flyers themselves depends upon having experienced mechanics (p. 45).

It is to be noted that this provision of the bill is simply an authorization and permits the Secretary of War to rate enlisted men as air mechanics up to a total of 14 per cent of the total authorized strength of the Air Corps. It is believed that this provision will serve to hold expert mechanics in the Air Corps and that the additional cost will be saved many times over by the reduction in the loss of air craft and the prolonging of its life through better care. Reduction in the loss of lives of

flying personnel can not be calculated in dollars and cents, and the decrease in schooling required and administration entailed in constantly securing replacements for men who find it more attractive outside the Army will be an additional saving to the Government.

Some comment has been made about a provision of this sort causing enlisted men to receive more pay than officers. It is felt that this comment is not appropriate, and in substantiation the following is quoted from the hearings held in 1922 on the pay bill. This is the opinion of a board composed of members of the several departments affected by the pay bill:

It should be noted that in establishing the pay schedule for enlisted men and warrant officers no particular attention was paid to the fact that the highest-grade enlisted man and the warrant officer receive more pay than the junior second lieutenants. It is considered that the pay schedules for officers and enlisted men and warrant officers are based on very different principles, and the pay of a second lieutenant, who is just starting his career in the commissioned service, bears no relation to the pay of an enlisted man of the first grade and a warrant officer, who are completing their careers in the enlisted service.

The following letter received from the Chief of Air Service on the subject of air mechanics is of interest in connection with this portion of the legislation:

JUNE 22, 1926.

HON. W. FRANK JAMES,

*Acting Chairman House Military Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. JAMES: As per your request by telephone with regard to the last provision of section 2 of H. R. 10827 concerning the rating of enlisted men as air mechanics, I believe the establishment of this principle in law and the authorization for rating the four (4) lower grades of enlisted men are most valuable provisions at this time. The necessity for additional pay was recognized by the Lampert committee in one of its recommendations. The need for such a provision has been felt for a long time, and an especial necessity for these ratings does exist in the Air Corps, where not only valuable Government property is a consideration but the safety of men's lives is at stake. I am confident the proper administration of this provision will save to the Government many times its cost.

Very truly yours,

MASON M. PATRICK,
Major General, Air Service, Chief of Air Service.

TEMPORARY RANK

Section 3 of the bill provides for temporary rank to be given in cases of command duty or staff duty where the rank of the Air Corps officer is not commensurate with the position filled, but limits this temporary rank two grades above that of the officer's permanent commission. There is at present a surplus of somewhat over 100 first lieutenants in the Air Corps and a shortage of approximately an equal number of captains. There is no way under the law at the present time of filling the vacancies in the grade of captain with the surplus in the grade of first lieutenant. The provision of temporary rank in the Air Corps bill will have a tendency to remedy, at least in part, this situation. The President's Aircraft Board carried a recommendation for temporary rank, and it is hoped that this provision will help to adjust the problem that the Air Corps at present phases where there is a great shortage of officers in the senior grades. Unfortunately, the attrition in the Air Corps is many times greater than that in any other branch of the Army and the casualties suffered by the Air Corps are almost equal to the total of those suffered by all the other branches combined. This temporary rank proviso may not prove to be the final solution of the problem when the study called for by section 4 of the bill is submitted by the Secretary of War.

CORRECTION OF THE PROMOTION LIST

Section 4 of the bill calls for an investigation and study of "the alleged injustices which exist in the promotion list of the Army" and the furnishing of this study to Congress at the beginning of the next session.

For several years the War Department has recognized injustices that have existed on the single promotion list among the junior Air Service officers. In fact, in 1922, a board appointed in the War Department, headed by General Shanks, reported:

The Air Service is the only branch or arm of the service which is adversely affected as a corps by the promotion situation.

And somewhat later another board in the War Department, headed by Colonel Woodward, recommended:

A change of the promotion list positions of Air Service officers by crediting them with all of their candidate service in excess of 90 days. That was the normal period for candidates of other branches.

The Secretary of War stated to the Military Affairs Committee that injustices did exist and that he hoped some solution

might be found in order that they might be rectified during the present session of Congress. Accordingly, a study was made by the War Department General Staff, which brought to light a number of other injustices on the single promotion list which should, perhaps, also be considered at the same time as those to the junior Air Service officers.

The principal cause of the injustices which exist to the officers of the Air Corps on the single-promotion list is the fact that their average period of training was nine months, as compared with three months for other branches, and their position on the promotion list is determined by the length of commissioned service. Consequently officers of the Air Corps having the same length of service, including training-camp service, as officers of other services find themselves several hundred files lower on the list.

There is another cause which I mentioned above, and that is the high rate of attrition among the officers of the Air Corps on account of casualties resulting from the occupation in which they are engaged. The last five years shows an average of nearly one-half of the casualties on the active list of the Army occurring in the Air Corps. It is hoped that the study made by the War Department will bring forth some solution to this problem which will be satisfactory to all concerned. The temporary promotion provided by section 3 will not correct this situation. Either a separate promotion list or some system of temporary promotion carrying the officers of the Air Corps as running mates with other officers of equal service, including training-camp service, appears to be the only method so far presented of solving this knotty problem.

There are about 400 Air Corps officers adversely affected. This is a larger group of officers than we find in any other branch in a similar situation, and it is hoped that some solution may be found in the near future.

AIR SECTIONS ON GENERAL STAFF

The President's aircraft board recommended:

It seems desirable to give to aviation some special representation on the General Staff. * * * We therefore recommend that the Secretary of War create administratively in each of the five divisions of the War Department General Staff an air section * * *.

The President's Aircraft Board further stated:

This plan may seem inconsistent with one of the fundamental principles of the General Staff, namely, that no member represent any particular service. We think the good to be gained, however, justifies departure from the general rule.

Since the organization of the Air Service as a separate branch in 1920, there have been a very small number of officers who have completed the course at the Army War College and thus became eligible for assignment to the War Department General Staff. In fact the representation on the staff has never exceeded three Air Service officers although the proportion for the Air Service is much higher. There are 93 officers on the War Department General Staff. At present three of these are from the Air Service. Three more will be detailed during the present calendar year. It is believed, however, that by July 1, 1929, a sufficient number of Air Corps officers will have graduated from the Army War College to always have available a sufficient number eligible for the War Department General Staff so as to give the Air Corps its proper representation. Until that time the creation of air sections in the General Staff are required to take care of the situation.

The following correspondence on this subject from the Secretary of War, The Adjutant General, and the Chief of Air Service will serve to explain more fully the necessity for this provision:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 4, 1926.

HON. W. FRANK JAMES,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. JAMES: In accordance with your telephone request, through Major Hammond this date, I am sending herewith a copy of the administrative action of the Chief of Staff which establishes the air sections in the several divisions of the General Staff.

Trusting that this will give you the information desired, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT F. DAVIS, *Secretary of War.*

JANUARY, 15, 1926.

Memorandum for The Adjutant General:

Subject: Provision for incorporation of Air Service personnel in the War Department General Staff.

The recommendations of the board appointed by the President of the United States on September 11, 1925, to make a study of the

best means of developing and applying aircraft to national defense includes the following:

(3) It seems desirable to give to aviation some special representation on the General Staff. There has not as yet been opportunity for many aviation officers of suitable rank to be qualified for membership on the General Staff. We therefore recommend that the Secretary of War create, administratively, in each of the five divisions of the War Department General Staff an air section, to be headed by a General Staff or acting General Staff officer detailed from the Air Corps (Air Service); such section, under the same supervision as other sections of its division, to consider and recommend proper action on such air matters as are referred to the division.

To accomplish this it may be necessary to waive in these instances some present qualifications for membership on the General Staff. This plan may seem inconsistent with one of the fundamental principles of the General Staff; namely, that no member represent any particular service. We think the good to be gained, however, justifies departure from the general rule. Obviously the men designated for such staff positions must be of a temper of mind to appreciate not only the special needs of aviation, but the needs of the Army as a whole.

In accordance with the recommendation stated above, the Secretary of War directs that there be created in each of the divisions of the War Department General Staff an air section, the duties of which will be to consider and recommend proper action on such air matters as may be referred to such divisions.

J. L. HINES,
Major General, Chief of Staff.

JANUARY 27, 1926.

Memorandum for the Chief of Staff:

Subject: Provision for incorporation of Air Service personnel in the War Department General Staff.

Reference is made to your memorandum dated January 15, 1926, to The Adjutant General on the above subject (OCS 9643-154).

The contents of the above memorandum have been noted and made of record in this office and, as contemplated therein, selection has been made of Air Service personnel for duty with the War Department General Staff.

ROBERT C. DAVIS,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

JUNE 16, 1926.

HON. W. FRANK JAMES,
Acting Chairman House Military Affairs Committee,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JAMES: I have been in conference with Gen. Fox Conner, Deputy Chief of Staff, with regard to section 5, air sections of the General Staff, contained in H. R. 10827, as passed by the House of Representatives on May 5, 1926, and which the Senate struck out when passing this bill.

If the House conferees decide that it is necessary to legislate on this matter, General Conner and I both feel that it would be advisable to place a time limit on this section, so as to make it effective only until such time as there are sufficient officers of the Air Corps eligible for detail on the War Department General Staff to maintain a proper representation of air officers in that body. After careful consideration it is believed that three years will suffice to bring about this condition, and it is therefore suggested that line 21, on page 6, read as follows: "Until July 1, 1929, there is hereby created, etc."

Very truly yours,
MASON M. PATRICK,
Major General, Air Service, Chief of Air Service.

JUNE 22, 1926.

HON. W. FRANK JAMES,
Acting Chairman House Military Affairs Committee,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JAMES: With reference to your telephonic request regarding section 5 of H. R. 10827, air sections of the General Staff, I believe that the proposed legislation, as finally agreed upon by the conferees, will best serve the present situation. It will be three years before a sufficient number of Air Corps officers become eligible for the War Department General Staff to maintain a proper representation in that body, and at that time it appears that there will be no further need for this special provision of law. Furthermore, having these air sections headed by officers of the Air Corps will carry out the recommendation of the President's Aircraft Board in this respect.

Very truly yours,
MASON M. PATRICK,
Major General, Air Service, Chief of Air Service.

FLYING PAY FOR OTHER THAN REGULAR ARMY

Section 6 clarifies the language of the pay act with regard to the extra pay for the flying risk and incorporates similar language to that included in section 2 for the Regular Army, making it mandatory that personnel be detailed by orders of competent authority and that they actually do participate in regular and frequent flights.

This section also increases the number of officers of the Regular Army other than the Air Corps who may be placed upon the flying status. It is necessary that flight surgeons and the special technical experts from the Signal Corps, Engineer Corps, and Ordnance Department particularly go in to the air in the performance of the work in connection with the Air Corps. The limitation to approximately 60 carried in the old law has now been increased to approximately 120.

The provision of flying pay for National Guard officers has also been changed so as to permit the National Guard officers to draw this form of drill pay when they have completed the required time in the air, even though the balance of their organization may perform drill at another time. This, then, permits National Guard officers to fly during the day and their organizations to drill during the evening or during inclement weather.

The President's Aircraft Board stated with regard to flying pay:

Considering the extra hazardous nature of flying, we believe that the principle of extra pay for flying should be recognized as permanent in time of peace. The administration of the provision for flying pay should be such that it will be paid only where the duties on which an officer is engaged may reasonably require flying or where necessary to keep him in training for future flying.

CHIEF OF THE AIR CORPS

Section 7 of the bill provides for the next seven years for the special appointment for the Chief of the Air Corps. The national defense act prescribes that chiefs of branches shall be appointed from among officers of the grade of colonel and from among those who have demonstrated by actual and extended service in the branch or on similar duty that they are qualified for the appointment. There are only two colonels in the Air Corps eligible for appointment. It therefore is the intent of this provision that the President shall have a much greater number from whom to choose in making his selection for the Chief of the Air Corps. The wording of the provision now follows closely the wording of the national defense act, except that it permits the appointment of the chief to be made from officers of any grade of not less than 15 years' commissioned service. By section 2 of the bill the Chief of the Air Corps is required to be a flying officer. This provision now makes approximately 60 officers eligible. They are as follows:

Air Service officers—commissioned service to June 30, 1926

(22 years or more)

	In service since—
Maj. Gen. Mason M. Patrick	July 1, 1886
Brig. Gen. James E. Fechet	July 25, 1900
Col. Chalmers G. Hall	June 11, 1897
Col. Theo. A. Baldwin	Sept. 18, 1898
Lieut. Col. Harry Graham	Sept. 1, 1900
Lieut. Col. Clarence C. Culver	Apr. 3, 1900
Lieut. Col. Ira F. Fravel	Aug. 6, 1900
Lieut. Col. William E. Gillmore	Feb. 2, 1901
Lieut. Col. Frank P. Lahm	Feb. 18, 1901
Lieut. Col. Charles H. Danforth	July 31, 1901
Lieut. Col. Roy C. Kirtland	Aug. 30, 1901
Lieut. Col. Arthur G. Fisher	Apr. 30, 1901
Lieut. Col. John H. Howard	Oct. 12, 1901
Lieut. Col. Seth W. Cook	July 7, 1901
Lieut. Col. Benj. D. Foulois	July 9, 1901
Lieut. Col. John A. Paegelow	July 1, 1901
Maj. James A. Mars	June 11, 1903
Maj. Jacob W. S. Wuest	June 11, 1903
Maj. Henry C. Pratt	June 15, 1904
Maj. Gerald C. Brant	June 15, 1904

(15 to 21 years' service)

Maj. Archie W. Berry	Feb. 13, 1905
Maj. Wm. N. Hensley	June 13, 1905
Maj. Ira A. Longanecker	Jan. 26, 1906
Maj. Frank M. Andrews	June 12, 1906
Maj. Oscar Westover	June 12, 1906
Maj. Henry B. Claggett	June 12, 1906
Maj. Jacob E. Fickel	Feb. 28, 1907
Maj. Rush B. Lincoln	Feb. 28, 1907
Maj. Augustine W. Robins	June 14, 1907
Maj. Henry H. Arnold	June 14, 1907
Maj. Barton K. Yount	June 14, 1907
Maj. Wm. C. McChord	June 14, 1907
Maj. John D. Reardan	Jan. 21, 1908
Maj. Lawrence W. McIntosh	Feb. 14, 1908
Maj. Harold Geiger	Feb. 14, 1908
Maj. Henry H. C. Muhlenberg	Feb. 14, 1908
Maj. John F. Curry	Feb. 14, 1908
Maj. James E. Chaney	Feb. 14, 1908
Maj. Horace M. Hickam	Feb. 14, 1908
Maj. Alfred H. Hogley	Feb. 14, 1908

	In service since—
Maj. Albert L. Sneed	Feb. 14, 1908
Maj. Walter R. Weaver	Feb. 14, 1908
Maj. John N. Reynolds	Sept. 28, 1908
Maj. Robert N. Coker	Sept. 28, 1908
Maj. Frank M. Kennedy	Sept. 28, 1908
Maj. John H. Pirie	Oct. 1, 1908
Maj. Robert E. Goolrick	Oct. 5, 1908
Maj. Jacob H. Rudolph	Sept. 28, 1908
Maj. Frederick L. Martin	Oct. 3, 1908
Maj. Jenner Y. Chisum	Oct. 18, 1908
Maj. Delos C. Emmons	June 11, 1909
Maj. Arnold N. Krogstad	June 11, 1909
Maj. Thos. D. Milling	June 11, 1909
Maj. George H. Brett	Aug. 29, 1911
Maj. Walter H. Frank	June 15, 1910
Maj. Wm. C. Sherman	June 15, 1910
Maj. Frank D. Lackland	Feb. 25, 1911
Maj. Herbert A. Dargue	June 13, 1911
Maj. Harrison H. C. Richards	June 13, 1911
Maj. Ira A. Rader	June 13, 1911
Maj. Leo A. Hefferman	June 13, 1911

This is a particularly important part of the Air Corps bill as it must be obvious that a chief selected from among officers "who have demonstrated by actual and extended service in such corps that they are qualified for such appointment" would undoubtedly be the best kind of a chief to have. It will do a great deal to boost the morale of the Air Corps to always have an officer who is an actual flier. This has been amply demonstrated in the service of General Patrick, who at the age of nearly 60, learned to fly and pilot his own machine in order that he might be the better fitted to administer the corps of which he has been chief.

The following letter from the Chief of the Air Service with regard to this provision is quoted:

JUNE 22, 1926.

HON. W. FRANK JAMES,
Acting Chairman House Military Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JAMES: In compliance with your telephonic request for my opinion with regard to section 7 of H. R. 10827, appointment of the Chief of the Air Corps, as agreed upon by the conferees, I am thoroughly satisfied that this will accomplish a most important purpose. At the present time there are only two officers in the Air Corps who might qualify for appointment as Chief of the Air Corps under the provisions of the national defense act. This new provision will permit the President a selection from somewhat over 60 officers at the present time, which number will increase during the period that this provision is effective. I believe that at the end of seven years there will be sufficient officers available in the Air Corps to remove the necessity for a continuance of this legislation.

Very truly yours,

MASON M. PATRICK,
Major General, Air Service, Chief of Air Service.
FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM

Section 8 sets forth a five-year development program for the Air Corps. Over three years ago the Lassiter Board met in the War Department and recommended a 10-year program, and that legislation be secured for making it effective. This program was never submitted to Congress for this purpose. It has been evident, however, to the War Department and to the several boards that have met that a development program for the Air Corps is most desirable.

In his message to Congress at the beginning of this present session, the President stated:

We must have an air strength worthy of America.

Also:

Aviation is of great importance, both for national defense and commercial development.

This Lassiter Board stated:

We can not improvise an Air Service and yet it is indispensable to be strong in the air at the very outset of a war.

And again:

The committee finds our Air Service to be in a very unfortunate and critical situation.

And then this remarkable statement:

Should a national emergency confront this country within the next few years, the Air Service would not be able to play its part in meeting it.

In writing about the Lassiter Board recommendations to the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee on March 2, 1926, the Secretary of War said that—

the project as now revised by the War Department contemplates a five-year program which would eventually provide the Air Service with 1,650 Regular Army officers, 550 reserve officers on active duty, 2,200

airplanes, including those on order, and 15,000 enlisted men, including 500 flying cadets.

The five-year program as outlined in this revised project has been approved by me and will be the one toward which the War Department will work during the next five years to the extent that appropriations are made available.

PERSONNEL

It is the intent of Congress to increase the personnel strength of the Air Corps by 403 officers and 624 enlisted men so as to bring the commissioned and enlisted strength up to 1,650 regular officers and 15,000 enlisted men, including flying cadets. Authority is granted by the bill for the President to effect this increase by increasing the Regular Army or by making reallocations of the strengths of the various branches.

Authority is also contained for having 550 regular officers on active duty. This will provide for the creation of a real fighting reserve, and it is hoped, furthermore, to overcome many of the personnel difficulties now facing the Air Corps by permitting these reserve officers to be on active duty.

EQUIPMENT

The bill authorizes the Secretary of War to equip and maintain the Air Corps with not to exceed 1,800 serviceable airplanes, with replacements of approximately 400 annually. The airplanes contemplated in this program are as outlined in the following table:

Airplanes contemplated under five-year project Air Service

	Active	On order	War reserve	Total
Pursuit	420	105	54	579
Bombardment	161	40	24	225
Attack	89	22	6	117
Observation	414	104	26	544
Transport	41	10	—	51
Training	547	137	—	684
Total	1,672	418	110	2,200

It is hoped that the number of airplanes authorized will provide for a real fighting air component and that a large number of these planes will be allotted to units which may be able to take the field on the first day of any future emergency.

METHOD OF INCREASE

The program is to become effective this year, and the President is authorized to submit the necessary estimates for carrying out the program. It is interesting to note in this connection that the percentages of national defense budgets devoted to aviation in foreign countries are as follows:

	Per cent
France	10
Great Britain	15
Italy	17
Japan (excluding naval and civil aviation)	1 1/2

In comparison with this the United States is devoting 7 per cent.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR

Section 9 provides for an Assistant Secretary of War whose primary function will be in fostering military aeronautics. This official will be most valuable in seeing that the intent of Congress is carried out in the five-year development program and in coordinating the activities of the Air Corps with other aviation activities of the Government. The President's Aircraft Board stated:

We foretell that such an official properly used could be the means of promoting close cooperation between aviation and the other parts of the Army. In the matter of procurement he could be especially useful.

The President's Aircraft Board also felt that the Assistant Secretary of War, together with the Assistant Secretaries provided for the Department of Commerce and the Navy Department—

could perform in a continuous way from year to year by investigation and recommendation a substantial service to aviation.

PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT

Section 10 goes rather extensively into the method of procurement of aircraft. There has been considerable difficulty and dissatisfaction in the past with regard to procurement methods for aircraft, and it is in an effort to correct this situation that this subject has been incorporated in this legislation. The select committee of inquiry recommended as follows:

Congress should at once pass a law permitting the procurement of aircraft engines and aeronautical instruments and accessories with-

out requiring competitive bidding under restrictions that will promote the best interests of the Government.

This section of the bill, it is believed, will not only permit the procurement of aircraft in a much more satisfactory manner but will completely protect the interests of the Government in this matter.

This section of the bill was worked up by five members of the Military Affairs Committee and five from the Naval Affairs Committee, who sat and held hearings in joint session for several weeks. It is essentially the same as H. R. 12471, introduced in this House by Mr. McSWAIN. With regard to this particular bill, and consequently with regard to this section 10 of the Air Corps bill, the following letter from the Secretary of War is quoted:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 14, 1926.

HON. JOHN M. MORIN,
Chairman Military Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives,

DEAR MR. MORIN: The report on H. R. 12471, a bill to encourage the development of aviation and secure advancement of Army aeronautics, and for other purposes, forwarded to you by the Acting Secretary of War under date of June 10, 1926, is fully concurred in by me.

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT F. DAVIS, Secretary of War.

There is also quoted a letter from the Assistant Secretary of War, who in the War Department is charged with matters of procurement and who was acting as Secretary of War at the time he wrote the letter:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 10, 1926.

HON. JOHN M. MORIN,
Chairman Military Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MORIN: In compliance with the request of Hon. W. FRANK JAMES, acting chairman of your committee, I am pleased to submit the views of the War Department upon H. R. 12472.

The War Department has taken considerable interest in this proposed legislation, hearings before your committee and subcommittee having been attended by the Secretary of War and several representatives of the department. The text of the bill as printed has been carefully studied and I have read with interest the printed report of your committee upon the measure. The amendments recommended in the committee's report are merely clarifying and can not be said to materially alter the text of the bill as originally printed.

The subject of the proposed bill as stated in the preamble thereof is to encourage the development of aviation and secure the advancement of Army aeronautics. The procurement of the best types and quality of aircraft to meet the needs of our national defense, and at the same time to reduce so far as possible the hazards of military flying, as well as to stimulate the aircraft industry of the United States, are the predominating purposes to be served by the enactment of this legislation.

The applicable provisions of existing law on this subject are too voluminous to recount in this letter other than to say that at the present time the procurement of aircraft and aircraft accessories is comprehended within the mass of law now upon our statute books relating generally to the procurement of matériel for the Government.

The changes that will be brought about in existing law by the enactment of the proposed legislation may be outlined as follows:

Inventive genius in the creation of new designs for aircraft and their accessories will be stimulated by the competition in design provided for in the bill, in which the awards are based upon merit of design rather than on cost of production or cost of design. This principle also is carried into the quantity production (secs. 1, 13, and 16) of aircraft by discretionary powers given to the department head. This feature is most desirable from any standpoint.

The purchase of unpatentable design rights is permitted and thus adequate reward to competent designers is authorized. This feature alone is a valuable addition to existing law in the development of the aircraft industry and also from the War Department's point of view.

The proposed legislation in general is designed to give legal effect to the principal recommendations of the President's Aircraft Board relating to the procurement of aircraft. The War Department is in hearty accord with these principles.

Your attention is invited to the provisions of the bill providing for legal remedies on the part of competitors and contractors in the district courts of the United States. These provisions seem to be sharp departures from the policy followed in the past, but it is not believed to be the function of the War Department to comment upon them. There is one provision in the bill, namely, that providing in certain cases for arbitration (sec. 4 of the bill), which it is believed is unsound in principle for the reason that it seems to take the settlement

of an administrative question out of the hands of the department head who is by law held responsible. While the War Department would favor seeing this provision deleted from the bill, I am constrained to say that its retention, if insisted upon by the Congress, in all probability will not create insurmountable difficulties to the administration of the bill generally.

I am pleased, therefore, to state that the War Department is in favor of the proposed legislation, subject to the remarks above, provided the same be enacted without substantial alterations; that is to say, if sections 7 and 16 of the bill which grant the department head discretionary powers in quantity procurement of aircraft and procurement of aircraft and designs for experimental purposes should be deleted or substantially altered, thus making the provisions of section 1 of the bill exclusive, there would be great objection to section 1 of the bill. In other words, taking all of the provisions of the bill together, excepting only the one providing for arbitration (refraining from commenting upon the judicial provisions as noted above), I believe their enactment into law will be found to be of great benefit to the War Department in its procurement of aircraft, and also to the industry at large.

If any additional information from the War Department is desired, I shall be pleased to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

HANFORD MACNIDER,
Acting Secretary of War.

An additional letter from the Secretary of War is quoted:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington.

HON. W. FRANK JAMES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. JAMES: Complying with your request for report on sections 10 to 10(t), inclusive, of the conference committee print of June 19, 1926, H. R. 10827, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, I am pleased to advise you that those sections as they appear are satisfactory to the War Department, and I recommend that they be enacted into law.

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT F. DAVIS,
Secretary of War.

The following is a letter from the Chief of Air Service:

JUNE 22, 1926.

HON. W. FRANK JAMES,
Acting Chairman House Military Affairs Committee,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JAMES: Complying with your request by telephone for comments concerning section 10 of H. R. 10827, as agreed upon by the conferees, dealing with the procurement of new designs for aircraft and of aeronautical matériel, I believe that this will be of benefit to the military services. It will insure that the industry is kept posted with regard to orders placed by the Army and Navy for aeronautical matériel. It will also protect the manufacturer and designer, while at the same time it will completely safeguard the interests of the United States.

Very truly yours,

MASON M. PATRICK,
Major General, Air Service, Chief of Air Service.
SOLDIER'S MEDAL

Section 11 of the Air Corps bill provides a soldier's medal and is available for all Army personnel. The need for such a medal has been apparent for some time in order that acts of heroism not involving actual conflict with an enemy might be properly awarded. This provision authorizes a medal which is similar to the one now granted in the Navy.

DISTINGUISHED-FLYING CROSS

By section 12 of the Air Corps bill a distinguished-flying cross is provided for acts of heroism or extraordinary achievement while participating in an aerial flight. Medals undoubtedly have a great influence upon morale, and in the case of acts of heroism or achievement performed in the air there must not only be taken into consideration the act itself but the constant danger and risk to life that surrounds the performance of the act. It is therefore felt that the distinguished-flying cross provided in this bill will do much toward morale and providing recognition where it is deserved.

EXTRA PAY FOR ENLISTED MEN RECEIVING AWARDS OF MEDALS

By section 13 of the Air Corps bill enlisted men receiving either the soldier's medal or the distinguished-flying cross are authorized to receive the \$2 extra per month, which it is now customary to give in the case of awards of the distinguished-service cross.

REPEALING CLAUSE

Section 14 is simply the normal repealing clause.

GENERAL

The following letters with regard to the general merits of the Air Corps bill are considered valuable to complete the record.

JUNE 22, 1926.

HON. W. FRANK JAMES,
Acting chairman Committee on Military Affairs,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. JAMES: I have given careful consideration to the conference committee print of H. R. 10827, "An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes," and am pleased to inform you that I find myself in general accord with the agreement reached by the conferees as set forth therein, and with the bill as a whole.

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT F. DAVIS, Secretary of War.

JUNE 22, 1926.

HON. W. FRANK JAMES,
Acting Chairman House Military Affairs Committee,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JAMES: In compliance with your telephone request concerning H. R. 10827, a bill primarily to increase the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army, I am thoroughly satisfied that when this measure becomes a law it will do much for national defense and very materially increase the efficiency of the Air Corps. It contains many excellent provisions and is evidently the result of a most thorough and complete study of the subject. It is hoped that this measure will be passed and that its provisions will be made immediately effective.

Very truly yours,

MASON M. PATRICK,
Major General, Air Service, Chief of Air Service.

IMMIGRATION

MR. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of immigration.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of immigration. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, I propose by this speech to point out to you briefly the history of immigration and what Congress has done to our immigration policy, beginning prior to our 1921 laws and including the permanent act that was passed by Congress in May, 1924.

Prior to 1921 we all know that a different policy of immigration was pursued, namely, to allow able-bodied men, women, and children to enter this country who were morally and physically fit and who would not become public charges. As a result of this policy our country is now the greatest Nation in the world.

In 1921 we proposed a quota policy of 3 per cent of the nationals in the United States, based upon the census of 1910, and although we drifted away from our original scheme, nevertheless it was a workable policy and it greatly restricted immigration and gave us the following number of immigrants:

Country or region of birth	Year ended June 30, 1924, quota	Year ended June 30, 1923, quota	Year ended June 30, 1922, quota
Albania	288	288	288
Armenia (Russian)	230	230	1,589
Austria	7,342	7,451	7,451
Belgium	1,563	1,563	1,563
Bulgaria	302	302	302
Czechoslovakia	14,357	14,357	14,282
Danzig, Free City of	301	301	301
Denmark	5,619	5,619	5,694
Esthonia	1,348	1,348	1,348
Finland	3,921	3,921	3,921
Fiume, Free State of	71	71	71
France	5,729	5,729	5,729
Germany	67,607	67,607	68,059
Great Britain, Ireland	77,342	77,342	77,342
Greece	3,063	3,294	3,294
Hungary (including Sopron District)	5,747	5,638	5,638
Iceland	75	75	75
Italy	42,057	42,057	42,057
Latvia	1,540	1,540	1,540
Lithuania (including Memel and part of Pinsk region)	2,629	2,460	2,460
Luxemburg	92	92	92
Netherlands	3,607	3,607	3,607
Norway	12,202	12,202	12,202
Poland (including eastern Galicia and part of Pinsk region)	30,977	31,146	25,827
Portugal (including Azores and Madeira Islands)	2,465	2,465	2,520
Rumania	7,419	7,419	7,419
Russia, European and Asiatic (excluding Barred Zone)	24,405	24,405	34,284

Country or region of birth	Year ended June 30, 1924, quota	Year ended June 30, 1923, quota	Year ended June 30, 1922, quota
Spain (including Canary Islands)	912	912	912
Sweden	20,042	20,042	20,042
Switzerland	3,752	3,752	3,752
Yugoslavia	6,426	6,426	6,426
Other Europe (including Andorra, Gibraltar, Liechtenstein, Malta, Monaco, and San Marino)	86	86	86
Palestine	57	57	56
Syria	882	928	906
Turkey (European and Asiatic), including Smyrna region, and Turkish-Armenian region for 1923	2,654	2,388	656
Other Asia (including Cyprus, Hedjaz, Iraq (Mesopotamia), Persia, Rhodes, and any other Asiatic territory not included in the Barred Zone; persons born in Asiatic Russia are included in the Russian quota)	92	81	81
African	104	122	122
Egypt	18		
Atlantic islands (other than Azores, Canary Islands, Madeira, and islands adjacent to the American continents)	121	121	65
Australia	279	279	279
New Zealand and Pacific islands	80	80	80
Total	357,803	357,803	356,995

The act of 1921 was extended up to 1924 by an act of Congress when the committee pursued a further restriction, and in May, 1924, proposed a new theory of fixing the quota back to the census of 1890 for future immigration, instead of the census of 1910.

The committee, by debating the 1890 census as a quota basis for future immigration instead of the 1910 census, had the hope thereby to equalize the number of rapidly breeding people of southern and eastern Europe with the slowly breeding people of northern and western Europe.

By permitting more people from northern and western Europe to come here, we will eventually have an evenly balanced foreign population and happiness will reign supreme. In short, we must have more Nordics, more people with blue eyes, blond hair, and long stature.

By the adoption of the 1890 census Congress hoped to increase the number of Nordics and decrease the number coming from eastern and southern Europe to be admitted, and under the 1890 census the following table gives us the number to be admitted:

Country or area:	
Afghanistan	100
Albania	100
Andorra	100
Arabian Peninsula	100
Armenia	124
Australia, including Papua, Tasmania, and islands appertaining to Australia	121
Austria	785
Belgium	512
Bhutan	100
Bulgaria	100
Cameroon (proposed British mandate)	100
Cameroon (French mandate)	100
China	100
Czechoslovakia	3,073
Danzig, Free City of	228
Denmark	2,789
Egypt	100
Esthonia	124
Ethiopia (Abyssinia)	100
Finland	471
France	3,954
Germany	51,227
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	34,007
Greece	100
Hungary	473
Iceland	100
India	100
Iraq (Mesopotamia)	100
Irish Free State	28,567
Italy, including Rhodes, Dodekanesia, and Castellorizzo	3,845
Japan	100
Latvia	142
Liberia	100
Liechtenstein	100
Lithuania	344
Luxemburg	100
Monaco	100
Morocco (French and Spanish Zones and Tangier)	100
Muscat (Oman)	100
Nauru (proposed British mandate)	100
Nepal	100
Netherlands	1,648
New Zealand (including appertaining islands)	100
Norway	6,453
New Guinea and other Pacific islands under proposed Australian mandate	100
Palestine (with Trans-Jordan, proposed British mandate)	100
Persia	100
Poland	5,982

Country or area—Continued.

Portugal	503
Ruanda and Urundi (Belgium mandate)	100
Rumania	603
Russia, European and Asiatic	2, 248
Samoa, western (proposed mandate of New Zealand)	100
San Marino	100
Slam	100
South Africa, Union of	100
South West Africa (proposed mandate of Union of South Africa)	100
Spain	131
Sweden	9, 561
Switzerland	2, 081
Syria and The Lebanon (French mandate)	100
Tanganyika (proposed British mandate)	100
Togoland (proposed British mandate)	100
Togoland (proposed French mandate)	100
Turkey	100
Yap and other Pacific islands (under Japanese mandate)	100
Yugoslavia	671
Total	164, 667

Area	Annual quota	
	Number allotted	Per cent of total
Northwestern Europe	140, 999	85. 6
Southern and eastern Europe and Asia	21, 847	13. 3
Africa, Australia, and New Zealand and other Pacific Islands	1, 821	1. 1
Total	164, 667	100. 0

It will therefore be seen that the so-called Nordics are permitted an annual quota of 140,999 out of 164,667, leaving the balance the difference for 39 nations.

Congress admits that it is discriminating against southern and eastern Europe. Congress practically declared the people from southern and eastern Europe inferior, and by the passage of this immigration act it has practically placed a stamp of approval in favor of the Nordic races as against the whole world.

During the quota year of 1923-24 there came to the United States the following number of persons:

To New York	116, 129
To Massachusetts	36, 374
To Illinois	33, 722
To Michigan	36, 374
To New Jersey	23, 943
To Pennsylvania	37, 515

Does the cry against immigration come from these States? Decidedly not. In fact, statistics show that where the immigrant settled the city or country prospered. Out of the number of immigrants during the quota year of 1923-24 which I have enumerated we find that the number of males and their professions are as follows:

Members of various professions	15, 056
Architects	1, 138
Electricians	2, 600
Professional engineers	3, 302
Musicians	967
Teachers	2, 058
Physicians	646
Literary and scientific persons	460
Sculptors and artists among them	226
Skilled workmen, including a large number of traders, among them miscellaneous	100, 339
Laborers	62, 144
Farm laborers	19, 152
Farmers	12, 000
Servants	38, 283
Total	160, 578

Those men were an asset to this country. It can not be said they were undesirable. It can not be said that because they came from southern and eastern Europe they were weakening the structure of America.

It has been claimed that the immigrant has reduced the standard of living which prevails here. This is likewise untrue. Those who live amongst immigrants, as distinguished from those who write about them for the purpose of establishing a thesis, know that almost from the moment of their landing they begin to establish themselves and shape their lives according to the standard mode of living.

There has been a further unjustifiable charge and contention that there is in this country an undigested mass of alien thought and alien sympathy which breeds racial hatred. This, as other figures of speech, can not bear analysis. This does not mean that they are opposed to the land in which they live and in which they earn their livelihood, where they have established a permanent home for themselves and their children.

When they left their country, they severed all political relations with foreign countries. Do any considerable portion of them expect to leave our shores? Certainly not.

Were the Puritans of New England, the Cavaliers of Virginia and Maryland, the Knickerbockers of New York, the Quakers of Pennsylvania, or the Scandinavians of the Middle West, with their undigested mass of alien thought and alien sympathy, a menace to this country? They were not.

All students of American history know very well that our majestic Republic has been built up by a mingling of many races including those which are being discriminated against to-day as undesirables.

The Italians, the Jews, the Poles of Russia, the Lithuanians, and Bohemians, have mingled and fused with the early immigrants, namely, the English, the Scotch, and the Irish, and the Scandinavians.

While the melting pot has not yet completed its amalgamated process, who shall say that America has lost any of her superiority because of the inter-racial transplanting and inter-racial transfusion?

What a country this would be if the quota law was enforced during the time Columbus entered this country.

What a country this would be if Marconi were returned when he came to this country in excess of the quota, or Tesla, with his wireless telegraphy and electrical inventions. What would happen if Steinmetz was barred from entering this country because of the quota act or because he came from southern Europe? And who by these contributions have justified the wisdom of admitting the Jews and eastern Europeans in this land of ours. The president of one of the largest construction companies—Thompson-Starrett—was once a poor immigrant boy, coming from the land which is now being discriminated against. He is Louis J. Horowitz.

In 1776 there were some 4,000 Jews in the United States who generally aided the Americans in the Revolutionary War.

Haym Saloman, a Polish Jew, loaned his great fortune to help the Colonies at a critical juncture.

Columbus came with Jews to America 128 years before the *Mayflower*, who brought to Plymouth its political and religious refugees from England, who gave to America its spirit, its truth, and its freedom.

If there is anyone who doubts or questions the value and the contribution made to America by the races and people of southern and eastern Europe, he has but to spend a few days in a typical New England industrial center.

In Worcester, Mass., for instance, there are 37 nationalities at work in its various factories, creating the wealth of that thriving city; and what is true of Worcester is true of all of New England's industrial centers of population, with her humming mills and busy factories.

I have referred only briefly to the contributions made by the immigrants of southern and eastern Europe in the field of creative arts. I believe it is conceded by the keenest and deepest students of sociology that these peoples, because of their tradition and by virtue of their temperament, can and will and are supplementing our material development with creative production in the artistic realm.

The cultured of our people in New York enjoy and admire the world-famous Jewish violinists, pianists, vocalists, and actors.

Dr. Leopold Auer, most famous of violin teachers, has his studio in New York.

Rubin Goldmark is president of the Bohemians, which is the largest and strongest of the world's clubs of musicians. His symphonic compositions are played by the world's great orchestras, and artists from all parts of America seek his studio for lessons in harmony and composition. In Puritan meeting houses the fiddle was thought an instrument of Satan's. Our Anglo-Saxon stock has crying need for the sobbing violins of virtuosi from southeastern and southern Europe and for all their wonderful arts: Zimbalist, Elman, Heifetz, Kreisler, De Pachmann, Godowsky, Rachmaninoff, Caruso, Gigli, and Bonci.

Russia sent us Stokowski, who gives to Philadelphia the most brilliant of all orchestras.

Naturally and instinctively we think of patriotism as the highest expression of Americanism. In the great hour of an emergency or national crisis all people of all races and religions are tested by the call to arms and by the service and self-sacrifice on the battle field, if need be. Anyone familiar with the devotion and heroism of our boys in the recent war must admit that no single race had a monopoly on heroism.

I commend to those who are infected with the germ of the Nordic superior race theory, their beautiful and effective story of the eight American soldiers, by Samuel McCoy, which I shall take the liberty to quote:

The heroism of the eight Americans whom I am about to name was duplicated in every one of the hundreds of regiments which were

sent from America to serve in France. I name these eight men merely because their war records happen to be before me at the moment and because much has been said of late in regard to the proper qualifications for American citizenship.

Each of these men was awarded the distinguished-service cross. Twenty thousand men who fought in the same division to which they belonged, all acquitted themselves with honor in the face of danger. A thousand men of the division were singled out to appear in the divisional citations for feats of heroism performed in that campaign. But these eight were ranked even higher than all these. They were of the handful who won the distinguished-service cross, a decoration awarded only "for extraordinary heroism in action."

The first man, a sergeant, in the assault launched against the seemingly impregnable Hindenburg line, "although twice wounded, refusing to leave the field, but remained with his platoon, exhibiting magnificent courage and bravery until he was wounded a third time. His devotion to duty set a splendid example to the men of his company."

The second man, a corporal, in the same fearful fire of the enemy, "was an advance scout for his platoon. The platoon was temporarily halted by machine-gun fire from a section of the enemy trench in their immediate front. He rushed through the heavy enemy fire to the trench, and at the point of his rifle compelled 12 of the enemy to surrender. He then signaled for the platoon to advance."

The third, also a corporal, "left shelter, went forward, under intense machine-gun fire, and carried a wounded officer to safety. In accomplishing this mission he was severely wounded."

The fourth, a private, first class, "when the advance of his battalion was checked by heavy machine-gun fire, went forward, and two other soldiers, under heavy fire to reconnoiter the enemy positions. By effective rifle fire they drove the gunners from two machine-gun nests into a dugout nearby, which they captured, together with 35 prisoners, including 3 officers."

The fifth man, also a private, "after being severely wounded by shrapnel, took shelter in a shell hole somewhat in advance of his company, from which he had become separated in the fog and smoke. He saved the lives of four of his wounded comrades, who were occupying the shell hole, by throwing live grenades which had been tossed into the shell hole by members of his own company in the rear into the enemy's lines."

The sixth, a private, "under heavy shell and machine-gun fire, left the shelter of his trench, and going forward under a thick smoke screen, single-handed captured between 30 and 40 prisoners. Three weeks later, in a second battle, after the advance of his company had been stopped by strong, hostile machine-gun fire, he, with three comrades, advanced far ahead of the front line to attack an enemy position located in a large farmhouse. By skillful maneuvering in the broad daylight they covered all entrances to the house and forced the surrender of the entire force of the enemy, numbering 36 men and 2 officers. During the exploit they killed 2 of the enemy who attempted to take cover in the cellar."

The seventh, a private, "exhibited exceptional bravery by leaving shelter and going into an open field, under heavy machine-gun and shell fire, to rescue wounded soldiers."

The eighth man, also a private, "while the advance against the Hindenburg line was at its height, seeing an American machine gunner exposed to the enemy, ran to his assistance. On the way he was seriously wounded, but continued on, reaching the position and using his body to shield the gunner while the latter poured a fire into the enemy. He was wounded three times, finally losing consciousness, but after his wounds were dressed he insisted on leaving the field unaided."

The names of these eight American soldiers, all of whom are still living, are John N. F. Bilitzki, Lonnie J. Moscow, Alojzy Nagowski, Isaac Rabinowitz, Epifanio Aflatato, Wasyl Kolonoczyk, Daniel Moskowitz, and Antony Sclafoni.

Having disposed of the racial ethnic argument used by the restrictionists to justify the closing of the door of the United States, let me pass on to another phase of the question. The restriction act of May 19, 1921, was enacted as a postwar reconstruction measure.

We had an army of unemployed, and as a temporary expedient we tightened up on our restrictive features. But that emergency is passed. Less than several years ago, when we were on the upward swing industrially, captains of industry and farmers were demanding the complete abandonment of all restrictive legislation on immigration. The cry went out that there was imminent danger of a labor shortage, seriously handicapping the industrial and the agricultural development of our Nation. What has happened since then to justify swinging to the other extreme? The passage of the 1924 act based on the census of 1890 is very evident as a discriminatory bill, as pointed out.

We have abandoned the policy laid down by the founders of this Republic, which policy, so far as immigration is concerned, made possible the greatest development ever witnessed by any people and by any nation in history.

I was designated as a member of the Immigration Committee in the Sixty-eighth Congress, and remain such a member of the same committee in the Sixty-ninth Congress.

I have carefully studied the immigration problem without any prejudice and without any foreign sympathy but purely from the standpoint of a representative of the American people and what in my opinion would be best for this country.

I find that during the course of my experience as a member of this great Immigration Committee that the members constituting this committee are men of great learning and intelligence, but yet they have not and do not fully grasp the situation and the conditions that confront certain sections of the United States. This, I presume, is due to the little time a Member has in the course of his duties in Congress to further study his people, their environment, and the surrounding home life, as a result of which when a Member representing a large city community proposes a workable liberalization policy of immigration, it may be looked upon with suspicion by the colleague coming from a southern or other part of the country, he believing that the proposed claim suggested by the Member representing the city district is furthering a measure to bring more labor into the United States. On the other hand, this may not be the intention at all, but may be purely an act of humanity and to bring about a better understanding of each restrictive policy on immigration and to unite the families of those people who are in the United States and who, as a result of statutory requirements, can not become citizens of the United States for a number of years. However, if these people were to apply for citizenship to-day, they could pass the tests and thereby be enabled to apply for visas for their wives and minor children, so that they may emigrate to this country and join their relatives.

During the present session of Congress there came before the Committee on Immigration several organizations who opposed the uniting of families as nonquota immigrants, but suggested that they be given a preference within the quota. It is surprising that some people will talk about preference in the quota, which means almost nothing, except to the ordinary American it would mean that a preference comes first, but in reality the quota under the act of 1924 is so small that in certain countries it would take years—not one or two, but perhaps five years or more—before the preference would amount to anything.

How can a wife and minor child interfere with any labor problems in this country, and why should the United States not allow a man who has been permanently admitted and of good moral character to bring in his wife and minor children exempt of any quota? This is strictly a humane measure. It tends to bring a better and higher standard of morality and, in my opinion, would be more advantageous to the prospective future citizen.

Who can honestly and justly advocate the separation for many years of a family? Yet that seems to be the case from sections of the country that have never had dealings with immigration direct and that do not know anything about the type of men and women but about whom they write and speak.

The President of the United States, in his message to Congress on December 8, 1925, said:

While not enough time has elapsed to afford a conclusive demonstration, such results as have been secured indicate that our immigration law is on the whole beneficial. It is undoubtedly a protection to the wage earners of this country. The situation should, however, be carefully surveyed, in order to ascertain whether it is working a needless hardship upon our own inhabitants. If it deprives them of the comfort and society of those bound to them by close family ties, such modifications should be adopted as will afford relief, always in accordance with the principle that our Government owes its first duty to our own people and that no alien, inhabitant of another country, has any legal rights whatever under our Constitution and laws. It is only through treaty, or through residence here, that such rights accrue. But we should not, however, be forgetful of the obligations of a common humanity.

* * * We ought to have no prejudice against an alien because he is an alien. The standard which we apply to our inhabitants is that of manhood, not place of birth. * * *

What has Congress done to follow this recommendation and the recommendation of the many millions of Americans who join in the President's message?

The uniting of families brings about better citizenship and a better class of people who will grow up with their newly adopted land. Why Congress should be guided by the influence of certain organizations in the United States who hold a whip over the heads of some Members of this great House of Representatives who fear political destruction is beyond me to conceive. I should venture to say, that if these various Members of Congress in their respective States would place

the question before their own constituents as to whether or not families of permanent residents in the United States and future citizens should be united, I have no doubt in my mind but that they would change their form of policy and their form of vote. I believe and have much faith in our American people, but the fact remains that they do not get the proper information. Some of them are led to believe that the uniting of families would completely open our doors to immigration and would allow in thousands and millions of immigrants, which is not a fact and never was supported by the most liberal in Congress.

I believe in a restrictive policy of immigration and I do not believe in allowing to come here more than we can absorb, but where no injury could come to any of us—and in fact would help bring about a better spirit in patching up separated families—who can deny that right?

It is only necessary for me to make a slight reference to the testimony of a number of declarants, who appeared before the Committee on Immigration on or about the 16th day of February, 1926, which testimony will be found in the hearing entitled "Admission of Relatives and Soldiers," No. 69.1.9.

In this instance the committee came into close contact with the new immigrants, and had an opportunity to cross-examine each declarant individually. To relate all their testimony would burden the reader, and I will therefore just confine myself to a very few brief questions and answers. It must also be borne in mind that these declarants although only here between one and two and one-half years, can speak the English language understandingly.

The first one, Joseph Danowsky, in this country about two and one-half years, has a wife and two children in Europe. He states, "I wrote to my wife and children on the other side and also sent them the flag of this country and told them it was the American flag. One of my children answered me that it was very nice and would like to be where it is and learn the English language and become Americans":

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

Q. All you are seeking is to have your wife and children come into this country? Is not that the point?

By Mr. Danowsky:

A. Yes; and to get a real education, to be a good American boy and girl.

Part of the testimony of Phillip Reiss, another declarant, who appeared before the committee, is as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

Q. How long are you in this country?—A. Two years and eight months.

Q. What do you average a week?—A. \$55.

Q. Can you support your wife and children?—A. Yes; I have a home for a year.

Q. Without a wife?—A. Yes.

Q. You say you make \$50 a week. Are you prepared to give your wife a good home?—A. Yes.

The other declarants, who appeared before the committee, made statements of a similar nature to the questions which were asked of them and they gave the impression of being men of good character. They came into this country through the quota process and are able to pass the examination for citizenship to-day if the statutes permitted it. All they requested was that they be given the right to bring in their wives and minor children in exemption of the quota, so that they may live a cleaner, happier, and more respectable life with the same equal rights as offered other men.

Can Congress therefore close its ears and deny them the right to bring in the dearest members of their family? How can the restrictionists answer this question?

NATIONAL ORIGIN SCHEME

To the existing confusion with reference to the enforcement of the immigration act of 1924, there will be added the difficulty in ascertaining the status of every alien by the new feature which goes into effect July 1, 1927, and written into the act of 1924, as follows:

SEC. 11. (b) The annual quota of any nationality for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1927, and for each year thereafter, shall be a number which bears the same ratio to 150,000 as the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 having that national origin (ascertained as hereinafter provided in this section) bears to the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920, but the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100.

This new method of computation is without precedent in the traditions of American lawmaking. Under the provisions of this so-called "origin scheme" quoted above, after July 1, 1927, three members of the President's Cabinet are given the

right to decide the national origin of the population of the United States in 1920. The alleged statistics of which the law of 1924 is based do not exist in fact; are built on carefully made and skilfully spread falsehoods and prejudices, presented to the Imm'gration Committee of the Senate when the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] insisted upon its incorporation in the act of 1924 the so-called "origin provision," and the House naturally fell for it. When the bill was passed in the House originally this provision was not included. Not until it got to the Senate was it attached to the bill by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

At that time both the Director of the Census, Mr. Steuart, and Doctor Hill, who appeared before the managers, declared that they would be obliged to adopt arbitrary methods to arrive at the proper basis upon which allocation would be based. This provision, which is to go into effect July 1, 1927, limits the number of European immigrants to 150,000 annually, and from the tabulation prepared by the proponents of this scheme and utilized on the floor of the House by Mr. VAILE, of Colorado, then a member of the Immigration Committee, and in the conference meeting by the conferees, through the efforts of this distinguished Senator I speak of from Pennsylvania, reduced to actual understandable figures—not upon any scientific basis at all—a limitation of 150,000 for all the countries of Europe.

The following table of permissible immigration is shown below as they were submitted on the floor of the House:

Quotas

Nationality or country	Present law	2 per cent of 1890 with minimum of 100	National origins under the 150,000 limit proviso
Albania.....	288	100	100
Armenia.....	230	100	100
Austria.....	7,342	990	1,840
Belgium.....	1,563	509	260
Bulgaria.....	302	100	100
Czechoslovakia.....	14,357	1,873	1,320
Danzig.....	301	223	100
Denmark.....	5,619	2,782	1,092
Estonia.....	1,348	102	221
Finland.....	3,921	145	498
Flume.....	71	100	100
France.....	5,729	3,878	2,763
Germany.....	67,007	50,129	22,018
Great Britain and Ireland.....	77,342	62,458	91,111
Greece.....	3,063	100	536
Hungary.....	5,747	488	1,259
Iceland.....	75	100	100
Italy.....	42,057	3,889	5,878
Latvia.....	1,540	117	253
Lithuania.....	2,622	302	444
Luxemburg.....	97	100	100
Netherlands.....	3,602	1,637	2,669
Norway.....	12,205	6,453	2,433
Poland.....	30,979	8,872	4,509
Portugal.....	2,465	474	275
Rumania.....	7,419	631	386
Russia.....	24,405	1,792	4,002
Spain.....	912	124	141
Sweden.....	20,042	9,561	3,707
Switzerland.....	3,752	2,081	781
Yugoslavia.....	6,426	735	602
Other Europe.....	86	125	100
Palestine.....	57	100	100
Syria.....	882	100	162
Turkey.....	2,654	100	119
Other Asia.....	92	100	100
Africa.....	104	100	100
Egypt.....	18	100	100
Atlantic Islands.....	121	100	134
Australia.....	279	120	100
New Zealand.....	80	100	100
Total.....	357,801	161,990	150,903

At that time I bitterly opposed this scheme and made a speech against it on May 9, 1924, in which I attacked this so-called "origin scheme," but it seems little attention was paid to my protest. Nobody seemed to be familiar with it, but nevertheless they accepted the report of the House managers, who knew just as little about it. Now that the law is going into force the voice of the people is heard against it, and rightfully so. It is a law which will bring about a most hopeless confusion in the entire scheme of immigration; and no matter how complicated the law may be to-day and how unjust it may be to the alien who seeks admission into the United States, it is nothing compared to what it will be when this so-called "origin scheme" goes into effect.

The writing into the law of this provision was a new departure from our immigration policy in the history of our country. It is a brand-new scheme of dividing the world into

friendly and unfriendly races. It will undoubtedly result in a decided cleavage amongst the alien population of the United States into races which are considered good and races which are considered inferior. What the basis for the division is is almost impossible to ascertain, if we take into consideration statistics and such other material before us. It is the most arbitrary division of peoples and nationalities which the world has as yet seen.

I am not aware that there is any satisfactory yardstick which can, in view of our present knowledge of races and nationalities, determine at a moment's notice an individual race or origin. A study of the European nations will clearly show that none of them can boast of uniform racial origin. All European races have been the result of a long process of mixture of nationalities and races, so that a Briton of to-day may have as much Irish blood in him as he has Scotch or English. How it will be possible to ascertain that a person is purely Irish or English or Swedish or German has not yet been shown in the scheme that is to take effect in July, 1927.

In practical operation it has been figured that the bulk of the new immigrants will come from Great Britain and North Ireland. The Irish Free State has been cut from the present quota of 28,567 to a quota of 8,330. The increase in the quota of Great Britain and North Ireland is 34,000 to 85,135, and I predict that the figure will be 91,111, as I stated on the floor of the House in my speech in opposition to this "origin" proposition in May, 1924. How in the world can anybody determine whether a person is of north Irish or south Irish extraction is beyond my comprehension.

Who brought about this "national origin" scheme? In making a thorough examination, we find that paid agents of the Carnegie organization, having secured appointments as unpaid officials of the United States Government departments, being in the Government service, under these conditions, and while under the pay of the Carnegie Endowment, and with its powerful backing, were thus enabled to work out the law passed in 1924, which provided for this so-called "origin" provision and which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania accepted as accurate. As a matter of fact, the principal officials of the Carnegie organization admit its responsibility for the 1924 immigration law, and its agents also admit that they were employed by the Carnegie organization for this purpose.

I could go on and on to show the unjustness and the slur upon the good people of this country by such a scheme, but one need not go very much further to establish one's case after reading the three tables I have set forth above, and which will convince you beyond a shadow of doubt that a certain group of individuals who enjoy luxury and who know of no hardships are seeking to make America Nordic and are going to extremes at the expense of the American people and against those who have helped to build America.

I hope at the next session of Congress to remove the stain that has been on the statute books of our country and which are contrary to every tradition of America.

SPEECHES DELIVERED AT THE STATE RALLY OF 2,000 OHIO DEMOCRATS IN COLUMBUS, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 1926

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including the addresses of certain gentlemen at a Democratic meeting in Columbus two or three weeks ago, including the former Secretary of the Navy, Senator KING, the State chairman, and myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by publishing the addresses of some Democrats. Is there objection?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not hear distinctly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by publishing the addresses of certain Democrats.

Mr. HOWARD. That seems reasonable.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted I insert the addresses delivered at the State Democratic rally in Columbus, Ohio, June 2, 1926, by Hon. T. E. Dye, chairman Democratic State executive committee; by Hon. Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy in the Cabinet of President Wilson; by Hon. WILLIAM H. KING, United States Senator from Utah; and by Hon. MARTIN L. DAVEY, Member of Congress for the fourteenth Ohio district. The addresses are as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. T. E. DYE, CHAIRMAN DEMOCRATIC STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Your excellency, Governor Donahey, distinguished guests and fellow Democrats, this great outpouring of men and women, representing prac-

tically every county of the State, to do honor to a distinguished Secretary of the Navy from North Carolina and the great Senator from Utah, the cradle of beautiful Salt Lake, is characteristic of the militant Democracy of Ohio.

Let me assure you, Mr. Secretary and Mr. Senator, that we boys and we girls are not related either by blood or political ties to a certain other group of Ohio citizens who called themselves "we boys," better known as the "Ohio gang," and who now are so conspicuous by their absence in any political gathering.

Sirs, when you have returned to your homes let us hope that you may have been impressed with the fine citizenship of this great Commonwealth. Be assured that not only the men and women comprising the Democratic Party, but also the great mass of independent thinking Republicans have been humiliated and are determined to blot out the stain on Ohio's fair name not only by punishing the guilty, but also by returning to private life men in high position who have tried to shield them by resorting to the mongrel family for emblems of purity for comparison. Friends, can it be possible that the senior Senator from Ohio, the purifier of Newbury, has been wrongly interpreted, that after all he did not seek to elevate in his famous hound's tooth oration, but rather to classify, knowing old dog Tray's propensity to gorge himself on viands repulsive to decent citizens. Democratic candidates for United States Senate, please take notice, have a heart.

I want to take this opportunity to appeal to the Democratic men and women present—when you return to your respective homes lose no time to cooperate with your fellow Democrats to fill your tickets with men of quality, men of character for every office within the gift of your respective counties, particularly legislative candidates. In senatorial and congressional districts give us men, real red-blooded men. If you leaders will lead, if you will become enthusiastic your enthusiasm will be infectious and good men will respond to your appeal. We must be willing to sacrifice and to serve, we must be unselfish and untiring in our efforts; never was the stage set prettier for the Democrats in Ohio than it is to-day. We have elected 8 governors out of the last 10, and each succeeding administration has brought new honor and glory to the Democratic Party in Ohio.

In 1910, under the gallant leadership of that great statesman, the dean of Ohio's Democracy, Hon. Judson Harmon, we elected a legislature in both branches and a full complement of State officers, and we delivered the goods to the people of Ohio.

Under the leadership of Governor Harmon's successor, the little giant from the Miami Valley, Hon. James M. Cox, we placed Ohio in the forefront of the States of the Nation in progressive and humane laws for the common man, and while there has been a relaxing on the part of the great body of voters for legislative and minor offices in the past eight years, the masses are again aroused and fully realize that they had placed a herculean task on the shoulders of Ohio's present distinguished governor, Vic Donahey.

Let me say to you now, without preference or prejudice, that whom-ever the party selects for its standard bearer this fall that candidate will go to the people with an appeal to give him a legislature and State officers who will cooperate and with our pledge that we will give them an administration of which they can well be proud.

The stage is set, the curtain is drawn; are we going to give the people a show befitting the dignity of a great party, or are we going to strew the State with political corpses? It is in our hands, fellow Democrats; let's be men, let's defend our share of the present administration, conscious of the fact that it is human to err but firm in the faith that our servants have done the right as God has given them the light to see the right.

We know from experience in our own household that it is hard to always keep every member in the straight and narrow path. I have had a close-up view of the present administration for the past 20 months, I know that each and every department under Democratic rule has vied with the other to excel in their service to the people of this great State, and I defy Granny Crabbe, attorney general, or any of his satellites to show wherein the present administration has wilfully or intentionally abused the trust imposed in it. I do not make this statement in defense of any candidate for office at this time but in defense of the Democratic Party.

It is my hope to see our party in Ohio builded on so firm a foundation that it can never again be said that our governor is bigger than the Democratic Party. Ohio has many sons that are destined to shine, Simon-pure Jeffersonian Democrats, Christian gentlemen, broad in mind, keen of instinct, leaders of men, leaders in business acumen. Men who believe governments were made for men, not men made for governments, men who believe that our Government is a big business institution and should be run as such.

It is now my pleasure to introduce one of the outstanding Ohio men of this type. One who has been growing rapidly in northern Ohio for the past 10 years, who served a Republican city as mayor for 6 years, and who is now serving a third term in Congress from a Republican district. It gives me great pleasure to introduce Hon. MARTIN L. DAVEY, Congressman from the fourteenth district, to the Democracy of Ohio.

ADDRESS OF HON. MARTIN L. DAVEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FOURTEENTH OHIO DISTRICT

To the men and women of Ohio Democracy, perhaps I may be pardoned for telling this gathering of coworkers in the great cause for which we stand, why I am a Democrat. As the apostle said, "Let us give a reason for the faith that is in us," and I would like to relate to you the historical facts and the reasoning which have made me a Democrat from deliberate choice.

I was not born a Democrat. My good old father was an independent in politics. My mother's people happened to be all Republicans. I am engaged in business, in fact, there is where I make the money I spend in politics, and undoubtedly the larger proportion of the people with whom we do business are Republicans. My home county, and every other county in my congressional district, is normally Republican. So the easy course for me, if I merely wanted to secure and hold public office, for the sake of the office, and if I wanted to do the thing politically which would be likely to help my business most, would be to join the Republican Party and accept the benefits of the easy road.

But there is something about it that appeals to me in a deeper and more fundamental sense than mere temporary political success and the fleeting honor that goes with it. My immediate inspiration is the romance surrounding the life of my good old father, who came to America 53 years ago as a penniless immigrant and carved out a name and a place for himself in this country by virtue of the opportunities and the conditions that exist here. Granting that he had a genius for doing the things that he did, yet it is only fair to say that America made him possible. And I might go even further and say that America made us all possible. I have a feeling of deep gratitude to my native country and its institutions that gave me my all, that provided in its very foundations the opportunities and the possibilities which I crave. It is all the more significant to me that these things were possible in spite of the fact that I came from the people and had no advantages of wealth or aristocracy to aid.

When you and I speak of America we do not mean the vast expanse of land nor the majestic mountains nor the mighty rivers. We do not even mean the unsurpassed natural wealth that God Almighty put here as a storehouse upon which mankind might draw. These things have been here for countless centuries. The physical world does not change. The same glorious sun shone upon the wondrous mountains and fertile valleys of America 10,000 years ago that shines to-day. The same brilliant stars twinkled in the nighttime in bygone ages. The same moon spread her silvery luster over the earth in the beginning of time as it does to-day. For thousands of years the mighty rivers have continued to flow to the sea. Towering trees have adorned the surface of the earth for so long that man can not tell, and for countless centuries flowers have bloomed and the birds have sung their sweet songs and the winds have made sweet music through the tree-tops.

While the physical world has remained unchanged, great things have taken place in the progress of the human race. We go back for centuries and we see the masses of mankind as the unrewarded and unconsidered slaves of selfish masters. And then there began to work in the human consciousness and undefined and perhaps incoherent force—a groping after something better. Gradually, and by very long processes, mankind wrested from unwilling lords and kings and rulers the beginning of liberty. Step by step the human race moved forward, led by daring and courageous spirits who aspired to the advancement of the race, and oftentimes they paid a tragic price for their defiance of the established order. It was the spirit of liberty and democracy working in the souls of men, always groping through the darkness toward the rising sun.

Finally, there was established here in America, as a result of the centuries of human advancement, an entirely new system and philosophy of government. It was born of the blood and suffering of the pioneers. It was dedicated to human liberty and equal rights. It proclaimed to the world a new philosophy that all men should have an equal opportunity, no matter what might have been their origin.

And yet, in the very beginning of this Republic, there developed a struggle for supremacy between two opposing philosophies—one advocated by Hamilton and the other by Jefferson. Hamilton was at heart a monarchist. He believed that all government should be run for the benefit of the rich and powerful, and I think he believed it honestly. He had no faith in the masses. He would have given them nothing except the crumbs from a benevolent aristocracy. He would have made of this country not only a monarchy, but he would have grafted on it the curse of social castes and the blighting influence of titled nobility. He would have made the Federal Government supreme not for the benefit of the people, but to rule them in the interest of the masters. Hamilton did not even favor the American Constitution, and he accepted it only because he found that it was impossible to get anything more nearly to his liking.

The titanic struggle that took place in the early days of this Republic, a century and a quarter ago, is one of the greatest romances of human progress in all history. It must be that God gave Thomas Jefferson to America, and put into his noble soul the philosophy of government and the spirit of liberty that became the foundation of our Nation.

And God must have given to Jefferson a marvelous courage and a spirit of self-sacrifice adequate to meet the demands of a situation charged with great possibilities for the future of the race.

The story of Jefferson's life and service is so inseparably interwoven with the America that we know and love that it challenges the thought and spirit of our citizenship for all time. Think of this man, born of aristocratic lineage, with all that wealth and social position could give him; think of this man at a time when the spirit of aristocracy and wealth temporarily held sway and defied the elemental purpose of democracy. Jefferson might very easily have chosen for himself the path of luxury and social preferment and political advancement among those of like birth. Many another man in similar circumstances would have done so, but the great Jefferson breathed the spirit of democracy, felt the heart throbs of the great common people, turned his back on the things that were his by birth, and took up the battle for human rights and popular government.

Jefferson believed in the masses. It was his conviction that no just government could rest upon any other foundation than that of popular satisfaction and support. His philosophy was not one of force, exercised by an all-powerful Federal Government, but one built upon the solid foundation of popular approval. He was the great apostle of democracy in its noblest and truest sense. The political battle which was waged under his magnificent and courageous leadership was probably the most important thing that has happened in America, not even excepting the wars that have been fought to establish America and maintain her national integrity. If Jefferson had failed, the America that we know and venerate would probably never have existed, although perhaps it may be fair to say that the spirit of liberty is irresistible and might some day have asserted itself. At least the happy day when democracy should rule would have been postponed for a long time, and we would have had here in this land a Nation made up of millions of people ruled by a strong Federal Government that had no thought for the people themselves, but gave every consideration and all the benefits of government to the rich and powerful. There would have been no great opportunity for you and me. The places which we enjoy to-day we have in abundant measure because a noble and courageous soul, in the person of Thomas Jefferson, led a movement and a battle of human progress that established democracy as the fundamental basis of American civic and political life.

What is democracy, that sacred principle that has been the greatness and glory of America? It is that system and philosophy of government which guarantees to the children of all Americans an equal right to success and advancement, to prosperity and happiness. It proclaims to all men that the child of the most lowly shall have no barrier placed in his way by law or caste or custom. It beckons with outstretched hands, with like force and meaning, to the farmer boy in the far away prairies, to the son of the struggling mechanic, and even to one who toils way down in the mines, or to the child of adversity in the great cities, and bids him rise and partake of the blessings of this land of freedom and opportunity in full measure, according to his natural endowments and the effort which he is willing to give for his advancement.

This principle is so fundamental in America and has contributed so much to our greatness and our national well-being that it is worthy of the utmost devotion of a great people who have been its beneficiaries. That principle must be preserved in America in all of its virgin strength and fineness so that we may continue to enjoy a land of freedom and opportunity in a very real and full sense.

I believe in Democratic government. I believe in the masses of the people. Jefferson was their great advocate, and his philosophy has justified itself over and over again. The masses are more nearly right than their traducers. There is a great soul in the common people, a great God-given instinct to judge things by their true values. They may err at times, but nearly always through false leaders. But the masses work out their philosophy over a period of time in terms of truth and justice and human right.

Here let me tell a simple little story that illustrates my conception of democratic America. It is the story of a little home, somewhere in the interior of the country. There are only two rooms in this house. One is used as a bedroom and the other as a combined living room and dining room. There are no carpets on the floors, just three or four very inexpensive rugs. There are no lace curtains at the windows. Two pictures only adorn the walls. One is a picture of George Washington crossing the Delaware, and the other is the picture of a pansy bed.

The house is clean but the furniture is very simple, just a few inexpensive pieces. In the living room is a large cook stove that serves for heating purposes also. There are a table and a few chairs, with a desk at one side of the room and a sideboard at the other, both of which show unmistakable signs of the family adversities.

Here and there one may see cracks in the walls, because this home was crudely made by its owner who could afford nothing better. There are flowers in the yard and plenty of fresh vegetables in the garden, but it takes only a glance to see that this is a home of poverty, softened it is true by intelligence and cleanliness and the love of beauty in nature.

One day there is born to this family a son, who can not know the luxuries of life in his growing years, nor the advantages of wealth and social position. From his cradle days to young manhood, he grows in the rugged environment of struggle and adversity. The day comes when he is about to leave home to go out into the great world, to him unknown, and make his way in this land of freedom and opportunity.

As he is about to leave to face the battle of life in the unknown and uncharted field, where the mettle of men is severely tested, his mother takes his hand in hers that is wrinkled and worn with toil, and speaks to him, as follows:

"My son, I want to give you a message to take with you in your struggle for place and recognition in this, our America. We have endured great and unceasing poverty. We have been unable to provide you with any of the luxuries, and only the barest necessities of life. We can not give you social position with which to start your life. We can give you none of the advantages of wealth. We have been able, by great effort and sacrifice, to provide you with a good education that is made possible by the public-school system of this country. You have a good mind and good health. You have inherited energy and ambition.

"But, my son, you and I both ought to thank God that you were born in America, this great land of freedom and democracy and equal opportunity, a land in which there is no social caste and where there is no barrier against the children of the most lowly. There is no place within the gift of the American people that is not open to you in full measure if you are worthy of it. There is no high station in the business life of this country to which you may not aspire. There is no honor or reward in the professions which you may not rightly seek, and properly hope to attain, if you have the determination and the capacity to justify it. In spite of the humbleness of your beginning, and the lowly station from which you start, this great, wonderful America, with its democracy and its liberty and its equal opportunity, is of itself a priceless regal heritage. Go! And may God bless you in your struggle for the rewards that America alone makes possible!"

This little story tells in its way the whole basic philosophy of our country. It is a thing which has inspired us as a people to greater progress and achievement than anything in the history of man. It is not the story of a physical America but of a great human force—a people and a philosophy of government.

There is something about this spirit of democracy that stirs the soul of man. It is, I think, a spiritual force. Through all the long history of human struggle there was this same irreconcilable conflict between the theory of the Hamiltons, who could conduct all human affairs for the benefit of the favored few, and the Jeffersons, who would make of government and society the servant of the masses for their protection and advancement. God give us the wisdom to see its meaning and its significance. God give us courage and nobility of purpose to maintain the fight for its preservation and upbuilding, so that we may pass on to our children a really great and worth-while America—worthy of us and a noble ancestry.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY IN THE CABINET OF PRESIDENT WILSON

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen of the Democratic hosts of Ohio, I count it a genuine privilege, as the country is emerging from the deadening of conscience in a period of static normalcy, to greet the militant Democracy of a great Commonwealth which has won 8 out of the 10 last gubernatorial elections. It is a pleasure also to break bread with the indomitable Democracy of Ohio, and to join with your distinguished party leaders, including the unbeatable Buckeye Governor, Vic Donahey, whose administration has done more to secure real economy and has talked less about it than a certain much-bepraised enough, needs a diagram to point out the excuses for the mounting costs of peace-time government.

There is need for a change in government at Washington, because instead of government of the people and by the people and for the people, we have to-day a well-oiled Federal Government—I am not now speaking of Teapot Dome—in which privilege, to quote Senator Doliver of another administration, "knows what it wants and how to get it."

It is too soon now—and will be until after the November election—for Democrats to be picking out the winning candidate for 1928. If we carry Congress, the country will look to the Democrats to name the next President, and Democrats from ocean to ocean will unite to put an end to factionalism that has aforesaid jeopardized success. But if it is too soon to discuss candidates, the time is ripe to discuss policies and principles.

THE TWO-THIRDS RULE

The hour has struck for the Democratic Party to rid itself of the body of death, popularly known as the two-thirds rule. It is a misnomer. It should be called the one-third rule. It operates for no good purpose. It is a big stick that can be used to enable a handful of delegates to thwart the will of the majority. In the old days—to be exact, in 1832—militant politicians invoked it to carry out their

purposes, and were later "hoist by their own petard." It has not often operated to defeat the will of the majority. But just so long as it is possible for 366 delegates in a convention made up of 1,098 delegates, to defeat the will of 733, just so long is it a possible menace.

Even if this rule did not conceal the possibility of minority veto, the fact that it is the only place in American politics and government in which the majority does not prevail, shows it to be both undemocratic and un-American. In its practical workings it enables "the favorite son" candidates, by holding firm, to make a mesh of the rule which sifts out the really big men. It tends to force the nomination of a candidate who is more available and more acceptable than one who is the embodiment of great causes. There was a day when the unknown man, with no enemies, was the ideal candidate. That may still work well in constituencies for the candidate of a party with a certain fixed majority of the voters. No Democrat has been elected since the war of the sixties, however, who could not both hold the vote of his party and attract a large independent vote. The growing number of independent voters, therefore, makes it increasingly important for the Democratic Party to be delivered from a rule that puts a premium on mediocrity.

The day the two-thirds rule goes to the scrap heap, to which it is now headed, that day should the unit rule also go into innocuous desuetude. They were born in the same atmosphere, and it is fitting that they should be sepulchred as twin enemies of the easy ascertainment and acceptance of the rule of the majority.

A TEXT FROM JEFFERSON

I am going to take a text to-day for my political sermon, a text, which, it seems to me, is as much needed at this hour as when it was uttered 125 years ago. You will find my text in the Democratic political bible—that is to say, the inaugural address of Thomas Jefferson, delivered on March 4, 1801. In choosing a Jefferson utterance as my text I am not partisan, for I recall that Lincoln said: "The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society." After enumerating some of the blessings enjoyed by his countrymen, which called for gratitude and "acknowledging an adoring and overruling Providence," Mr. Jefferson asked: "With all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people?" and he answered in the memorable words of my text:

"Still one thing more, fellow citizens—a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuit of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities."

I make bold to say that so much wisdom as to government, outside of Holy Writ, has not been compressed by any man, living or dead, in one brief sentence. If every trace of the written Constitution of the United States, incorporating the Bill of Rights—the sheet anchor of the instrument—and the Declaration of Independence, by some cataclysm should be destroyed, and if Elliott's Debates and Hamilton's and Madison's notable discussion of the Constitution—if these should all be lost to posterity, every necessary right and duty of government and liberty of the citizen could be constructed from this almost inspired sentence in which Jefferson summed up the whole civic duty of man and the assurance of free government. It is at once a chart of freedom and a mandate to governing bodies.

For several generations it has been the habit of his admirers and detractors to magnify this or that saying of Jefferson found in some casual letter or some other statement, often taken out of its context, and to hold up the fragment of his philosophy to the emulation or the condemnation of his countrymen. Every philosopher or idealist toys with new ideas, expresses horseback opinions upon them, and delights in throwing out suggestions for debate and discussion. In vain will you look for any subject, from drafting the Declaration to the simplest detail of improvement of agriculture, which the versatile sage of Monticello did not touch upon in his voluminous writings. There was no excursion into the philosophies or explorations such as he entered upon when Lewis and Clark reached the shores "where rolls the Oregon," or any possible dream of achievement by his country; into the philosophies or exploration, such as the Louisiana Purchase, which did not call forth his vitalizing enthusiasm. There was no faith in the capacity of the average man to which he did not hold steadfast in a day when government of the people was hardly conceived of, even by those who fought in the hope that in some far-off day it might bless their descendants.

In these days there is much emphasis upon "the frugal government" to which Mr. Jefferson gave high place, and to the practice of his precepts he gave no mere lip service. People of all political parties have approved the utterances of President Coolidge for economy in public expenditures. He came into office after the waste of war—the only way to spell war is w-a-s-t-e—and after such debauchery and exploitation and stupidity as to drive members from his Cabinet and send to prison the recreant almoner of the people's gratitude and the defenders of democracy in the World War. It was not as easy to deflate public expenditures as it had been to practice too hasty a policy of deflation following the failure of America to lead in stabilization after the

armistice. There were those who wished to "carry on" in increased military and other expenditures.

Mr. Coolidge's preaching of economy was hailed by all who had resented the failure of the Republican Congress in 1918-1920 to follow Mr. Wilson's recommendation of large tax reduction. When you hear paeans of praise for tax reduction by the Coolidge administration—too long delayed—I beg to remind you that on May 19, 1919, when the Republican Congress met in extraordinary session, President Wilson urged an immediate reduction of war taxation. A Democratic Secretary of the Treasury pointed out that reductions could be wisely effected at once. But there was no reduction of expenditures or decrease of taxation by the legislative branch of the Government which came under Republican control after the November election in the 1918 debacle. Why the delay? The Republican Congress did not conceal its purpose. Its policy, determined upon by political expediency, was to let the people groan under war taxes until after the election of 1920. They believed that by such partisan course they could deceive the people and persuade them that the way to relief was in a Republican victory. They understood that American voters, disillusioned and shell shocked, could be stampeded into change. Their political assessment of popular turning from idealism proved to be accurate.

While acknowledging the value of much good preaching, and some, but belated, good practice of economy by Mr. Coolidge, the country has now come to see after a period of propaganda and acceptance of inspired statements by the spokesman, whoever he is, that there has been much more talk of "a frugal government" than of realization of the sort of administration Jefferson proclaimed and put in operation. It has been more noticeable in the breach than in the observance.

The cost of administration of Federal Government in peace times has steadily risen in the period when an army of press agents have been dinning into the ears of the people that economy to the bone has been inaugurated at Washington. No one expects to conduct government in this era of high prices upon the economical plane that prevailed in the administrations of Grover Cleveland or the pre-war period under Wilson. But they do expect, when all the virtues have been relegated to the scrap heap except economy, which has been crowned as the first and only commandment, that there shall be some fruits to show for the showers of promise and proclamation. The test of whether the promise to the ear has been kept to the hope is to eliminate all expenditures made necessary by war and contrast the regular expenditure of such years as 1914, 1915, and 1916 with those of 1924, 1925, and 1926. When the armistice was signed Wilson at once decreased expenses by \$12,000,000. It was necessary. Nearly all the expenses decreased since Wilson were likewise necessary when war expenditures were no longer required. The country expected real economy. Instead what do we have? In a recent statement Congressman BYRNS, of the House Appropriations Committee, after a careful comparative study gave figures which show that the boasted economy to the bone is more a pose or a gesture than an accomplished fact.

"Since 1924," says Representative BYRNS, "the cost of the Federal Government has been steadily increasing despite all claims to the contrary." The Federal expenditures have increased \$2,060,227,115 since 1916, the last pre-war year of the Wilson administration. Not only have expenses increased but not counting the increases due to the war debt, sinking fund, and interest, the expenses of the Veterans' Bureau and the Shipping Board, annual expenditures have increased \$1,751,686,975. These comparative figures are for 1916 and 1925.

Not long ago the President said:

"Federal expenditures, which then amounted to \$5,538,000,000 for that fiscal year, 1921, it is now estimated will be cut down to \$3,619,000,000 for this fiscal year. This is a saving of \$1,919,000,000."

To which Mr. BYRNS answers with the following figures, which show that but for the natural decrease in war-time expenditures the Coolidge-Harding administration would have increased expenditures \$278,000,000 and more if the Congress had not of its own motion cut the President's Budget estimates.

Mr. BYRNS gives these natural decreases, as follows:

Reduction in Army and Navy expenditures, \$1,062,394,000; reduction from cost of operating railroads, \$723,502,000; reduction in cost of United States Grain Corporation, \$90,353,000; reduction in payment of war debt and interest, \$180,000,000; reduction in Civil War pensions by deaths, \$50,555,000; reduction in Emergency Fleet Corporation, \$91,033,000. Total, \$2,197,847,000, and adds:

"These six items amount to \$2,197,847,000, or \$278,000,000 more than the \$1,919,000,000 reduction in which the President takes such great pride and which he credits to 'constructive economy.' Will anyone contend for a moment that either the administration or the Congress is entitled to the least credit for these reductions?"

Two enlightening sets of figures which Mr. BYRNS has compiled on the economy propaganda of the Coolidge administration show the increase in the cost of the President's own personal branch of the Government and the increase in the number of Government employees since 1916.

The cost of the executive establishment has increased 150 per cent since the Republican administration came in and 40 per cent since

Coolidge became President. Executive office expenditures have increased as follows:

Fiscal year 1921, last year of Wilson administration, \$197,341; fiscal year 1922, \$206,926; fiscal year 1923, \$349,380; fiscal year 1924, first Coolidge year, \$450,952; fiscal year 1925, \$411,898; fiscal year 1926, \$483,007.

"The following table, according to the report of the Civil Service Commission," says Mr. BYRNS, "shows the number of employees on the Government rolls:

"July 1, 1917, 438,057; November 11, 1918, 917,760; July 1, 1920, 691,116; July 1, 1921, 597,482; July 1, 1922, 560,863; July 1, 1923, 548,671; July 1, 1924, 544,871.

"Thus, it appears that on the first of the year (1924) the number of employees on the Government's rolls was nearly 24½ per cent greater than in 1916. The peak was reached at the close of the war. During the following two and a half years, under a Democratic administration, the number was reduced by 320,278. During the two and one-half years of the Republican administration the number was reduced by 52,811."

This record shows that though expenditures have been reduced and Mr. Coolidge has prevented enough increase in naval construction to insure the United States Navy equality with Great Britain on the seas, or with France in the air, the expenses of the civil Government at Washington, with increased force and expense, make it absurd to say that we enjoy a "frugal Government" or an inexpensive one. We have saved at the spigot and spent lavishly at the bung.

The American people, regardless of party affiliations, heartily approve every step looking to real economy and a frugal Government, but they are coming to see that they have been fed up on talk, while there has been denial of the appropriation to meet the national needs of an expanding Republic. Jefferson made a "wise" government an integral part of a "frugal government." The Bible says, "There is that which scattereth and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than it meet, but it tendeth to poverty."

It is difficult to see any grounds for the claims of "frugal Government" when the number of the employees has increased 24 per cent over like expenses in 1916. "Tomato sauce and warning pans!"

One of the ways that mislead the people is to broadcast the Budget estimates. The people accept them as the real cost of Government. Then follow "supplemental estimates or deficiencies" which the Budget was to eliminate. In one year over \$600,000 was required for these additional expenditures, and last year it was much over \$300,000,000.

The time has come for ending the much-talked-of reduction of unnecessary bureaus and overlapping governmental agencies at Washington. Senator Aldrich once said \$300,000,000 could be saved annually by applying business methods. Senator OVERMAN says the savings would be \$400,000,000. Congressman DAVEY puts it at a much higher figure. Certainly "wise" Government demands retrenchment whenever it can be made without lessening efficiency. There is almost a daily arraignment of the evils of bureaucracy in Washington, but nothing is done to decrease their number, their cost, or their ineptitude. Instead they are multiplied and the evils increased to the tune of "Economy and retrenchment," in the serene belief that Barnum was right when he said the people love to be humbugged.

I rejoice to see our President take his recreation trips on the *Mayflower* and to be surrounded by comforts and even luxuries. The strain on the Chief Executive is great enough, and no expenditure is too large to give him the sort of relaxation and recreation he needs from the heavy responsibilities and burdens of his great office. But, when day by day press agents broadcast the claims of a new sort of Vermont simplicity and economy, it should be told that these things cost much more than under Taft or Wilson. Everything costs more in this high-tariff era, and taxpayers are willing that the White House cost shall be increased by as much as Mr. Coolidge may desire for his comfort. But when the increase of Executive Office expenditures is 40 per cent more under Coolidge than under Wilson, are we not entitled to have a recess from having economy and economy and economy talk, found chiefly in proclamations but not in appropriations, dinned and shouted into our ears morning, noon, and night?

It is possible to have a frugal government without a "wise" one. This is seen in many ways. May I give you a few typical illustrations?

1. We have seen denial of naval equality while other nations have been in feverish competition to surpass America on the sea. From the day in 1915 that the United States adopted a policy of naval building to make the Navy of the country the equal of any upon the seas, there has been a fixed purpose on the part of Britain to keep its supremacy of the seas. The Washington Conference, while declaring for equality, did not secure it. Since its adjournment, Britain and Japan have engaged in feverish competitive building, and Congress has refused to permit this country to obtain the promised 5-5-3 navy.

2. We have seen Muscle Shoals, upon which \$260,000,000 of public money has been spent, marking time waiting for such time as the power combine may find a way to exploit it. Almost immediately after the close of the Wilson administration a "hue and cry" to "take the Government out of business" was set up as a camouflage to stampede Congress into letting the private owners of water power

obtain the valuable Muscle Shoals costly plant. This purpose was temporarily frustrated when Henry Ford made an offer which the farmers hailed as the opportunity to secure cheaper fertilizer. Advocates of preparedness favored it because it promised freedom from dependence on Chile for nitrates. Later the Ford offer was not renewed, and nothing has been done up to this hour for the utilization of Muscle Shoals. Mr. Ford says the "power combine," which first demanded to "scrap" Muscle Shoals now demands to "exploit" it. There was but one course for a "wise" government to pursue with reference to Muscle Shoals after the armistice. That was to complete that great project by the Government and then either to operate it as Panama Canal or the Panama Railroad is operated, or by such lease as would insure cheaper water power and the production of nitrates for defense and for fertilizer. There is no real saving in jeopardizing the \$260,000,000 already spent at Muscle Shoals, and it will be a blunder equal to a crime to let it become the central part of the coming water-power trust which should not be aided by the Government. The policy is penny-wise and pound foolish of letting the power trust exploit Muscle Shoals for profit.

3. For years the failure to appropriate sufficient money to provide adequate facilities for the growing Postal Service, for the Federal courts, and other public business has been a part of the program of a "frugal" but not a "wise" Government. The necessity for new buildings could not longer be postponed. The bill recently signed, however, was originally drawn to give power of selection to the bureaucrats in Washington. A vigorous fight was necessary to preserve the right of Congress to a voice in the location of public buildings. Even now there is no wisdom in the small number to be erected or enlarged, only a portion of the most pressing needs being taken care of in the bill.

4. The great Republic should have on hand always some giant project, too great for private initiative, such as the construction of the Panama Canal, the Alaskan Railroad, the building of post roads, the widening and deepening of rivers and harbors. There has been no adequate vision of such development, and the provision, while "frugal," has been far from "wise." There is a withholding that tendeth to poverty!

Let me come to the secondly of my text. Jefferson did not conceive of a weak and namby-pamby government impotent to protect the weak from the strong. He did, indeed, believe in the least interference upon the part of government in the affairs of the citizen, and he believed that the least government was often the best, but he stood as firm as Woodrow Wilson did, when in 1913 Wilson lashed the lobbyists out of Washington, in defense of a policy "which shall restrain men from injuring one another." Restraint implies power enough to prevent injury. In Jefferson's day the same influences sought to give special privilege to the few which flowers to-day. No benefit can come to one class by governmental action costing money which is not paid for by the many. Hamilton believed that to attract the powerful interests to support of his administration they must see some monetary benefit. Claude Bowers in his great book points out that it was not Jefferson who invented the term "a corrupt squadron" in the First Congress, but that it was the talk of the highway and byways. While saying that Hamilton did not personally profit by this policy, Bowers gives this illustrative incident that undoubtedly was in Jefferson's mind when he declared that wise government should "restrain men from injuring one another."

"Hamilton led the way for favoritism, influence, and monopoly. Long before he had been impressed with the industrial possibilities of the beautiful Passaic Falls of New Jersey, midway between New York and Newark, at the very door of the market. * * * He had personally appeared with others interested before the New Jersey Legislature. Hamilton's charter gave the company the right to dig canals on any man's land free from taxation for 10 years. The other manufacturers were indignant. A manufacturer wrote a vehement protest, mentioning Hamilton by name and denouncing the act of the legislature as vicious beyond comparison."

Is there no summons to-day for government to "restrain men from injuring one another"? Does not government take from the pockets of the many to enrich the few? As a matter of fact, Government at Washington to-day largely concerns itself with sugar coating new special privilege or camouflaging special privilege already granted. I am not now speaking of the sort of graft and corruption that struck a harder blow to national preparedness than any foreign foe could deliver. The turning over of the naval petroleum reserve by the "black bag" and like rotten methods was as shocking to honest Republicans as to Democrats, and one of the recipients of the stolen goods was a Democrat and a contributor to Democratic campaign funds. A short time ago, however, to the joy of Democrats and the chagrin of Republicans, he announced that he had quit the Democratic Party and was now affiliated with the Republican Party. He doubtless thought the road in that party was better oiled and would better keep the dust of conviction out of his eyes. Your own daily paper, the Columbus Dispatch, thus facetiously expressed the view of Republicans upon Doheny's announcement that he had decided to formally withdraw from the Democratic Party and become a member of the Republican Party when it asked: "Why didn't he send a check in the mails, instead of making a

public announcement?" I am not now speaking of the exposure and convictions of a court favorite, whose betrayal of the rights of the men who served in the World War shocked Republicans and Democrats alike. I honor the Coolidge administration for landing him in the penitentiary. Corruption may come in any administration. The test is whether the corrupt official is exposed and punished, as has been done under the Coolidge administration in the case of the unworthy head of the Veterans' Bureau, and which was not done upon its initiative in the other scandals of the Harding-Coolidge administration.

I have no reference either to the corruption in the office of the Allen Property Custodian charged or suspected with crookedness. These charges are to be determined in the courts, and the country will watch with interest to see whether punishment follows flagrant maladministration and favoritism.

The Jeffersonian demand upon Government for policies "which shall restrain men from injuring one another" had reference to laws and practices advocated by the Hamiltons of his day and the Mellons of this period. Both place their advocacy openly upon the ground that national prosperity is to be promoted by what is known as the process of percolation, going from the top down. In the case cited Hamilton argued that if the particular corporation was afforded freedom from taxation and privileges not granted to others it would result in development of a giant industry. He pointed out that it would give employment to many artisans, secure the building of more houses, increase the trade of merchants, and advance the price of adjacent real estate, and promote the public welfare. It sounded as plausible as it was specious!

To-day there is a species of favoritism which has flowered at Washington on all fours with that which called from the pacific Jefferson a demand for "restraint." It is the case of the subsidy voted to the Mellon aluminum interests. You know aluminum products are of universal use, and if the price is raised it "injures" millions in their pocketbooks. When the Fordney-McCumber tariff was framing representatives of that company asked for an increase in the tariff tax so as to keep out importations that might compete with their product. I am not saying that the Secretary of the Treasury used his position to secure the increase which daily pours a flood of gold into his coffers. If he had been a private citizen, the same rate might have been granted. It certainly would if his concern had used the same pull as a private corporation which other private corporations employed. As a matter of fact, it was easy for those who knew the ropes to get what they wanted in that high-tariff measure, drafted mainly by those who knew what they wanted and how to get it. The Aluminum Co. knew it wanted the tariff rate increased on crude aluminum 150 per cent—that is, from 2 cents to 5 cents a pound—and it got it. On coils, plates, sheets, rods, circles, disks, strips, rectangulars, and squares the duty was increased from 3½ cents per pound to 9 cents per pound, or 250 per cent. On table, household, and kitchen utensils the duty was increased from 25 per cent ad valorem to 11 cents a pound and 55 per cent ad valorem, or more than 250 per cent increase. There was no reason for the increase on the score of giving more pay to labor, the stock-in-trade plea for privilege. The worker rarely gets it or any part of it. There was no demand for increase by the consumer. There was no claim that an "infant industry" needed to be helped until it could stand alone.

Let us see the wrong of this typical piece of favoritism. In 1888 the Aluminum Co. was organized with a capital of \$1,810,000. It has paid its stockholders good dividends and has made so much money it has been able to put back into the company \$110,000,000. It shared with other big companies great profits during the World War. Under the Underwood-Simmons tariff the company paid dividends every year of from 6 to 12½ per cent, and its president said on November 4, 1920, that "in no year since 1915 have the company's earnings, after payment of interest, taxes, and other charges, been less than \$10,000,000 a year." That was the situation when the tariff bonus was voted to this concern and it was authorized and granted rights which now call in trumpet tones for the application of the Jefferson doctrine that government "shall restrain men from injuring one another."

It is a matter of common knowledge that the "Aluminum Co. of America is the sole producer in the United States of aluminum and supplies over one-half of the world's consumption, and is the largest manufacturer of finished products." This high tax enables that company to impose any tax in increased prices it thinks it can extort from the consumer. Immediately after the tariff rate was increased from 2 to 5 per cent per pound it proceeded to hoist the price to \$60 per ton. There is no suggestion that labor is paid more than under the Underwood-Simmons measure, the wage earners receiving now only about \$25 per week in this favored monopolistic industry. And yet, with such an outstanding demand that government "shall restrain men from injuring one another," this bonus goes on, and Congress refuses to turn on the light to see if there is any possible reason beyond favoritism for continuing this tax on the consumer. The investigation was feared and defeated by one vote for nothing except because it would disclose the wisdom of a reduction of the tariff rate.

I have not instanced this outstanding piece of "injuring" others by government favor because a distinguished Cabinet officer profits from

the monopoly. There are others just as significant of the policy of public taxation for private enrichment. This is cited merely as illustrative of how the big interests are enabled to profiteer by governmental favor. While two Democrats blocked the investigation, I am here to pledge you that when intrusted with power in 1928—it is coming—the Democratic Party will repeal this bonus to the aluminum monopoly and in this and other ways will adopt Jeffersonian methods which will "restrain men from injuring one another." The people are beginning to learn better than ever how one class may "injure another" by tariff taxation.

Mr. Cleveland showed that while comparatively few use imported articles, millions purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles. Those who buy imports pay the duty charged thereon into the Public Treasury, but the great majority of our citizens, who buy domestic articles of the same class, pay a sum at least approximately equal to this duty to the home manufacturer.

The third admonition of Jefferson has its logical place. So much has been said about Jefferson's opposition to government's invading the right of the citizens that it is well to stress the fact that he conditions freedom from Government regulations upon the necessity of previous governmental restraint upon acts of one citizen that injures others. Let first things come first. After the citizen is guaranteed by government against injury by others, Jefferson proclaims the truth that they shall be left "otherwise free to regulate their own pursuit of industry and improvement." This freedom is necessary to "complete the circle of our felicities." In Jefferson's day government was confined largely to the administration of justice, its manifestations being chiefly the courthouse and the jail; to the protection of national safety, symbolized in peaceful ambassadors and fighting ships; with legislative power to levy taxes and administrative powers to enforce the laws. They read Jefferson wrong who think he believed in static government. He was the first, long before Horace Mann, to wish government to provide for the education of all the people, holding that full suffrage could not flower to perfection without an educated citizenship. He wished the smallest number of laws, except those demanded by the common need, with no attempt at regulation of the citizen's affairs by the Federal Government except such as the Constitution expressly granted. The unnecessary multiplicity of governmental agencies, the entrance by Federal agencies into local concerns without constitutional power, and bureaucracy at Washington came in for rebuke by this second declaration of Jefferson. For example, the recently assumed power of the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix freight and passenger rates wholly within a State when a railroad also does an interstate business.

The local authorities can regulate public-service corporations better in their operations wholly within the territory of a State than it can be done at Washington. If there is acquiescence in this recent assumption of power at Washington, it will not be long before application of a manufacturer for a sidetrack in Ohio, or a community wishing a local or union depot will be compelled to go to Washington to secure relief. And, too, how long before this same Washington body will assume to fix the valuation for State and local taxes on public-service corporations? This right of the State to regulate its own affairs is in serious jeopardy and the Jefferson doctrine needs to be invoked. I have cited only one of many dangers to the right of the people of the States by usurped powers in a central agency.

The right of the individuals to be free to "regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement" is denied when government gives to any individual rights and subsidies and immunities that do not go to every citizen, or sits supine when a monopoly drives the individual to the wall by any policy made possible by favoritism. This is particularly true when one industry flourishes because it destroys competition. It required long periods in the courts to convict the oil and tobacco and other combinations in restraint of trade. The penalty of division, so-called, has not opened the door to free competition or brought the relief and competition expected when the courts declared these trusts were violating the Sherman law. Just as long as by combinations great concerns can freeze out or injure competition, just so long are men denied the privilege of regulating their pursuits of industry and improvement. In the Wilson administration the Federal industrial commission was established to protect big business as well as to protect consumers. Up to that time it was often said, business men were in doubt as to what they could legally do as to certain business methods. The Federal Trade Commission was organized to give advice to such business men to promote commerce and to investigate illegal or dangerous practices in order that they might safely and legally regulate "their own pursuits of industry and improvement" unmolested. It was to be a body composed of forward looking and able men of both parties, and it did much to make easy the path to law-abiding business and to make rough and rocky the path of those making combinations to destroy competition or mulct the public. At least it did until—

The story of its conversion into a cash-register bureau where the will of privilege is recorded and full investigation is smothered is a repudiation of the Jefferson doctrine and practice. That body has

been packed with men whose minds are sympathetic with the practices in business as the Aluminum Trust carries on, and one of the saddest evidences of its degradation is in connection with the proposed investigation of that company. If there was no other argument for the Jeffersonian guaranty of freedom in industry, the failure of the Federal Trade Commission to perform its necessary function should make the very stones cry out for a return to the policy that called the commission into being under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson.

Let us come now to the third Jeffersonian guaranty—a broad and necessary one in a republic where both the rights of property and the "personal rights of a citizen are held sacred." Jefferson said that government "shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned," and the necessary implication is that it shall not permit others to do what it can not do itself. How does government take "from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned"? First, by unnecessary or discriminatory taxation. Lately we have heard of tax reduction. There has been no difference between the two parties upon the necessity of reducing the excessive taxes laid on the people. Wilson urged reduction of war taxes in 1919. Taxes of all kinds—local, State, and National—have multiplied and bear heavily on labor and industry. As for the taxes imposed by the Federal Government, it was absolutely necessary to make large reductions to prevent a dangerous surplus in the Treasury. Democrats and Republicans have differed only as to whether the small taxpayers or the large taxpayers deserved first consideration, with the result that the small taxpayer obtained exemption from income tax and the large taxpayer also had his taxes materially reduced. But the reduction by this Congress is at least \$300,000,000 less than Treasury conditions justify. The Republican program of tax reduction has been to make a reduction previous to each election as a bait for votes. This year the reduction proposed was much less than the Democrats compelled Congress to grant, but still imposing something like \$300,000,000 annually in taxation beyond the total of the appropriations. Why? To pile up a surplus so as to make a further decrease prior to the 1928 presidential election. This policy is contrary to sound public policy and in direct conflict with this wise declaration by Grover Cleveland in 1887, when he wrote:

"When more of the people's substance is exacted through the form of taxation than is necessary to meet the just obligations of the Government and the expense of its economical administration . . . such exaction becomes ruthless extortion and violation of the fundamental principles of a free government."

Neither party deserves any credit for the tax reductions voted, for they should have been made earlier. They were necessitated to prevent a mounting surplus. However, except for those with large incomes, it can not be said that any tax reduction bill has ceased taking from the "mouth of labor the bread it has earned." It is not the excess-profits tax or the income tax which has weighed most heavily upon the backs of the man with the plane or the man with the hoe. It is the tariff tax, the highest in history, from which the Federal Government receives something like \$600,000,000 yearly, and an additional five billion is levied annually by private parties and corporations upon nearly every article made or sold in this country. Not one penny of this crushing tax has been removed. On the contrary, every time the Tariff Commission tariff wheel turns over—fortunately its spokes do not function often—there is an increased burden imposed. In this respect it has run true to form. There was a Tariff Commission in President Arthur's day, created as was said then, which aimed at a 20 per cent reduction of the tariff tax. Did such reduction reach the people? No. President Arthur named only high protectionists on the commission, and instead of the promised 20 per cent reduction tariff rates were decreased only 3 or 4 per cent. But even then the promise of tariff reduction was kept better in that decade than now. The existing Tariff Commission was organized primarily for the avowed purpose of reducing tariff rates if experience showed they were too high. The testimony of members of the Tariff Commission shows that executive tariff reduction can not be expected. The chief purpose of the Tariff Commission seems to be to enable favorites of the administration to "take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned" by indefensible tariff taxation.

In this year of observance of the sesquicentennial of the writing and signing of Jefferson's Declaration it behooves the believers in "equal rights to all" to summon the country to a renewal of their faith in the Jefferson Declaration I have chosen for my text. To-day as 125 years ago there is sore need for the policies stated by Jefferson to "complete the circle of our facilities."

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM H. KING, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM UTAH

Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Donahay, ladies, and gentlemen: This great gathering is conclusive evidence that the Democracy of Ohio is not only militant, but is looking eagerly for the contest in November, and is sanguine of a glorious and triumphant victory. The same spirit which animates the Democrats of this State fills with courage and enthusiasm the Democrats in all parts of our country. When 1,500 of the leading Democrats of this Commonwealth come from all parts of the State and gather around this banquet table, and give

expression to their undying faith in the principles of Jefferson, it is prophetic of victory, and attests their faith in the immortality of Democratic principles. Disappointments and defeats have not affected or diminished the faith of Democrats in the verity of the principles of their faith, and in the sacredness of the cause to which they have dedicated their lives.

Democracy is more than a political creed. It comprehends the principles of justice and liberty, and its mission is the moral and spiritual welfare of humanity. The Democrats of Ohio have a peculiar reason for their undaunted faith and their fighting spirit. This Commonwealth is one of the outstanding States of the Union. It occupies a strategical position, not only industrially, but politically. The Republican Party has recognized this fact, and upon several occasions it has selected its standard bearer from Ohio. Without disparaging those who have been selected or indulging in any invidious comparisons, it may be said with perfect truth that the Democracy of Ohio for many decades has presented to the Nation, men of the highest character, of preeminent ability, sound statesmanship, and universally recognized qualifications for the highest offices within the gift of the people.

In 1920 it named as its standard bearer Gov. James M. Cox, who had served his State with distinguished ability in the Halls of Congress. His record as governor stands unrivaled in achievements, and in the highest form of political and social service. He carried the Democratic banner with honor, and met with superb courage every attack made by political foes. I pay tribute to his splendid leadership, his magnificent campaign, his fidelity to Democratic principles, his broad statesmanship, and to those fine and noble qualities so abundantly manifest in his life and character and achievements.

The fierce and constant struggle between the great armies of Democracy in this State and the forces of reaction and special privilege has developed men and women of the Democratic faith worthy of leadership and competent to deal with the great problems, social, political, and industrial, which concern the American people.

It has been my good fortune to know many of the Democrats of this State during the past 20 years. I regret that I am not privileged to meet upon this visit Hon. Judson Harmon, whose intellectual power, legal attainments, broad statesmanship, and great public service have for more than a quarter of a century placed him in the front rank of American statesmen. It is also a disappointment not to meet Hon. Newton D. Baker, whose eminent services to his country during the World War gave to him an enduring name. He is one of the outstanding figures in the Democratic Party. His devotion to liberal policies and Democratic ideals and his recognized ability qualify him for the highest service in the Republic.

I have had the pleasure of an intimate acquaintance with former Senator Pomerene, who is with us to-day. His industry and zeal and courage placed him in the front rank in the Senate of the United States. He followed with rectitude whatever he believed to be right and earned the confidence and esteem of his colleagues and a high place among the statesmen of our country. I am gratified in having the opportunity of meeting Judge Allen, who is one of the members of your highest judicial tribunal. Her father represented at one time my State in the House of Representatives. He is a man of fine intellectual and political attainments and of recognized ability. I feel a just pride in the remarkable success which has come to his daughter, Judge Allen. It is a tribute to the intelligence and progressiveness of the people of Ohio that they selected Judge Allen for the exalted position which she now occupies. But she is worthy of this position and has demonstrated that women are entitled to the franchise and are competent to fill the highest positions of trust and responsibility in State or Nation.

And in any Democratic gathering in this State, and particularly one of this magnitude, it could not be fittingly concluded without paying tribute to Governor Donahey, whose name is known in all parts of this Republic. His record is most unique and remarkable. He has pursued with superb courage a course which has won him the love and confidence of all Democrats and the esteem and admiration of his political opponents. It is most unfortunate that the legislature of this State has been during his incumbency controlled by the Republican Party, and that his patriotic efforts to effectuate reforms in the government of his State, to reduce taxes, effect economies, and promote the general welfare have been thwarted and in part defeated by the legislature of the State, with the connivance and active cooperation of the Republican leaders of Ohio.

If Governor Donahey is renominated by his party, he will be triumphantly elected. Thousands of persons who have affiliated with the Republican Party will give him their support. They will, by so doing, condemn the reprehensible course of the Republican leaders of the State and justify the claim that the great mass of the American people desire honesty in government, fidelity on the part of public officials, and will not betray those who with sincerity have earnestly labored to put honesty into government and justice and righteousness into all political and public affairs.

I have listened with interest and pleasure to the eloquent address just delivered by Congressman DAVEY. His public record as mayor and as Congressman is familiar to the people of Ohio. He is worthy of the support of his district and should be overwhelmingly returned to the House of Representatives. It is not too much to say of him that his fine mind and constructive qualities, his comprehension of the spirit of democracy, and its high mission will so impress the democracy of Ohio that he will be called to higher stations.

The speakers who have preceded me have eloquently appealed for a renaissance of democracy. Perhaps the approach of the sesquicentennial directed their minds, as it should direct the minds and thoughts of all patriotic Americans, to the principles announced in the Declaration of Independence as well as the principles and policies which have been expounded by the greatest of all political philosophers, Thomas Jefferson, and exemplified, so far as it was possible, in his public and private career.

There are fundamental principles which must persist if humanity is not lost in the abyss of despair and degradation. This truism is recognized by the greatest of scientists, by biologists of note, by philosophers, by students of government, and by those who seek to know the sources of religion and the moral and spiritual influences which carry humanity forward. But I would speak for a moment concerning Jefferson and his philosophy, because he is the founder of our party and his philosophy must prevail if freedom endures and progress is not arrested.

There are those who would build our civilization upon the foundations of materialism. That is what the Bolsheviks of Russia seek to do. They regard the world as mechanical and human beings as the blind creatures of chance, battling in a dark and soulless world with hidden forces which are as meaningless as life itself. Democracy rests upon the concept that the universe is an expression of the divine purpose, and that this little world of ours is a revelation of God's greatness and goodness and mercy; that we live and move in order that we may have joy; and that peace and happiness and progress may be the inheritance of all. Democracy is not a barren or a formal creed. It recognizes the emotional, moral, and spiritual as powerful forces operating for the advancement and salvation of humanity.

That philosophy which rests all human institutions upon pure Intellectualism will fail. Materialism, whether in religion or philosophy or politics, leads to degradation and destruction. The political party which recognizes the ethical and the moral and seeks to measure things by spiritual values, which seeks to exalt the individual and crown him with the dignity and glory of divinity is the one which in the end must triumph. It is that party which is interested in men rather than in things; in ideals rather than in soulless and concrete things; in the moral advancement of humanity; in the establishment of that system of government in which justice and liberty are enjoyed by all.

Jefferson is the political Shakespeare of mankind. He comprehended human problems. He understood the human heart. He knew human emotions. He knew the causes of misery and woe and the results of tyranny and oppression. He saw a world which had been ensanguined with human blood, and he knew the cause of the rise and fall of nations, the selfishness, the cruelty, the injustice—all those ignoble things which had arrested human progress and chained the human mind. He devoted his life to the establishment of a new order and the development of those principles which lie at the base of liberty and progress. So long as men love liberty and justice his name will be revered; and believing as I do in the advancement and progress of humanity I believe that in the centuries to come no name will be more honored and revered than his.

The last words of John Adams, who had been a political opponent of Jefferson, were, "Jefferson still lives." Some reactionary Republicans and pseudopolitical philosophers affect to believe that the principles of Jefferson, if not obsolete, are decadent, and that the Democratic Party is in the stage of dissolution. There are some who construe the Republican elections of 1920 and 1924 as a repudiation of the theories and principles which have guided the Democratic Party, and as an approval of the archaic and reactionary policies which have so largely been followed by the Republican Party. The fact is that millions who voted the Republican ticket in the last two national elections, did not understand what the Republican Party represents. That party, by its sophistry and subtlety, its intrigues and deceptive propaganda, its promises of special privilege and material rewards, secured the support of millions of electors whose views are the antithesis of Republicanism and whose ideals are the opposite of the materialistic and sordid ideals of the Republican Party.

A wise man once said, "There is nothing new under the sun," and the political situation in the United States finds its analogies and correspondences in the records of nations now existing as well as those which have perished. There always have been opposing forces in governments. In all ages there have been individuals who struggled to establish freedom, and liberal forces that contended for personal

liberty, for democratic institutions, and for the precious fruits which progress and freedom bring to the world.

The establishment of this Republic was a protest against ancient forms and ancient wrongs. The Democratic Party was the liberal party—the party of progress and local self-government, in the days of Jefferson. The Federalist Party refused to heed the lessons of history, and organized the reactionary and illiberal forces existing in the new Republic. The Republican Party claims to be the lineal descendent of the Federalist Party. Certainly it bears the lineaments of that party, and represents principles and policies which tyrannous and imperialistic governments contended for, and which have persisted until this hour.

Those who are familiar with the political and industrial conditions in the United States must concede that the Republican Party represents the reactionary forces and seeks to carry out the views of Hamilton and the aristocrats of his time, who believed in a strong and powerful Federal Government, which found its type in monarchies of the Old World, and which sought to abridge the freedom of individuals and the rights of sovereignty of the States of the Union. The Republican Party, particularly since and during the administration of President Grant, has been the opponent of progressive policies and has been unresponsive to the aspirations of the liberal forces of our country. It has sought guidance from the discredited policies of the past, and direction at the hands of reactionary leaders and those who believe that any change is destructive, that the people were made for the State, and that the chief concern of all should be to perpetuate old conditions and protect property regardless of personal rights.

The political philosophy of Jefferson was comprehensive enough for all time. It embodied the ideals of Christianity; it exalted the individual and promulgated the truth, that the State is the servant of the individual and not its master. The spirit of democracy is not an evanescent thing. It is vibrant with life and puissant, though submerged at times by brutal forces and crass materialism.

And so Jefferson lives in this day. The principles of liberty and progress and justice for which he contended will persist regardless of individuals or parties. If the Democratic Party should be recreant to the principles of Jefferson and false to the ideals of those who seek progress and freedom, another party would arise to carry the torch which Jefferson held and to combat the reactionary policies of the Republican Party. I believe a majority of the American people are progressive and love liberty and prefer the philosophy of Jefferson to the philosophy of Metternich and Louis XIV and George III and Nietzsche and Hamilton and the leaders of the Republican Party from the days of Grant down to the present time. It must be confessed, however, that the Republican Party has been forced to make some concessions and support some liberal policies demanded by the Democratic Party and supported by a majority of the people.

It is one of the paradoxes of history that reforms are often secured under the administration of imperialistic and reactionary governments, but under the compulsion of public opinion, aroused by the liberal forces within the Government. And so the liberal forces are often denied the honor and credit for social and political reforms; and thoughtless people, though perhaps they have aided in securing such reforms, give their support to the party whose principles are hostile to the same and whose espousal thereof was insincere and hypocritical and only for the purpose of retaining power.

The Democratic Party, I repeat, has been, and still is, the liberal and progressive party of our country. Most of the political reforms and the adoption of industrial and social programs which have ameliorated the condition of the people and increased individual liberty have been the work, directly or indirectly, of the Democratic Party. If brought about when the Republicans were in power, it was because the Democratic Party compelled their adoption. But the Republican Party, by reason of the powerful machine which it maintains, its control of the press, and its support by great wealth, which is its powerful ally, has been able to maintain itself in power during the greater part of the past 60 years.

There is more reason for the existence of the Democratic Party now than at any time during the last half century. The dark and illiberal forces of our country are powerfully marshaled under the banner of the Republican Party. That party, flushed with victory, feeling secure in its fortresses, will prove more reactionary than in the past and seek with greater vigor to destroy liberal thought and democratic ideals and superimpose upon the people a more powerful and despotic Federal and bureaucratic government. This must be apparent to the liberal forces and to the students and thinkers of our Republic. Those who are patriotic, who love liberty and desire the preservation of this Republic, will feel constrained to ally themselves with the Democratic Party, because they must see that only through that party can the liberty of the people be preserved and the rights of the States maintained against the deadly federalism and the destructive paternalism and bureaucracy which the Republican Party promotes.

There has been some talk about the reorganization of the Democratic Party. What is needed is not reorganization, but united action upon the part of all Democrats throughout the land. The recent defeat is merely a call to arms of the militant forces of democracy, and all

who perceive that society is not a protoplasmic mass, but is an organic structure which passes through evolutionary states, each one of which augments human liberty and contributes to the happiness and felicity of the people.

Undoubtedly there have been differences of opinion among Democrats which have led to dissatisfaction upon the part of some and constrained them to withhold at times their support of the Democratic Party. In my opinion there has been a tendency upon the part of some members of the party to support measures which increase the power of the Federal Government, diminish the sovereignty of the States, and infringe upon the liberty of individuals. I have sometimes thought that the word "progressive" has been misinterpreted and misapplied. It has often been attached to measures which were destructive of the States and directly contributed to the establishment of socialism.

Democracy is the antithesis of socialism. The Democratic Party, as I have stated, regards the individual as the source of power and authority; it believes in personal liberty and regards with concern any proposition which seeks to limit the independence and freedom of the individual and the right of local government. The Republican Party has encouraged the adoption of measures which strengthen the General Government. It has misinterpreted the Constitution and supported policies which were deadly assaults upon the States and calculated to change our form of government. It is the mission of the Democratic Party to resist the paternalistic policies of the Republican Party and to defeat socialistic schemes which would blot out the States and reduce the people to a colloidal mass devoid of local or individual stimulation or movement, and mobile only when pricked by the powerful hand of an oppressive Federal Government or a despotic bureaucracy.

The first inaugural address of Thomas Jefferson is a safe guide for our footsteps. It is there declared that—

"The support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies, I deem [one of the] essential principles of our Government, and consequently [one] which ought to shape its administration."

In a letter in 1816 Jefferson stated that—

"What has destroyed the liberty and the rights of man in every government which has ever existed under the sun? The generalizing and concentrating all cares and powers into one body, no matter whether of the autocrats of Russia or France or the aristocrats of a Venetian senate."

He further stated that good government is only secured by the distribution of powers, not by consolidation or concentration. I believe that the Democratic Party should revive the spirit of Jefferson and resist the constant encroachments upon the States and the efforts which are made to strengthen the power and authority of the Federal Government. In the last Democratic platform this view was emphasized in the following planks, which I had the honor to prepare:

"We demand that the States of the Union shall be preserved in all their vigor and power. They constitute a bulwark against the centralizing tendencies of the Republican Party.

"We condemn the efforts of the Republican administration to nationalize the functions and duties of the States.

"We oppose the extension of bureaucracy, the creation of unnecessary bureaus and Federal agencies, and the multiplication of offices and officeholders.

"We demand a revival of the spirit of local self-government essential to the preservation of the free institutions of our Republic."

As I have stated, the Republican Party is building a despotic paternalism. It is projecting plans which Bolshevik Russia adopted as a part of the creed of Marxian communism. It is weakening the States and devitalizing the people. It has corrupted the minds of many people by subsidies and promises of Federal bounties and subventions. The moral fiber of the people is being weakened and they are being taught more and more to rely upon the Federal Government for the performance of duties which rest upon them or local communities in which they reside or the States in which they have their homes. Only by a revival of the spirit of Jefferson and the application of Democratic principles can the States be preserved and local self-government developed. I regard as the most deadly menace to the perpetuity of our Republic the paternalistic, socialistic, and bureaucratic assaults which are being made by the Republican Party and by some misguided people who believe that it is progressive to atrophy the individual and make impotent the States.

The problem now is to preserve the States against the sweeping and widening power of the Federal Government. As Henry Clay declared, we must foster a strong and wholesome State pride. The theory of our Government is that the Union shall consist of indestructible States. Who shall say, under the assaults made upon it by the Republicans and Socialists that the States are indestructible? I submit they are being destroyed, they are being stripped of their sovereign powers, and reduced to mere geographical expressions where it is expected they will exhibit only an anemic reflex of that glory and dignity and power which sovereign States of this Union should enjoy. Undoubtedly efforts are being made to reduce the States to mere administrative departments like those of France, and the people

are being taught to look to the Federal Government to assume the responsibilities and duties of sovereign States and to become guardians of the people.

There is a weakening of that fine individualism which found expression in the pre-Revolutionary days of this Republic. Some of the so-called progressivism fostered by the Republicans has for its object the aggrandizement of the Federal Government and the control by it of the States and the people. It is the duty of the Democratic Party to bring back local government and to inculcate the view that it lies at the very foundation of a free country. The ideal of local government is one which animated the founders of this Republic and is the precious heritage from a heroic past. "It is the school in which self-control, independence, and liberty are bred."

It was Jefferson who foreshadowed the ideal form of our Government when, in 1776, in the house of burgesses he urged that the delegates from Virginia be instructed to favor confederation provided the Colonies should have the unrestricted power to form governments for the regulation of the colonies, and their internal affairs.

Jefferson perceived that governments as well as individuals must have souls; that there must be a spirit of the law and of the institutions of the land to give them vitality. He sought to put a soul into the people; to awaken their slumbering spirits to a realization of their power and innate greatness. His faith in the people was unconquerable; there were no problems which they could not solve; no heights which they could not reach. He believed, as did De Tocqueville, that the cure for the evils of democracy was still more democracy. Not only did he feel that the people possess souls, but he demanded that the Government itself should possess a soul. He spoke for the rights of mankind; their natural rights, their inherent rights, not conferred or created rights.

Nowadays wealth and privilege regard the Government as its property. Social justice, personal rights, the inviolability of the individual—these things are not understood by the cynical and soulless forces which control the Republican Party. The great historian Fiske stated that the chief characteristic of Jefferson was his belief in the essential rectitude of the purposes of the people. He had a sublime faith in their integrity, in the verity of the universe, in the concept that men were not ignoble and worthless things, living for a moment and passing forever from this terrestrial globe. He insisted, as I have stated, that all governmental powers are delegated by the people in whom they reside; that governments possess no inherent powers, but only those granted by the people. Governments do not grant rights; they are only the agents and trustees of the people. They may make natural rights more secure; but the Government is not an end in itself, but only a means of increasing human happiness.

No one can read Jefferson's letter to Mayor Wightman, of Philadelphia, written January 24, 1826, in which he referred to the Declaration of Independence, without deep emotion and without the conviction that the spirit of Jefferson will prove immortal and that his dreams of universal freedom and justice will be realized.

In this letter he says:

"May it be to the world what I believe it will be (to some parts sooner, to others later, but finally to all) the signal of arousing men to burst the chains under which monkish ignorance and superstition had persuaded them to bind themselves and to assume the blessings and security of self-government. That form which we have substituted restores the free right to the unbounded exercise of reason and freedom of opinion. All eyes are opened, or opening, to the rights of man. The general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth that the mass of mankind have not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, and by the grace of God. There are grounds of hope for others. For ourselves let the annual return of this day forever refresh our recollections of these rights and inspire an undiminished devotion to them."

Jefferson taught that personal liberty is individualism, and the only conceivable individualism. Shibboleths and traditions meant little to him unless they were inspired by the ideals which he possessed. He believed that they too often belong to the parties of the status quo and to the immobile elements in society. He hoped for a new era when the world's ruling interest would cease to be local and become universal, and he set himself to the task of government with this golden age in view.

He aspired, as none others have dared, to legislate as though eternal peace were at hand in a world torn by wars and convulsions and drowned in blood. He was unwilling to build a new nationality merely to create more armies and navies and to perpetuate the crimes and follies of Europe.

Some Democrats have been seduced by the propaganda in favor of a unitary system of government. They have supported measures which found their origin in imperialistic and autocratic governments. The effort is being made to reduce the American people to a dead level of uniformity. The differences in physical environments and historical traditions which have produced diversity of custom and thought throughout the States are to be ignored, and by statute and by Federal usurpations the people of the States are to be cast into one mold.

There is no merit in unity, in homogeneity. Progress results from diversity, plurality, heterogeneity. In most countries the spirit of democracy and local self-government is growing. Individuals are standing erect and asserting their individuality. They are combating the compulsory processes which bureaucrats and those who believe in centralized authority are projecting for the purpose of promoting paternalism and State control, and are demanding the opportunity for the assertion of self and to be educated in the school of local self-government.

Mr. Laski, an eminent political writer, has said: "There is real moral insufficiency in any theory of state which impresses upon its numbers the need of any consistent uniformity of outlook." If the Democratic Party will walk in the paths of Jefferson; if it will hold fast to the ideals which he proclaimed; if it will preserve the States in all their vigor and power, and maintain inviolate the rights of individuals against Federal aggression; if it will attack privilege wherever entrenched and wrong wherever enthroned; if it will fight to protect the people against the abuse of power and the employment of the Government for private ends and for the exploitation of the people; if it will compel the Federal Government to move only in the orbit delimited by the Constitution, then it will gain in influence and again be placed in power.

Mr. Collins in his excellent work entitled "The Fourteenth Amendment and the States" says that—

"Local self-government lies at the very foundation of a free country. The private affairs of a community should be regulated by that community without interference from the Federal Government so long as national interests are not directly affected. This ideal of local government is one of our most precious heritages from a heroic past.

"This is not a question of bringing to life a dead State rights doctrine. It is dealing with a fundamental principle of political science. It is by no means a dead issue. On the contrary, no student of public affairs can fail to see that the question of the relation of the State functions to Federal control is one of the most vital problems in our body politic. These United States cover a vast territory. From ocean to ocean and from the Lakes to the Gulf may be found almost every variety of soil and climate. Physical environment and historical traditions have given rise to diversity of custom and manner, thought, and speech. The occupations of the people of the different sections are characterized by fundamental and permanent differences. While we are essentially one people along broadly nationalistic lines, one meets with a variety of local conditions and habits of life as one journeys from Maine to California or from Key West to Oregon. This very diversity makes local government essential to justice.

"The fourteenth amendment is a paternal measure. It is the introduction of the principle of paternalism among a people whose genius is foreign to such a political ideal. It has in it the germ which may retard their growth. Like all centralizing measures, it tends to reduce the life of the people to a dead level of uniformity. In such a vast territory as the United States, occupied by a people who for centuries have been accustomed to trust themselves in the regulation of their domestic affairs, the stimulus of local self-government is essential to their natural development."

I regard the preservation of individual rights and the preservation of the States as a most vital issue in our political life. When it was believed the States would destroy the Federal Government or limit its rightful authority, a Civil War ensued which baptized this Republic in blood. If it were a national wrong to imperil the Federal Government, is it not a national crime to imperil the States or attack their sovereignty, or destroy or weaken local self-government? The aggrandizement of the Federal Government could only be at the expense of the States, and anemic and lifeless States controlled by bureaucratic forces in Washington would destroy this Republic and transform it into an oligarchy, into a powerful paternalistic force, or into a more deadly bureaucracy.

President Jackson declared—

"The Federal Union, it must and shall be preserved."

We need another Jackson who will demand that the States shall be preserved.

From every quarter we are attacked by this new federalism. It assumes varied forms; it seduces the States by making grants from the Federal Treasury. With pious but hypocritical protestations of its desire to relieve the States of their burdens it generously (?) offers to create new Federal departments and bureaus and agencies through which moneys from the Federal Treasury will be distributed and under whose direction internal and local affairs, belonging solely and exclusively to the States, will be discharged. There is scarcely a duty, resting upon the States that the Federal Government is not now seeking in part at least to assume, and many thoughtless people, many who do not comprehend our form of government, many who do not understand the sources of strength and power in this Republic, throw themselves with the zeal of crusaders into all sorts of schemes and plans and plots and intrigues to secure Federal legislation which is destructive of the sovereignty and independence of the State, and is calculated to enervate the people and reduce them to the position of

lowly creatures who will accept the crumbs dropped from the table of Dives.

The fourteenth amendment was an attack upon the sovereignty of the States. The same may be said of other amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and throughout the land we hear the tumultuous cries that we must be bound and tied by the cords of centralization and bureaucratic authority in order that we may be stamped as coins are stamped with the marks of uniformity.

It would be well if we were to remember the words of that great political philosopher, John Stuart Mill, who says:

"Every function superadded to those already exercised by the Government causes its influence over hopes and fears to be more widely diffused and converts more and more the active and ambitious part of the public into hangers-on of the Government or of some party which aims at becoming the Government. If the roads, the railways, the banks, the insurance offices, the great joint-stock companies, the universities, and the public charities were all of them branches of the Government; if, in addition, the municipal corporations and local boards, with all that now devolves on them, became departments of the central administration; if the employees of all these different enterprises were appointed and paid by the Government and looked to the Government for every rise in life, not all the freedom of the press and popular constitution of the legislature would make this or any other country free otherwise than in name. And the evil would be greater, the more efficiently, and scientifically the administrative machinery was constructed the more skillful the arrangements for obtaining the best qualified hands and heads with which to work it."

Individualism is regarded as radicalism. Independent thinking is a dangerous symptom. State pride, ambition for local preeminence, and superiority—these things are not to be tolerated. Bureaucracy always represents repression. It is characterized by fanaticism, intolerance, bigotry.

Our Government to-day is influenced too much by this spirit of intolerance, and the people are cursed with the enervating, autocratic, deadly spirit of bureaucracy. The mission of the Democratic Party has been and is to free the minds of men from all forms of superstition and tyranny. We want not only political and civil and religious liberty but there must be intellectual and industrial liberty.

The British Empire is decentralizing its authority. Its Dominions are free States. A million imperial bureaucrats and spies and tax eaters and taxgatherers do not infest Britain's independent, democratic, self-governing Dominions. But in the United States we will soon have a million Federal officials, Federal bureaucrats, Federal tax eaters, who, like the plague of the locusts, will infest every county, every rural community, and indeed almost every home in our broad land.

And as bureaucracy increases in numbers it increases in power. There were never as many Federal bureaus and executive agencies and instrumentalities as now exist, and they are multiplying. A large number of Federal executive agencies and commissions and bureaus have been created during the present session of Congress. More are provided for in bills now pending both in the House and in the Senate. Hundreds, if not thousands, of additional officials and employees have been provided for in the legislation to which I have just referred, and the swollen tide of bureaus and bureaucrats will mount higher and higher until it will attack the very citadel of the Republic.

The people are burdened with Federal and with State exactions. Taxes outrun population and rest like a heavy iron yoke upon the necks of the people. We speak of our prosperity, but it is the result of inflation and artificial stimulation, the result of uneconomic and empirical legislation enacted under the eyes and lash of big business, destructive monopolies, and predatory interests which control the Republican Party.

The per capita tax paid to the Federal Government in 1913 was but \$6.92. In 1916 the entire expenditures of the Federal Government were but a billion dollars. In 1924 the per capita Federal tax was \$28. The Federal appropriations for the next fiscal year will, in my opinion, exceed four and one-half billion dollars; and, of course, that stupendous sum must be wrung from the people under the drastic provisions of revenue laws.

The President of the United States in a recent address stated that in all probability the expenditures of the Federal Government had reached the low-water mark. Obviously, if the Republican Party remains in power, that is true. Already the rising tide of expenditures has set in, and with the growing demands for Federal appropriations and the appeals by organizations and groups who seek to raid the Treasury and secure the passage of laws utterly at variance with the spirit and letter of the Constitution we may expect progressively increasing expenditures. This is an era of extravagance. The Federal Government is inefficient, extravagant, and wasteful in the highest degree. If proper economies were practiced, if a reasonable degree of efficiency were employed, our governmental expenses could be reduced by at least \$400,000,000 annually.

But with this cancerous, bureaucratic growth there can be no hope of reform in the administration of the affairs of the Federal Government if the Republican Party remains in power. When the Democrats come into power it will be their first duty to abolish scores of Federal

bureaus, agencies, commissions, and executive instrumentalities, and to separate from the public service not only tens of thousands, but several hundred thousand unnecessary employees. It will be a titanic task. It will need courage, but it must be done if bureaucracy is not to strangle the Government and destroy the morale and freedom of the people. There are thousands of Federal employees who spend much of their time in lobbying for increased salaries, increased appropriations, and increased power. Bureaus and Federal agencies multiply as cells in the tissues of the body multiply. And these bureaus are always at work to augment their powers.

It is in part true of the bureaus in States and municipalities. No one can defend the enormous increase in the cost of maintaining our State and municipal governments. In 1913 the taxes collected by the States and municipalities amounted to \$15.81 per capita, but in 1924 they had increased to \$43.12. The total amount of taxes collected by the States in 1913 was \$570,000,000, but in 1924 it was \$1,064,000,000.

State and municipal indebtedness has advanced by leaps and bounds. In 1912 it was \$3,104,000,000. In 1924 it was \$11,650,000,000. The annual interest charge upon this sum exceeds \$300,000,000. It is manifest that our country is staggering under its tax burdens; and yet the appetite for spending is increasing, the obligations of States and municipalities and individuals are being augmented, and the Federal Government is paying more than \$800,000,000 a year interest upon its monumental indebtedness of nearly \$20,000,000,000.

In the fact of this appalling situation, the Federal Government is reaching out to absorb the States, to increase the number of Federal employees, and to multiply the taxes annually placed upon the backs of the people. While the average earnings of the farmers are considerable less than \$1,000 each, and the earnings of the great mass of employees and wage earners outside of Government and State service, is not greatly above that figure, Congress has constantly increased the salaries and compensation of all Federal employees and has surrounded them with conditions so favorable that from all walks of life multitudes seek to escape—to find safe harbors in the Federal service.

More than one-half of the taxes now collected from the people, aggregating \$8,000,000,000 annually, is required to meet the annual pay roll of the Federal Government and the States and their political subdivisions. Nor is that all that is taken from the taxes collected from the people. There are pensions, military and civil; allowances and annuities and public charges in governmental institutions, to the amount of \$900,000,000 annually. This means that more than two-thirds of all the taxes collected from the people are required to meet the salaries, pensions, and allowances of those upon the pay rolls, pension and annuity rolls of the National and State governments.

No country can continue to be prosperous with so great a burden. But we could look with some degree of hope upon the situation if there were any evidence of a desire to reform, or satisfactory manifestation among the people that they would no longer submit to these exactions which amount to robbery and spoliation. I have sometimes thought that many of the people were suffering from some deadly drug that has made them insensible to the encroachments of bureaucracy and Federalism, and to their plundering and exploitative operations. There should be scourged from our political temples hundreds of the parasites who feed upon the people and who devote much of their time to increasing their emoluments, securing pensions, and retirement privileges, and lobbying to increase their authority.

We have all seen the picture of Laocoon. The giant and his sons were destroyed by the writhing serpents that crushed them. The Government, in the hands of bureaucrats and oppressive bureaus and commissions, and its policies largely controlled by big business and exploiting monopolies, will be crushed unless the spirit of democracy shall assert itself and a political revolution ensue which will hurl from power the forces which control the Government, and restore the Government to those who will suffer and sacrifice for their country.

Much has been said by Republicans about the economy of the Coolidge administration. The Coolidge economy is a myth. This administration will expend for the fiscal year 1926-27 approximately \$5,000,000,000. It already has appropriated for the Army and Navy between seven and eight hundred million dollars for this fiscal year. We are not at war with any nation. Peace reigns throughout our borders. No clouds of war are seen in our skies, and yet this so-called economical administration has within the past three months enacted laws which will take from the Treasury of the United States for the maintenance of our Army and Navy for the next fiscal year more than \$700,000,000. We denounce France and other nations as being militaristic, and yet no nation in the world to-day is expending as much as the United States for its Army and Navy.

The Budget Bureau and the President have approved these enormous expenditures, and they will submit to Congress to meet the expenditures for the next fiscal year a Budget in excess of that for the present fiscal year. It is worthy of note in passing that Congress appropriated during the last fiscal year a sum by nearly \$200,000,000 below the total amount recommended by the President.

The Republican Party, with a cynicism, audacity, and mendacity scarcely paralleled in political history, has sought to secure political support upon the ground of economy. It has fooled and deliberately deceived the people. While proclaiming its devotion to retrenchment and reform in public service, it has wasted public treasure and committed all forms of extravagance.

I charge that the Harding-Coolidge administrations have been inefficient and extravagant. The success of the Republicans in thus deceiving the people is due largely to their subtlety, to their control of the press, to their powerful nation-wide organization, and to their constant, dishonest, and untruthful propaganda. There is not a department of the Federal Government that is not expending more than it did prior to the war. The people must be aroused to the danger of increasing the burden of taxation and to the expanding and crushing power of the Federal Government. There must be economy and still greater economy in the administration of the Federal Government. To reduce Federal taxes, to lop off unnecessary bureaus and Federal agencies, to curb the ambitions and voracious appetites of Federal bureaucracy is one of the issues in the coming campaign.

The Republican Party has always had the support of monopolies and those illegal and criminal organizations which are generally known as trusts. Crooked interests, as Mr. Roosevelt was wont to call many of the trusts, and the predatory interests operating in our industrial and economic life have been the chief supports of the Republican Party. They are now more powerful than ever. The Harding and Coolidge administrations have looked with complacency upon their growing power, their audacity, and their destructive methods. These organizations and their allied forces have secured legislation in order to prevent any possible foreign competition, and have strengthened and made more effective their monopolistic organizations in order that they might increase the prices of commodities and exploit the American people. The trust question is not dead; it is a vital and burning issue which must be solved by the American people.

The Department of Justice and the Department of Commerce have looked with indifference—indeed, I might say with approval—upon the illegal organizations which have been formed and which are being formed in the business world. They have encouraged trade associations, many of which have become ruthless and devouring monopolies, destroying legitimate competition and preventing the operation of the natural laws of supply and demand. More than one-third of the wealth of the United States is controlled by corporations and trusts and monopolies. Competition has been destroyed and the great consuming public has become the victim of these evil forces. They have, by illegitimate means, raised prices to oppressive levels and have produced a condition of inflation in respect to the prices of commodities which in the near future will result in widespread ruin and financial disaster.

The great middle class, as it is sometimes called, those who work in factories, mills, mines, and plants, the agriculturists, teachers, professional men, clerks—they are being exploited by these monopolies.

When the Fordney-McCumber tariff law was under discussion in the Senate the chairman of the committee, a Republican Senator, conceded that the tariff rates fixed in the bill were higher than had ever been written in the history of our Republic, so high, indeed, as to place in the hands of the manufacturers the power to plunder the American people.

And by way of apology for the unjust provisions of the bill he appealed to those whom this exploiting power was to be conferred upon, not to employ it, not to raise the level of prices to such heights as to despoil and rob the people. His appeals, as he should have known, fell upon deaf ears. That tariff measure has annually robbed the American people of \$5,000,000,000 and the agriculturists of our country have been the greatest sufferers.

The Republican Party harken in its legislation only to the demands of wealth. The farmers, the laborers, the great middle class, ask no subsidies or bounties. They want only justice. But they must realize sooner or later that the powers of the Government were prostitute and perverted, and the Republican Party has been used by corrupting and soulless organizations, and trusts and monopolies, to extract billions from the toilers of our land, in order that the profits and accumulations of the rich and the powerful might be increased.

No more sordid chapter can be found in the annals of free government than that written by the Republican Party during the Harding and Coolidge administrations. The Tariff Commission, which was organized to obtain helpful information which would aid Congress in preparing tariff measures, has been made an ignoble instrumentality to promote the interests of the privileged classes. It is no longer a nonpartisan or bipartisan commission. But its controlling membership has been selected because of their devotion to extreme protection, as a result of which tariff duties have been increased and the grip of the trusts tightened upon the throats of the people.

Pursuant to the demands of these selfish interests a provision was written into the tariff law just referred to which has been employed by the Tariff Commission to raise the tariff duties to higher levels. The so-called flexible provision of the tariff act is an ugly monstrosity. It was framed to increase the power of the Executive and to subject him

and the Tariff Commission to the powerful pressure of big business and the beneficiaries of high protective measures. It can not be defended as constitutional and it rests upon the uncertain base of greed and selfishness and injustice.

The Federal Trade Commission, which was organized to restrain monopolies and trusts and to protect honest and legitimate business against unfair competition, has likewise been converted into an instrumentality to screen and protect monopolistic forces.

The President of the United States in a recent address before the Chamber of Commerce of New York City declared, in effect, that big business had become penitent, had purged itself of immoral elements, and was now following the paths of honest dealing. His speech can not be construed otherwise than an express approval of the conduct of corporations and trusts and conspiracies in restraint of trade and the monopolistic organizations whose ugly heads are lifted higher now than ever before and whose oppressive power is exerted more strongly than in the past. It was an unfortunate speech; it was a most inaccurate speech. As soon as it was delivered, many consolidations of stupendous organizations took place, and unmistakable movements to further centralize and strengthen corporate power and bring within the hands of monopolies the industries and productive wealth of our country were perceived.

Notwithstanding the Harding and Coolidge administrations have treated the Sherman and Clayton laws as though they were dead letters, demands are being made by these powerful organizations that they be repealed. With foreign competition destroyed and all laws against monopolies and combinations in restraint of trade repealed, it is apparent the American people would be at the mercy of these devouring monopolies. If those who are behind this movement and are prompting these great consolidations were wise, they would perceive that a continuation of this evil policy will arouse such resentment among the American people that in their anger they will rise and smash trusts and monopolies and these destructive and oppressive combinations.

The soil of this Republic is not favorable to socialism; but if the people are compelled to choose between Government ownership and control, or Government control, of the great key industries of our country, and private monopoly of these great industries, they will choose the former. Private monopoly of the resources, industries, and sources of wealth will eventuate in industrial slavery and can not be tolerated in a democracy.

The domestic policies of the Republican administrations just referred to have ruined agriculture, consolidated wealth, brought fictitious and inflated conditions in business affairs, and produced a situation which gives unmistakable evidence of approaching economic and industrial convulsions.

If time permitted, much could be said concerning the unwise and mistaken foreign policies adopted by the Harding and Coolidge administrations. Mr. Harding and Republican leaders, not satisfied with opposing the entrance of the United States into the league, sought to weaken its influence and destroy its efforts to promote world peace. Evidence is not lacking that the Harding administration sought to detach Latin America from the league with the view, apparently, of creating a counterinternational league upon the Western Hemisphere. This movement failed, as it should have failed.

Under the Wilson administration the relations between this Government and the countries of South America were most cordial and were characterized by the strongest spirit of amity and good will. Secretary Hughes unwisely placed President Coolidge in an impossible situation when he agreed that the President of the United States would arbitrate the controversy between Peru and Chile growing out of the Tacna-Arica matter.

In dealing with Mexico the Harding and Coolidge administrations have acted in a most unfortunate manner. And in our relations with Europe we have been no less unfortunate. European nations distrust the United States and most Europeans either fear or heartily dislike this Nation.

Our relations with China have been most unsatisfactory. Under President Wilson's administration China trusted unreservedly our country. The so-called "disarmament conference" called by President Harding dealt unfairly with China, and the treaties which she felt compelled to sign have provoked resentment throughout all parts of the Chinese nation. We have lost our influence throughout Asia as well as in Europe and now occupy a position of comparative isolation.

The selfish, narrow, and illiberal foreign policies adopted by the Republicans under Presidents Harding and Coolidge have deprived our Nation of its moral leadership in the world and estranged peoples who regarded with affection this great democracy, which they believed was to carry high the principles of justice and liberty for the guidance and salvation of the world.

The time has come to clean house, to turn out of power the party which has been so false to the ideals of the fathers and to the best interests of the American people and the peace of the world. The embattled hosts of Democracy will go forth in the coming campaign knowing that their cause is just; that their country is in danger; that the Government is controlled by reactionary and destructive elements;

and that to them and to the great liberty-loving forces of our country has been committed the glorious task of protecting this Republic and proclaiming undying principles bequeathed by Thomas Jefferson.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of flood control.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Mexico asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of flood control. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to H. R. 12803, recently introduced in this body. The proposed legislation has for its purpose flood control upon the Missouri River and includes all the territory of the tributaries of this great stream. The river is to be made an inland waterway to reach the Gulf of Mexico, and by means of drainage and flood control it will be protected as such a waterway. The measure also includes the Arkansas River as its main western tributary.

New Mexico has two tributaries of the Arkansas River, which rise in the mountains at an elevation of some 8,000 feet and flow across a part of the northern section of the State. These tributary streams during the spring of the year, when the heavy snows of the winter are melting, carry immense bodies of flood water, as they also do during the July rainy season when the streams, having a tremendous fall, carry the flood water with great velocity. This causes a rise of many feet in the water carried by the streams.

When the level areas of Oklahoma and Texas are reached, the water leaves the channel of the river and overflows its banks, causing great damage in Oklahoma estimated to be many millions of dollars; these floods occur with great destruction almost annually. The damage in Oklahoma from the flood waters of the Cimarron and the Canadian or Red Rivers has destroyed thousands of acres of formerly good agricultural land and removed from the tax rolls millions of dollars in property values.

In 1923 the property of one railroad company in Oklahoma suffered a damage of \$1,000,000 from the Canadian River. This could all have been avoided if this stream had been controlled by impounding the flow of water during the flood season and diverting the same into reservoirs. Vast fertile areas in Oklahoma and New Mexico, which do not now receive sufficient rainfall, could be thus reclaimed.

By impounding these flood waters the saving of property for one year would create a sufficient fund for building reservoirs that would hold back the waters and thus utilize the water beneficially. A wonderful change would be wrought in the food supply of the Nation, and the crops produced could be confined to those which would not interfere with the market conditions at the present time.

The reclamation districts would naturally be located within the areas having desirable climatic and soil conditions for the production of sugar beets, and thus increase our supply of home-grown sugar. The Nation can readily absorb all of the products that would be produced in this area, including the alfalfa for the raising of dairy cattle, for milk and butter; the district would also be well adapted to poultry and egg production. In 1925 the United States imported 7,212,103 pounds of butter and 8,933,232,785 pounds of sugar; 608,768 dozen eggs in shell were imported during the same year; the latter figures do not include the importation of whole dried eggs, egg yolks, yolks frozen, egg albumin dried, and egg albumin frozen, which total over 20,000,000 pounds.

The rivers and their tributaries set forth in H. R. 12803 traverse several States; and, as the bill indicates, a unity of action of all these States is necessary to direct the attention of the Government to the necessity for a proper survey for Federal flood control.

The consolidation of railroads, which prevents competition, means that water transportation is necessary in order that a fair rate may be maintained in the shipping of livestock and farm products to the centers of consumption; also for export trade, waterways to the Gulf and seaboard must be maintained. This can best be brought about by maintaining the navigability of the inland streams.

It is the overflowing of agricultural land in Texas and Oklahoma by the two tributaries of the Arkansas River which largely prevents the navigability of that stream for several miles of its course and interferes with the navigability of the Missouri River as well. The navigability of the Missouri River is questioned by many, but it is largely prevented by the debris carried in the flood waters. During a period of 50 years before 1906 the steamboat was the method of transportation of cargoes from St. Louis to the river towns. The change

in the channel of the river is due to the washing down, from the fertile valleys above, of the virgin soil; all this can be regulated by impounding the waters in the mountains above the plains and the utilization of the same for irrigation and also for electrical power purposes for the growing cities of the agricultural districts.

Nature provided the inland channel for man to utilize for transportation; it provided land for reclamation, and it provided protection in the inland waterway, by competition in transportation with the lines of railroad that now haul the freight to the seaboard. Man has thus far failed to utilize the methods provided by nature.

In looking back we see that up to the Civil War the country along the river's course depended entirely upon the river for transportation. Capital has since combined in great transportation lines, and thus traffic has been drawn away from the river. There is no question but that with proper flood control above the points of possible navigation and the impounding of the flood waters, the navigation of the rivers would be largely protected.

New Mexico is directly interested in two tributaries of the Arkansas River, which are the Cimarron and the Canadian or Red Rivers. A preliminary survey of the two streams was made in 1924, and report thereon was submitted by Donald H. Connolly, major, Corps of Engineers, district engineer of the United States. The report on the Cimarron River contains, in part, the following important information:

It appears feasible to control floods by detention dams in the headwaters and benefit the valley for an indefinite distance downstream. Complete control can be obtained by detention dams along the streams from Gate, Okla., westward. The Cimarron River rises in the mountains of New Mexico and flows eastwardly to Oklahoma and across the southwest corner of Kansas into Oklahoma, not far from Beaver, Okla. The watershed of the river is 470 miles long from east to west with fairly uniform average width of about 40 miles.

The valley sometimes 2 to 3 miles wide probably will average more than 1 mile for most of the whole area. The soil varies from almost pure sand to black loam. The existing development affected by floods are bridges, tracks, and highways. The river is crossed by 17 railroad lines, one of which is in New Mexico, 2 in Kansas, and 14 in Oklahoma; bridges are expensive to build and have been repeatedly lost at several localities in Oklahoma.

The last destructive flood was in June, 1923. Many bridges were washed out. The worst flood was on August 26, 1908; the town of Folsom, N. Mex., where the fall is said to be 40 or 50 feet per mile, was washed away and 17 people were drowned.

The average rainfall (annual) over the watershed is less than 16 inches in New Mexico. One of the plans for controlling floods is by means of detention dams located in the canyon formation of New Mexico and the extreme western part of Oklahoma.

Concerning the Canadian or Red River, the preliminary report contains the following:

The Canadian River is a tributary of the Arkansas River. It rises in the Cimarron Mountains of New Mexico, near the Colorado-New Mexico State line, and flows in a southerly direction to San Miguel County, N. Mex., then in an easterly direction through New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma to its termination in the Arkansas River, 27 miles below Muskogee, Okla. The total length of the river is 833 miles, and it drains an area 560 miles long from east to west, comprising about 46,140 square miles. From the source to the longitude of Amarillo, Tex., this area comprises 18,634 square miles.

Existing developments affected by floods are: Engineering works, bridges, industrial plants, etc. The main damage by floods has been to railroad bridges and tracks, highway bridges, farm lands, and crops. Of the 21 railroad crossings 4 are in New Mexico, 2 in Texas, and 15 in Oklahoma. The land is subject to frequent overflow. It is believed that the combined capacity of the reservoir available at sites outlined will be sufficient to retain the run-off from the greatest storms that have occurred. If not, other suitable sites may be found where on account of the short span the cost of construction would not be excessive.

Estimates of land susceptible of irrigation where surveys have been made are:

- (a) Along Ute Creek and lands to the east of Ute Creek, between Gallegos and Logan, N. Mex., 60,000 acres.
- (b) On the Bell ranch, 100,000 acres.
- (c) In the vicinity of Tucumcari, N. Mex., 60,000 acres.

An examination of the monthly run-off in acre-feet at Logan, N. Mex., for the years for which the records are published, shows a variation from 274,000 acre-feet in the whole year 1913 to 1,558,387 acre-feet in the last half of 1904. The largest potential irrigation developments in acres would approximate the dependable yearly run-off in acre-feet from the watershed. About 12 inches is deemed sufficient for irrigation in New Mexico.

New Mexico and Texas are interested in flood control and irrigation; Oklahoma primarily in flood relief.

In his recommendation the district engineer says in regard to the Cimarron and Canadian or Red Rivers:

It is believed that on account of the interests involved and the apparent feasibility of controlling the floods of these rivers by a reasonable expenditure of funds, a further investigation is warranted.

As a further argument in support of the necessity for enacting the legislation provided for in H. R. 12803, I cite from a report obtained from the agricultural engineer of the Bureau of Public Roads. The total land in the United States overflowed and in need of drainage is as follows:

Area unfit for cultivation without flood control and drainage: 91,543,000 acres.

The total area in need of flood control and drainage is 113,537,000 acres. The area in Oklahoma that is overflowed and unfit for cultivation, without drainage, is 650,000 acres; and the total acreage in Oklahoma requiring flood-control protection (on account of lack of drainage) is 952,000 acres. The impounding of the flood waters at the source of the streams will reclaim that land.

It would appear from the figures submitted by the Government that it is time that we start to protect our overflowed lands by the erection of detention dams nearer the source of the rivers; the waters must be impounded and utilized beneficially, instead of allowing the same to rush uncontrolled and destroy the soil that it took nature millions of years to form.

This legislation is practical and feasible; it is beneficial, desirable, and economical and should receive the support of Congress.

CAPSTONE OF NEGRO EDUCATION—HOWARD UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission for my colleague [Mr. CELLER] to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his colleague [Mr. CELLER] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education has reported favorably H. R. 393, which will legalize annual appropriations for Howard University. Each year when the Department of the Interior appropriation bill comes in a point of order is always successfully made against the item of Howard University on the theory that such appropriations are not authorized by existing law. The item is restored by the Senate, and in conference between the two Houses the House managers on the bill approve, and finally the House concurs. Concurrence is always by an overwhelming majority.

Such a situation is most anomalous. What is the good of striking out the appropriation only to have it restored again? I sympathize with those Members of the House who support the point of order. They very likely satisfy the wishes of their misguided constituents, but a greater sympathy goes out to the colored race, which needs Howard University as all of us need breath.

Howard University was established in 1867, soon after the Civil war, when the freedmen were flocking to Washington. What was to be done with all these negroes, many of them bodily and mentally ill? They were becoming a menace to themselves and the white population. Gen. O. O. Howard and General Balloch, famous Civil War commanders, determined upon an institution for the education of the negroes, and Howard University was born. It began by the establishment of a religious school and Howard finally grew into a splendid university, receiving an "A" rating by the General Educational Board. It now has over 2,000 students—young men and women in its schools of liberal arts, education, commerce and finance, applied science, music, religion, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, and law.

The first Federal appropriation for its aid was granted in 1879. From that date the Federal Government has annually contributed to the construction, maintenance, and development of the institution, \$221,000 being the largest amount appropriated for maintenance in any one year. The university can not exist without Government support; support which has existed for so long a time can not be withdrawn. Strictly speaking, there may not be too strong constitutional foundation for the appropriation except that we are in a measure responsible for the enslavement of the negroes and for their emancipation; not only for emancipation of the body but the mind as well. What boots it if the body be free and the mind be fettered?

The salvation of the negro is in education. The Federal Government must help supply it. Negroes practically are barred from

all white higher institutions of learning. Harvard, Stanford, and Columbia Universities, I am informed, require photographs on application for matriculation. The purpose is obvious. Even the governmental institutions of West Point and Annapolis are practically closed to the negro. Annapolis has never had a colored graduate. West Point in all its history has had but three graduates who were colored, although at the present time there are in attendance several Chinese, in pursuance of the Boxer indemnity agreement, as well as the son of the Filipino rebel, Aguinaldo. Where are the colored students to go if not to Howard? The colored people, by private subscription and endowment, contribute about 60 per cent of its cost and maintenance, the Government the other 40 per cent. Each student pays \$99 a year for tuition and \$20 a month for board, except the medical student pays \$150 a year. The medical school is one of the finest in the country and receives an "A" rating from the American Medical Association. There is quite a shortage of professional men among the colored people to meet their needs. I am informed through the Department of the Interior that recent investigations show that the colored population of the Nation has increased to nearly 12,000,000 and that there is only one colored physician to 3,194 persons, while the white race has a physician to every 553 persons, thus raising an important issue in the care of the sick and the protection of the health of the negro inhabitants. The disparity is even greater in the proportion of white and colored dentists. Statistics show that there is one white dentist to every 2,070 white people in the United States, while there is but one colored dentist to every 20,500.

Other figures reveal the fact that only a very meager number of colored doctors and dentists are completing the course every year at Howard University, the average annual number of physicians graduating for the past 10 years being 20, while the number of dentists average 22.

Responsibility for the situation is attributed not to the disinclination of colored youths to study medicine and dentistry and adopt them as professions but to the deplorable limitation of the capacity of the colored educational institutions.

Doctor Durkee said:

I made a very careful study of that situation two years ago to discover how many professional men were needed. If Howard University could turn out every year about 400 thoroughly trained colored physicians for 10 years, they would catch up with the needs of the race. That is how far behind we are, medically speaking.

Of course, there are colored students in other medical schools. They have no difficulty the first two years but after that there is mischief. When they are ready for clinical work and get into the hospital wards the color line is drawn. Not so much by the white patients in the hospital as by the management thereof. A black student is not tolerated at a white bedside. Therefore, after their first two years these students knock at the doors of Howard University. Howard only can help them.

Attached to Howard is the Freedmen Hospital, to which the colored sick, wounded, and maimed go. There are no white sick there. The colored doctors and students are therefore welcome. It is practically the only hospital where students and internes can get clinical experience and bedside training. The Freedmen Hospital is supported exclusively by the Government.

The following interesting colloquy is to be found on page 12 of the hearings:

Doctor DURKEE. I will say to you, frankly, the thing would crash. It could not go. The colored people in some centers have been doing splendidly, but the race as a race is poor, and the race as a race can not maintain the strain of properly qualifying the professional men needed in the race for the next quarter of a century.

The CHAIRMAN. In the event of a great national epidemic like the "flu" a few years ago, or during the war, is it not of the utmost importance to the public generally that these doctors be educated and turned out to take care of a situation like that?

Doctor DURKEE. I might answer by describing a well-known situation, and it tells the whole story. Down in Richmond, Va., a lady put her head out of the window of her house one morning and spoke to Mary, the colored maid, who was coming up the walk, and said, "Mary, you need not come in this morning. My children have the measles, and I do not want them to spread it, and I do not want your children to get it." Mary stopped and rolling her big eyes around she said, "Lord bless you, my children done got through with the measles three weeks ago." The measles came from the home of those colored people. That is a common happening. Disease knows no color line.

If white America wants to preserve her standing and her health, she has got to train her colored physicians to take care of the health of the colored people.

The general health of the country is an all-encompassing reason for maintaining Howard University. So that the Members of the House may know the number of students coming from their States that go to Howard University, I herewith present a table giving the geographical distribution in Howard:

Geographical distribution, 1925-26

Table with columns: States and counties, Liberal arts, Education, Applied science, Music, Religion, Law, Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Total, Graduates in residence. Lists various states and foreign countries with corresponding student counts.

Does not include special students.

Although Howard maintains a religious school, the number of religious students in proportion to the entire enrollment is practically negligible—that is, 114, which includes students receiving instruction by correspondence, there being 41 resident religious students to the total enrollment of 2,032.

It is nothing new for Congress to appropriate moneys for colleges. Under various land grants the Government appropriates directly \$4,317,583 to white universities in the North and the West and \$3,759,000 to universities in the South. Doctor Durkee in this connection testified as follows:

Statement of appropriations

WEST AND NORTH

Table listing appropriations for various universities in the West and North, including University of California, Colorado Agricultural College, Connecticut Agricultural College, etc.

Table listing appropriations for various universities in the South, including New Hampshire College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts., Rutgers College, Cornell University, etc.

Total 4,317,583

No discrimination is made in these schools on account of color.

Turning to the list of southern white schools drawing money from the Federal Government through the Department of the Interior, the same situation obtains, though enhanced by discrimination.

SOUTH

Table listing appropriations for various universities in the South, including Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Alabama Technical Institute and College for Women, University of Arizona, etc.

Total 3,759,742

Separate schools for white and colored are conducted in our Southland, but only the white schools appear as listed. The colored schools which receive aid secure same through the above-named institutions.

It should be said that of the total amount of \$3,759,742 paid to the white schools of the Southland, about \$150,000 only is allocated by those States to colored schools, when at least \$625,000 should be so allocated. I draw these statistics from reports of the Federal Board for Vocational Education and from the Negro Yearbook for 1921-22, pages 264 and 267.

It is hoped, therefore, that this most important bill will be passed at this session.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print a brief address made by me to-day before the National Educational Association on the motion picture and the child, dealing with my bill in that respect.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an address made to-day—

Mr. UPSHAW. My own remarks.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do the remarks include anything about the question of prohibition or the Anti-Saloon League?

Mr. UPSHAW. I do not think there is any reference to the Anti-Saloon League. I was dealing with "The motion picture and the child."

Mr. SCHAFER. All right; I shall not object.

Mr. UPSHAW. Also to extend very briefly my own remarks about the memorial now being erected in Atlanta to former Senator Watson.

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

There was no objection.

A MEMORIAL TO THOMAS E. WATSON

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of many of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD who might like to know, I wish to remind you that the friends of the late Senator Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, are engaged in the patriotic task of building a fitting memorial to him on the capitol grounds in Atlanta.

I believe that many, not only in Congress but widely over the country who may not have agreed with some things which he said and did will still be glad to have some part in erecting this memorial out of sheer admiration for Thomas E. Watson's brilliant ability and notable achievements.

We are proud to remember that when he was a young Member of this body he initiated the movement that eventuated in that great national blessing the rural free delivery. It is also worthy of memory that some of the most notable planks in the old Ocala platform for which he and William J. Bryan both stood have been enacted into law.

Those who love history and literature are glad to remember and read those masterpieces of Thomas E. Watson, Napoleon, The History of France, the Life and Times of Andrew Jackson, and Thomas Jefferson, with many other shorter triumphs of his wonderful pen that give an indispensable embellishment to modern American literature. When this brilliant Georgian died soon after beginning his notable career in the United States Senate, 10,000 sorrowing people journeyed to his home at Thomson, Ga., to attend his funeral. Such a notable American ought to have a worthy memorial in the capital of his native State, and I hope that many Members of this body and many who read this statement will promptly communicate with Hon. James H. Boykin, chairman Watson Memorial Association, Ansley Hotel, Atlanta, Ga., who is giving himself unselfishly to this worthy movement.

THE APPROACHING PRIMARY ELECTION IN MARYLAND

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the approaching primary election in Maryland. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, September 14, the primary election will take place in Maryland.

The Republican Party in Maryland will select its candidates for United States Senator, governor, attorney general, and for other State offices.

After the Harding election of 1920 both United States Senators, four out of the six Congressmen, the mayor of Baltimore, the attorney general of Maryland, and numerous other State officers were Republicans. To-day, instead of two, there is but one Republican Senator. Instead of four there are but two Republican Congressmen. Instead of a Republican there is a Democratic mayor of Baltimore, a city whose population is more than half of the total population of the State, and instead of a Republican there is a Democratic attorney general.

The host of other State offices held in 1921 by Republicans are mostly now held by Democrats. In October, 1925, the Republican national committeeman for Maryland, former Senator Jackson; the Republican national committeewoman for Maryland, Mrs. Lowndes; France, who was senior Senator from Maryland in 1920; Broening, who was mayor of Baltimore in 1920; Lowndes, son of a great Republican Governor of Maryland; Parran, who had represented the fifth district in Congress; Metzgerott, Harp, Gladden, Hawkins, Cameron, Smith, Albrecht, Wille, Kuebler, Love, Horner, Jenkins, McGuinn, McGinity, and a host of other loyal Republicans, after many conferences, concluded that the Republican Party in Maryland must be reorganized if it were ever again to be a vital agency for good government in city, State, and Nation.

As the result of this, on October 28, 1925, Col. Marion A. Humphreys, former Mayor Broening, and I became candidates for the Republican nominations for governor, attorney general, and United States Senator, respectively, in the primary election to be held Tuesday, September 14.

No candidates have entered the primary against Colonel Humphreys or Mayor Broening. The present senior Senator from Maryland, Mr. O. E. WELER, in November became a candidate against me for the nomination.

In 1921 the Sixty-seventh Congress began. The Sixty-eighth Congress succeeded it, and in a few days the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress will have concluded its work. For these five years of postwar Federal Government reorganization Mr. WELER has been a Member of the Senate and I have been a Member of the House.

Mr. WELER, in the year of a Republican "landslide," had 15,799 majority. My district, with a Democratic registered majority of about 16,000, in an "off year" reelected me to the Sixty-eighth Congress by 15,292 majority, only 507 less than the majority Senator WELER had obtained in the whole State, including the strongly Republican counties of western Maryland.

In a few days Senator WELER's and my records will be fixed finally in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He is a candidate for renomination on his record, I for nomination on my record.

If they wish to win the general election in November, the Republicans of Maryland must select on September 14 as their candidate for the Senate one whose principles are those of Lincoln and Roosevelt and whose record is one of incessant work in Congress for those principles. The duty of Congress is to enact good legislation and to kill proposed bad legislation. If the Members of Congress are absent more than one-half of the time, if the Members of Congress do no committee work and introduce and report no bills, if the Members of Congress never open their mouths for a good bill or against a bad bill, the Government must cease to exist.

Members of Congress are sent to work and vote, not to devote their time to personal politics or to clique politics.

I have been a servant of the people for 15 years; from 1910 to 1915 as United States attorney for the district of Maryland, from 1916 to 1920 as a soldier on the border and in France, and from 1921 to to-day as a Member of Congress.

Since 1921 I have done nothing except public work. My record is contained in the official records of the Sixty-seventh, Sixty-eighth, and Sixty-ninth Congresses, which contain also the record of Senator WELER. The Republican Party of Maryland must decide whether it wishes to present to the whole Maryland electorate in November Mr. WELER's record or mine.

I invite attention to the indexes of the seven sessions of Congress for the past five years. Up to June 1 last Senator WELER was absent or not voting 1,495 times out of 2,713. His record is 55.1 per cent absent or not voting. In the same five years there have been 1,043 roll calls in the House. I am recorded as absent or not voting 164 times. I was specifically excused from answering roll calls or voting by unanimous consent of the House 12 of these times, because I was in the Walter Reed Hospital for a war disability, and 14 of these times because my committee was considering Muscle Shoals. I was therefore absent 138 times out of 1,043, 13.2 per cent of the time. Senator WELER has been present or voting 44.9 per cent of the time. I have been present or voting 86.8 per cent of the time.

What have we done in the Senate, in the House, or in committees? Look at the indexes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the past five years under "WELER" and under "HILL," and consider (1) bills and resolutions introduced, (2) committee reports filed, (3) amendments and other motions on the floor of the Senate or the House, (4) debates, (5) membership in Senate-House conference committees, and (6) votes.

(1) Senator WELER in five years introduced 30 bills and resolutions, the most noteworthy of which was S. 2907, for the relief of Galen L. Tait. I introduced 121 bills and resolutions, including H. R. 46, for a department of national defense, on which I opened all the recent House hearings that led to the passage of the Army Air Corps act, which will ultimately provide for air defense about \$102,772,185; the \$28,000,000 Wadsworth-Hill Army housing bill, on the basis of which \$410,000 have just been appropriated for barracks at Camp Meade and \$90,000 for Edgewood Arsenal; and the new judge bill for Maryland, which has passed the House.

(2) Senator WELER in five years has filed two reports from the Senate committees of which he is a member. I have officially, at the direction of my committee, filed 29 committee reports, including reports on such bills as the above \$28,000,000 permanent Army posts construction fund bill; the bill making Fort McHenry a national park; and the bill to dredge the waters near the Aberdeen Arsenal to protect the wild fowl of Maryland.

(3) Senator WELER in the five years of his incumbency has never made a motion nor offered an amendment on the floor of the Senate. In all that time he has filed in writing but three proposed amendments to pending bills. I was recognized by the Speaker to suspend the rules and pass the new judge for Maryland bill and also the \$28,000,000 Army post bill. I passed the amendment naming the new Potomac bridge after Francis Scott Key, and I have offered and passed amendments to the grain futures bill, the Coast Guard bill, the Muscle Shoals bill, the Rent Commission bill, all kinds of appropriation bills, and have offered instructive amendments to the Volstead Act and various other pending measures, all of which appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

(4) Senator WELER in the five years of his incumbency has never opened his mouth in the Senate to help pass a good bill or help kill a bad bill. I have constantly taken part in debate in the proceedings of the House in favor of the kind of legislation the people of Maryland want and against the kind of legislation that is opposed to the principles of our Maryland people.

(5) When the Senate and the House disagree on amendments to a bill, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House appoint managers of a conference on the part of the Senate and the House to try and effect an agreement.

Senator WELLER has been appointed a conferee but once, although he is a member of five committees. In the House no Member belongs to more than one important committee, while every Senator has from three to five committees, depending upon the importance of such committees. I have been a conferee many times. The Army Air Corps bill passed by this Congress provides a five-year building program for the Army air defenses of this Nation, at a cost of about \$102,772,185. The Speaker appointed me a conferee on this bill. With Senator WADSWORTH, Senator BINGHAM, Representative JAMES, Representative McSWAIN, and the rest of our conferees, I spent weeks on the disagreements of the House and the Senate, and our report was ultimately adopted by the Senate and the House.

(6) As to votes in the Senate and the House, Senator WELLER voted the United States into the World Court, the back door of the League of Nations. I voted against the Burton resolution pledging our entry into the World Court. Senator WELLER's votes, when he was present, and my votes all appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I shall be glad to advise the voters of Maryland at any time how Senator WELLER voted and how I voted on any question.

The work of the House is extraordinarily interesting. An individual Member of the Senate has, however, a much greater chance of accomplishment than an individual Member of the House. I am a candidate for the Republican nomination for the Senate because I want to do part of Maryland's work in the Senate. I want to see the Republican Party in Maryland an active agency for good government. Therefore, I hope, in the approaching primary election in Maryland, that the great majority of Republicans will go to the polls and place an X mark after my name on the ballot.

A SOLDIER'S OPINION UPON THE DEBT OF FRANCE

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a Memorial Day address delivered by Gen. John F. O'Ryan.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members of this House may know the opinion of a representative American soldier upon the war debt of France, I present the following address delivered on Memorial Day at Mount Kisco, N. Y., by Maj. Gen. John F. O'Ryan, who served two years in the American Expeditionary Forces and commanded the Twenty-seventh Division:

Comrades of the American Legion and neighbors of northern Westchester, this is Memorial Day, the day set apart for rendering honor to those who gave up their lives in our wars. It is the day above all other days when we, the living, should specially consider the measure and character of the sacrifice made by our soldiers and sailors. It is the day when we should particularly consider the relation of their services and their sacrifice to the future; when with hearts that are true to ourselves and to the best interests of our country, and with minds that are synchronized with the hour in which we live, we should apply our past experience to the solution of our present problems, so that we may more effectively contribute in our time and generation to the better advancement of the world in which we live.

The thought I have expressed would connote a serious half hour ahead of you if I were to build upon it a framework of public duty and locality spirit, and attempt to urge upon you some standard of civic responsibility and service which might be the logical outcome of the sacrifice of the past. But I have no intention of attempting this. I am not fitted for the rôle of preacher. I prefer to tell you something of war, something of mass psychology, and let you draw your own conclusions.

It is well that a people should have pride in their accomplishment, both civil and military, when there is warrant for it. We have had an extraordinary history and our record as a whole is wholesome and commendable. Our material success has been without precedent in the world's history, but this success carries with it corresponding responsibilities, and it is well that we reflect more upon them than upon our material success, for pride goeth before a fall.

Our soldiers in the war were splendid. Our dead were sacrificed in a great and worthy cause. Our maimed and wounded contributed in no small way to our present preeminent position of power. But a reasonable measure of modesty, I might say decency, demands we should remember that our allies did all we did and more.

Right here let me illustrate what I mean by the need for repressing the spirit of self-laudation, or superpatriotism, and stimulating instead a better understanding of our national obligations. We can not speak of our 60,000 dead of the World War with too much reverence, but

we should not make of that sacrifice a boast of the measure of our contribution. If our dead could be resurrected and were to form a column and march by us here to-day at the rate of 10,000 an hour, it would take six hours for them to pass this spot. What an impressive spectacle that would be of the destruction and waste of war! But what about the French? If their 1,600,000 dead were to follow them, also passing at the rate of 10,000 an hour, they would take 20 days to pass, marching 8 hours a day. If their dead were to march day and night, 24 hours a day, more than 6 days and nights would pass before we saw the last of their column.

And this is not the whole story. We loaned France some billions of dollars for war purposes. We ourselves entered the war in April, 1917. It was not until June, 1918, more than a year later, that we were holding any appreciable part of the line. But we were one of the allied and associated powers during that year 1917-18. By all the rules of sportsmanship, it was up to us, with our great man power, wealth, and resources to take over at once a lion's share of the fighting line. We did not do so. We were not prepared. General Pershing was strong enough to prevent such a tragedy, and so the American Army of nearly 4,000,000 men were trained and disciplined behind the lines, and in America, while the French, in addition to holding their own long line, held our line too, aided by the British. In other words, during that year thousands and thousands of French and British boys and men died while serving as substitutes for American boys.

Who cared about money in those momentous days? We spent money freely, and we loaned it freely to our allies. It went into the common pot of sacrifices and endeavor. But it was no substitute for the lives of those French and British boys who died that our boys might train in security. French and British families of the dead don't think so. Neither do you. But now it turns out that we did not put these moneys, or any part of them, into the pot. We want back our money—all of it—and with interest. We stand upon the fact that technically the moneys were loaned and must be repaid. The war is over. We won. Back to business. Let Congress mop up the aftermath.

Is this attitude right? Is it sportsmanlike? Isn't it our duty to acquaint ourselves with such facts as I have mentioned? Americans believe in the "square deal." We invented the term. It isn't that our people knowingly are playing the rôle we are now playing toward Great Britain and France, but that we haven't taken the trouble to ascertain the facts, to learn the point of view of Europe, to understand the relation between the two columns of marching dead, one 6 hours long, the other 20 days long. The fathers and mothers of Europe know the relation, and their grief-stricken memories will continue to carry it.

Now isn't it better, isn't it more enduringly profitable, on this memorial occasion, to reflect with some measure of Christian humility upon our shortcomings, rather than to blare out hallelujahs of admiration for our own rectitude and material accomplishment?

The relation of our wealth, resources, and point of view, to the poverty of Europe and the European viewpoint is indicated by the admonition of Washington written in 1791, in a letter to Gouverneur Morris, then in England. He referred to his belief that the only treaties that will endure are those which are mutually beneficial to the parties, and then said, "I believe it is among nations as it is with individuals, that the party taking advantage of the distresses of another will lose infinitely more in the opinion of mankind, and in subsequent events, than he will gain by the stroke of the moment."

This is a new world in which we live. The airplane, the motor car, and the radio have annihilated distances and are decreasing the number of spoken languages. Peoples all over the world are becoming more and more intimately related in their commercial and industrial endeavors—more and more dependent upon each other for mutual support. Aside from the moral viewpoint, we must be alive to maintain a high standard among all peoples, and especially our late allies, for "coming through" in clean and manly fashion.

The fighting phase of the great world struggle, the phase which ended with the armistice, did not terminate the struggle itself, the struggle for a better world. But we then quit, and left the rest to struggle on, to organize the world for peace, without us, to rehabilitate destroyed areas and to revive industry. Is it any wonder that so many of the people of Europe whose hearts we held in firm allegiance at the time of the armistice now feel that they have been disillusioned?

No, I feel that every dictate of Christian principle demands that we profit by such occasions as this to take stock of ourselves—to determine whether we are doing as we would be done by—to resolve that our struggle for material gain should be mellowed by the spirit of service, to remember, that "He who would be exalted among you, let him be the servant of all."

THE "NATIONAL ORIGINS" PROVISION OF IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1924

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I desire to make a statement explaining the status of the so-called "national origins provision" of the immigration act of 1924.

Many Members of the House have received communications in recent weeks indicating a belief on the part of citizens that

a bill to alter the existing quota arrangement has been under consideration in the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Such is not the case. The subject matter to which correspondents have referred is the provision in the immigration act of 1924, section 11, by which a new quota basis may become effective July 1, 1927. The only bills relating to the subject pending in the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization during the present session are measures to repeal this provision and continue in effect the existing quota arrangement.

As is well known, immigration quotas at present are fixed upon the basis of 2 per cent of the number of foreign-born individuals resident in continental United States as determined by the United States census of 1890, the minimum quota being 100. On this basis the total of all quotas is 164,667.

Under the so-called "national origins provision" the total of all quotas would be set at 150,000, and this number would be allocated, not according to the number of foreign-born persons resident in the country, but upon the basis of the proportionate numerical strength of nationalities among the whole population of the United States. The census of 1920 would be used, the national origins of all the people would be calculated, and, for example, if it should be found that a particular nationality contributed one-tenth of the whole population, that nationality would have one-tenth of the total quota, or 15,000. I quote the appropriate subdivisions of section 11 of the immigration act of 1924, as follows:

NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS

SEC. 11. (a) The annual quota of any nationality shall be 2 per centum of the number of foreign-born individuals of such nationality resident in continental United States as determined by the United States census of 1890, but the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100.

(b) The annual quota of any nationality for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1927, and for each fiscal year thereafter, shall be a number which bears the same ratio to 150,000 as the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 having that national origin (ascertained as hereinafter provided in this section) bears to the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920, but the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100.

(c) For the purpose of subdivision (b) national origin shall be ascertained by determining as nearly as may be, in respect of each geographical area which under section 12 is to be treated as a separate country (except the geographical areas specified in subdivision (c) of section 4) the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 whose origin by birth or ancestry is attributable to such geographical area. Such determination shall not be made by tracing the ancestors or descendants of particular individuals, but shall be based upon statistics of immigration and emigration, together with rates of increase of population as shown by successive decennial United States censuses, and such other data as may be found to be reliable.

(d) For the purpose of subdivisions (b) and (c) the term "inhabitants in continental United States in 1920" does not include (1) immigrants from the geographical areas specified in subdivision (c) of section 4 or their descendants, (2) aliens ineligible to citizenship or their descendants, (3) the descendants of slave immigrants, or (4) the descendants of American aborigines.

(e) The determination provided for in subdivision (c) of this section shall be made by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, jointly. In making such determination such officials may call for information and expert assistance from the Bureau of the Census. Such officials shall, jointly, report to the President the quota of each nationality, determined as provided in subdivision (b), and the President shall proclaim and make known the quotas so reported. Such proclamation shall be made on or before April 1, 1927. If the proclamation is not made on or before such date, quotas proclaimed therein shall not be in effect for any fiscal year beginning before the expiration of 90 days after the date of the proclamation. After the making of a proclamation under this subdivision the quotas proclaimed therein shall continue with the same effect as if specifically stated herein, and shall be final and conclusive for every purpose except (1) in so far as it is made to appear to the satisfaction of such officials and proclaimed by the President, that an error of fact has occurred in such determination or in such proclamation, or (2) in the case provided for in subdivision (c) of section 12. If for any reason quotas proclaimed under this subdivision are not in effect for any fiscal year, quotas for such year shall be determined under subdivision (a) of this section.

The determination of quotas under the "national origins provision" is an executive function, and under the law the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor are charged with the responsibility of ascertaining the ratio numbers to be used

in calculating quotas to be proclaimed by the President. The law, however, is peculiarly worded. It says:

Such officials shall, jointly, report to the President the quota of each nationality, determined as provided in subdivision (b), and the President shall proclaim and make known the quotas so reported. Such proclamation shall be made on or before April 1, 1927.

But the law says further:

If the proclamation is not made on or before such date, quotas proclaimed therein shall not be in effect for any fiscal year beginning before the expiration of 90 days after the date of the proclamation. * * * If for any reason quotas proclaimed under this subdivision are not in effect for any fiscal year, quotas for such year shall be determined under subdivision (a) of this section.

In other words, if the "national origins" provision does not become operative, the existing arrangement shall continue.

It must be clear that, upon the adoption of the "national origins provision" by the Senate and House conferees in 1924, consideration was given the possibility that ascertainment of "national origins" might not be feasible, and the above language was employed to provide authority for the continuance of existing quotas in such a contingency.

It follows, therefore, that notwithstanding the mandatory terms apparently requiring that national origin quotas be determined, and that report be made to the President, and requiring also the issuance of a presidential proclamation on or before April 1, 1927, the new quota basis need not become effective at all.

At this time I do not propose to discuss the propriety of readjusting quotas upon the "national origins" basis, or the desirability of the provision in the law, or the possibility of its repeal.

I do not know of a certainty what quotas may be expected to be assigned to particular nationalities in the event that the provision becomes operative. Various computations have been made, but all are estimates merely. No one of them is entitled to be considered as certain of adoption.

I am including in these remarks two tables—one presented during debate on the immigration bill by Senator REED of Pennsylvania and the other printed in the brochure, entitled "An Analysis of the American Immigration Act of 1924," by John B. Trevor, M. A., published in International Conciliation, a periodical issued by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in September, 1924. I am informed that final figures on the larger quotas will vary at least 15 per cent from the estimates in these tables.

I am informed, further, and quite informally, that a committee of experts, including statisticians and cartographers, has been constituted by the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor, and authorized to prepare the detailed information necessary to determine quotas under the "national origins provision," and that the members of this committee expect to make their report to the President before Congress convenes in December. If this is so, I think it likely that the Immigration Committees of the House and Senate, or one of them, will conduct hearings on the subject during the winter session.

Since the enactment of the immigration act of 1924 the press has given some attention to the "national origins provision," and because there is much misinformation concerning it I am inserting in these remarks a brief statement of the legislative history of the matter, together with a bibliography prepared for me by the Library of Congress. This information, together with the tables above referred to, is as follows:

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF "NATIONAL ORIGINS PROVISION"

(Note: All page numbers relate to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, permanent edition, 68th Cong., 1st sess.)

The "national origins provision" of the immigration act of 1924 was first offered in the House of Representatives by the late Representative Rogers of Massachusetts, April 11 and 12, 1924, during debate on the immigration bill, H. R. 7995. The House rejected the Rogers amendment. (RECORD, pp. 6110, 6111, 6226-6229.)

During debate on the immigration bill in the Senate, April 14, 1924, the proposition in slightly different language was presented by Senator REED of Pennsylvania. (RECORD, p. 6316.) After amendment it was agreed to in the Senate on April 14, 1924. (RECORD, pp. 6471, 6472.)

The only presentation of the subject matter in a committee hearing before enactment of the immigration act of 1924 was on March 8, 1924, when John B. Trevor testified before the Senate Committee on Immigration. (See hearing entitled "Selective Immigration Legislation," Committee on Immigration, United States Senate, 68th Cong., 1st sess., on S. 2365 and S. 2576, p. 89.)

Having been accepted by the Senate (April 16, 1924) and rejected by the House (April 12, 1924), the "national origins provision"

became a subject for consideration of the committee of conference, which revised the text of the entire bill, amended and accepted the "national origins provision," and submitted its report (H. Rept. No. 688) to the House on May 9, 1924.

The conference report was debated in the House that day and the "national origins provision" was discussed by Representative SABATH (RECORD, pp. 8230, 8231), and by Representative DICKSTEIN (RECORD, pp. 8238, 8239).

The bill was recommitted to the committee of conference (RECORD, p. 8249) and was again brought before the House in a second conference report (H. Rept. No. 716) submitted May 15, 1924. (RECORD, p. 8627.) In debate on the second conference report the "national origins provision" was discussed by Representative SABATH (RECORD, pp. 8634, 8635); by Representative WEFALD (RECORD, pp. 8635, 8636); by Representative DICKSTEIN (RECORD, p. 8637); and by Representative Watkins (RECORD, p. 8650).

The second conference report was submitted in the Senate on May 15, 1924 (RECORD, p. 8568). The "national origins provision" was mentioned briefly by Senator HARRISON (RECORD, p. 8580).

Table of quota and estimated quotas submitted by Senator Reed of Pennsylvania

Nationality or country	Act of 1921, which was then the law	2 per cent of 1890 with minimum of 100	National origins under the 150,000 limit proviso
Albania	288	100	100
Armenia	230	100	100
Austria	7,342	990	1,840
Belgium	1,563	509	260
Bulgaria	302	100	100
Czechoslovakia	14,357	1,873	1,320
Danzig	301	223	100
Denmark	5,619	2,782	1,092
Esthonia	1,348	102	221
Finland	3,921	145	498
Fiume	71	100	100
France	5,729	3,878	2,763
Germany	67,607	60,129	22,018
Great Britain and Ireland	77,342	62,458	91,111
Greece	3,063	100	536
Hungary	5,747	488	1,259
Iceland	75	100	100
Italy	42,057	3,889	5,878
Latvia	1,540	117	253
Lithuania	2,622	302	444
Luxemburg	97	100	100
Netherlands	3,602	1,637	2,669
Norway	12,205	6,453	2,433
Poland	30,979	8,872	4,509
Portugal	2,465	474	275
Rumania	7,419	631	386
Russia	24,405	1,792	4,002
Spain	912	124	141
Sweden	20,042	9,561	3,707
Switzerland	3,752	2,081	781
Yugoslavia	6,426	735	602
Other Europe	86	125	100
Palestine	57	100	100
Syria	882	100	162
Turkey	2,654	100	119
Other Asia	92	100	100
Africa	104	100	100
Egypt	18	100	100
Atlantic Islands	121	100	134
Australia	279	120	100
New Zealand	80	100	100
Total	357,801	161,990	150,903

Table published in John B. Trevor article, "An Analysis of the American Immigration Act of 1924"

[An analysis of the population of the United States based upon the 1920 census]

Country of birth	Descendants of colonial stock enumerated in first census, 1790, and descendants of arrivals between 1790-1820 (numerical equivalent)	Foreign white stock foreign born; native born of foreign parentage and native born of mixed parentage	Native born of native parentage contributed by arrivals between 1820-1900 (numerical equivalent)	Colored races	Total	Quota on basis of 150,000 act of 1924, subsec. (b), effective July 1, 1927
Albania		7,461			7,461	100
Armenia		44,042		899	44,941	100
Austria		1,249,852		66,241	1,316,093	2,171
Belgium		132,195		17,498	149,693	251
Bulgaria		14,485			14,485	100
Czechoslovakia		783,946		41,774	825,720	1,359
Danzig		15,066		2,679	17,745	100

Table published in John B. Trevor article, "An Analysis of the American Immigration Act of 1924"—Continued

Country of birth	Descendants of colonial stock enumerated in first census, 1790, and descendants of arrivals between 1790-1820 (numerical equivalent)	Foreign white stock foreign born; native born of foreign parentage and native born of mixed parentage	Native born of native parentage contributed by arrivals between 1820-1900 (numerical equivalent)	Colored races	Total	Quota on basis of 150,000 act of 1924, subsec. (b), effective July 1, 1927
Denmark		511,906		64,078	575,984	945
Esthonia		196,187		4,043	200,230	325
Finland		302,931		6,548	309,479	517
Fiume		875		51	926	100
France	294,518	556,202		231,679	1,082,399	1,772
Germany	2,768,473	6,779,598		2,625,308	12,173,374	20,028
Great Britain and North Ireland	44,017,828	4,875,370		2,854,482	51,747,680	85,135
Irish Free State	650,798	2,991,273		1,421,895	5,063,966	8,330
Greece		236,150		1,091	237,241	384
Hungary		854,816		45,917	900,733	1,521
Iceland		6,351			6,351	100
Italy		3,365,261		107,196	3,472,457	5,716
Latvia		224,213		4,673	228,886	384
Lithuania		272,259		7,817	280,076	458
Luxemburg		49,600		3,601	53,201	100
Netherlands	1,227,160	383,568		67,735	1,678,463	2,762
Norway		1,063,147		187,548	1,250,695	2,053
Poland		2,675,878		83,163	2,759,041	4,535
Portugal		137,399		13,216	150,615	236
Rumania		138,266		1,091	139,357	222
Russia		2,362,247		72,422	2,434,669	4,002
Spain		83,756		9,336	93,092	148
Sweden	127,625	1,521,153		218,574	1,867,352	3,072
Switzerland		374,611		99,929	474,540	783
Yugoslavia		345,284		16,522	361,806	591
San Marino		1,010		32	1,042	100
Andorra						100
Liechtenstein						100
Monaco						100
Palestine		5,382			5,382	100
Syria		87,733			87,733	100
Turkey		25,243	1,091		26,334	100
Hejaz		359			359	100
Persia		1,974			1,974	100
Egypt		2,241			2,241	100
Liberia						100
Abyssinia						100
Morocco						100
Union of South Africa		1,245			1,245	100
Australia		28,020	5,241		33,261	100
New Zealand and Pacific Islands		9,714			9,714	100
Canada		2,703,055	793,998		3,497,053	
Newfoundland		27,565	6,301		33,866	
West Indies		47,872	22,634		70,506	
Mexico		726,463	72,808		799,271	
Central and South America		21,833	12,183		34,016	
Black				8,802,577	8,802,577	
Mulatto				1,660,554	1,660,554	
Indians				244,437	244,437	
Chinese				61,639	61,639	
Japanese				111,010	111,010	
All others		153,901	144,266	9,488	307,655	
Total	49,086,402	36,398,958	9,335,555	10,889,705	105,710,620	150,000

Bibliography prepared by the Library of Congress

LIST OF REFERENCES ON THE "NATIONAL ORIGINS" PROVISION IN THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1924

1. America invites British racial control; scrutiny of the new immigration law reveals a "joker." Current opinion, Nov., 1924, v. 77: 623-624. AP2.C95, v. 77.
2. "The American bid for British stock." Progressive, Jan. 15, 1925, v. 8: 200-201. Reprinted from Observer, London.
3. Bacon, Robert L. Speech in the House, Apr. 8, 1924. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 68th Cong., 1st sess., v. 65, pt. 6; 5901-5907. J11.R5, v. 65, pt. 6. Includes discussion of "national origins" plan.
4. Beaman, Middleton. The immigration act of 1924. American bar association. Journal, July, 1924, v. 10: 490-492. Economic world, July 19, 1924, n. s. v. 28: 76-79. HC8011.M3, n. s. v. 28, National origins: p. 490.
5. Burr, Clinton S. America's race heritage; an account of the diffusion of ancestral stocks in the United States during three centuries of national expansion and a discussion of its significance. New York, The National historical society, 1922. 337 p. Bibliography: p. 325-327. E184.A1B9.
6. Choosing a quota basis. American review of reviews, May, 1924, v. 69: 455-456. AP2.R4, v. 69.

7. Dickinson, Edwin De Witt. The meaning of nationality in the recent immigration acts. In American journal of international law. Concord, N. H., 1925. v. 19, p. 344-347. JX1A6, v. 19.
8. Douglass, John J. Remarks in the House, May 28, 1926, on "National origins method." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 69th Cong., 1st sess. v. 67: 10339-10341.
9. Fairchild, Henry P. Immigration, a world movement and its American significance. Rev. ed. New York, The Macmillan co., 1925. 520 p. Bibliography: p. 501-511. National origins: p. 460-461. JVG465.F3 1925.
10. ———. The immigration law of 1924. Quarterly journal of economics. Aug. 1924, v. 38: 653-665. National origins; p. 660-661. HB1.Q3, v. 38.
11. ———. The melting-pot mistake. Boston, Little, Brown and co., 1926. 266 p. JVG465.F35.
12. Garis, Roy L. How the new immigration law works. Scribner's magazine, Aug. 1924, v. 76: 183-188. National origin scheme: p. 187. AP2.R4, v. 76.
13. Grant, Madison. America for the Americans. Forum, Sept. 1925, v. 74: 346-355. National origins feature: p. 355. AP2.F8, v. 74.
14. Hinman, George W., jr. National origins; our new immigration formula. American review of reviews, Sept. 1924, v. 70: 304-309. AP2.R4, v. 70.
15. Immigration into the United States—II. The restriction policy. Economist (London), Apr. 11, 1925, v. 100: 697-699. Quota immigrants: p. 698. HG11.E2, v. 100.
16. McSweeney, Edward F. Facts and a fraud. Columbia, v. 4, Oct., 1925: 5. "Further exposure of the 1924 immigration law."
17. ———. Making America English. Progressive, Aug. 15, Sept. 1, 1925, v. 8: 543-545; 559-561.
18. ———. Making America Nordic. Columbia, v. 4, Aug., 1925: 9-10.
19. ———. Nativism gone mad. Progressive, Feb. 1, 15, 1925, v. 8: 227-231; 255-257.
20. Maier, David. The immigration problem; A supplementary report of the Political committee of the Steuben society of America. Progressive, May 15, 1926, v. 9: 348-349.
21. ———. Same. In CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 69th Congress, 1st session. v. 67: 11350-11351. Introduced into the RECORD by Senator COPELAND.
22. National manufacturers' association. Immigration committee. Report, 1925. Journal of commerce, June 8, 1925, p. 22. Opposed to the further reduction beginning July 1, 1927.
23. National origins. Outlook, May 5, 1926, v. 143: 10. AP2.O8, v. 143.
24. Our new "Nordic" immigration policy. Literary digest, v. 81, May 10, 1924: 12-13. AP2.L58, v. 81.
25. Parker, A. Warren. The quota provisions of the immigration act of 1924. American journal of international law, Oct., 1924, v. 18: 737-754. The "national origins" plan, p. 740. JX1A6, v. 18.
26. Reed, David A. America of the melting pot comes to end. Effects of new immigration legislation described. New York Times, Apr. 17, 1924, sec. 9: 3. Includes national origins method.
27. ———. Remarks in the Senate Apr. 9, 1924, explaining "national origins" plan. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 68th Cong., 1st sess., v. 65, pt. 6: 5942-5945. J11.R5, v. 65, pt. 6.
28. Restriction of immigration. Law and labor, Apr., 1924, v. 6: 93. HD7608.L3, v. 6.
29. Saguntinus, E. The new discrimination act. Columbia, v. 4, May, 1925: 5-6, 45, 50. Opposed to "national origins" provision.
30. ———. A new constitutional issue. Columbia, v. 4, Dec., 1925: 15-16. On the "national origins" clause.
31. Schrader, Frederick F. Mr. Valle and the immigration problem. Progressive, Feb. 1, 1926, v. 9: 174-176.
32. Stephenson, George M. A history of American immigration, 1920-1924. Boston, New York, Ginn and co. [1926.] 316 p. "Select bibliography": p. 283-302. National origins provisions: p. 189-191. JVG455.S94.
33. Trevor, John B. An analysis of the American immigration act of 1924. New York City, Greenwich, Conn., Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, division of intercourse and education [1924], 76 p. (International conciliation, pub. monthly by the Carnegie endowment for international peace. . . Sept., 1924, no. 202). JX1907.A8 no. 202. Numerical limitations: p. 14-19. Appendix "B." A study of the population of the United States: p. 54-63.
34. Trevor, John B. Immigration problem; Preliminary study of immigration problem. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 68th Cong., 1st sess. v. 65, pt. 6: 5469-5471; 5906-5907. J11.R5, v. 65, pt. 6.
35. ———. Immigration quotas. An explanation of their method and of their practical effects. New York Times, Aug. 14, 1925, p. 12. See also article by E. F. McSweeney, Aug. 7, 1925.
36. U. S. Bureau of Immigration. Annual report, 1925. Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1925. 181 p. Harry E. Hull, commissioner. Legislative changes recommended: 13th relates to sec. 11: p. 29. JVG414.A3 1925.
37. ———. Congress. Debate on the Johnson immigration bill (H. R. 7995) is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 68th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 65, on the following pages:
H. R. 7995.—To limit the immigration of aliens into the United States. Introduced by Mr. Johnson and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, p. 4395. Reported with amendments (H. Rept. 350), p. 4912; minority views submitted (H. Rept. 350, pt. 2), p. 5117; debated, 3424, 5577, 5588, 5640-5707, 5833-5907, 5908-5936, 6110-6150, 6153-6174, 6225-6274, 6476, 8639.—Amended and passed House, 6258.—Amended and passed Senate (S. 2576), 6644-6649.—Conference report submitted in House (H. Rept. 688), 8218.—Debated, 8218-8249, 8250, 8279, 8639.—Recommitted to comm. of conference, 8249.—Conference report (H. Rept. 716), 8627.—Debated, 8626-8652, 8655.—Agreed to, 8652.—Conf. report, Senate, 8568, 8575.—Agreed to, 8589.—Examined and signed, 8511, 8738, 8958.—Approved, 10068.
Senate, 2576. The bill was introduced into the Senate, p. 2829; reported, 5055; debated, p. 5393, 5409, 5459-5477, 5553, 5565, 5737, 5802, 5823, 5941, 6302, 6354, 6366, 6373, 6457, 6533, 6608-6644.
Many of the debates include discussions of the national origins plan.
38. ———. House. Committee on immigration and naturalization. Restriction of immigration. Hearings . . . House of Representatives, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, on H. R. 5, H. R. 101, H. R. 561, H. R. 6540. Washington, Government printing office, 1925. 1433, 1439-1462 p. JVG505.19.
39. ———. Restriction of immigration . . . Report. (To accompany H. R. 7995). [Washington, Government printing office, 1924] 41 p. (68th Cong. 1st sess. House. Rept. 350.) See especially p. 12-17, 26-40. JVG505.1924b.
40. ———. Senate. Committee on immigration. Selective immigration legislation. Hearings on S. 2365 and S. 2576, a bill to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and to provide a system of selection in connection therewith, and for other purposes. Feb. 13-14, 20-21, Mar. 8, 13-14, Apr. 7-8, 1924. Washington, Government printing office, 1924. 314 p. (68th Cong. 1st sess.) JVG505.1924d.
41. ———. Conference committees, 1923-1924. Immigration of aliens . . . Conference report. (To accompany H. R. 7995) [Washington, Government printing office, 1924] 22 p. (68th Cong., 1st sess. House. Rept. 688.) JVG505.192c.
42. U. S. Congress. Conference committees, 1923-1924. Immigration of aliens into the United States. . . Conference report. (To accompany H. R. 7995). 20 p. (68th Cong., 1st sess.; House. Rept. 716). JVG505.1924f.
43. ———. Dept. of Labor. Letter from the Secretary of Labor to the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, transmitting suggestions in connection with impending immigration legislation. Washington, Government printing office, 1924. 20 p. Nationality and percentage limitation: p. 5. JVG491.1923d.
44. ———. Dept. of State. Letter from the Secretary of State [Charles E. Hughes] relating to the selective immigration act. Apr. 8, 1924. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 68th Cong., 1st sess. v. 65, pt. 6: 5810-5813. Includes discussions on Sec. 11. J11. R5, v. 65, pt. 6.
45. Valle, William N. Germany and the immigration quota. Extension of remarks in the House, Dec. 16, 1925. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 69th Congress 1st session, v. 67, No. 12 (current file): 823-826.
"The national origins plan is fair to all; it avoids completely all racial discrimination, and it will preserve the blood of the United States in its present proportions."
46. Ward, R. de C. New immigration law and its operation. Scientific Monthly, July, 1925, v. 21: 45-53. National origins: p. 46 (foot-note), 53. Q1.S817, v. 21.
47. ———. Our new immigration policy. Foreign affairs, Sept. 15, 1924, v. 3: 89-111. Racial origin provision: p. 107-108. D410.F6, v. 3.
48. Wasson, R. Gordon. New American immigration policy. Spectator, Mar. 28, 1925, v. 134: 491-492. National origins: p. 492. AP4.S7, v. 134.

FARM RELIEF

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to tell in one minute the substance of divers and sundry telegrams which I am receiving from the farmers of Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I am receiving numerous telegrams to-day from the people of Nebraska, mostly agriculturalists—I think we all are out there—and I think I might epitomize all of them in this language: The Congress having killed the last hope of agriculture, as we saw it,

in the Haugen bill, you are urged to vote against the Fess bill, the Tinchler bill, or any other spurious bill in behalf of agriculture. [Applause.]

JOE BURTON COURSEY

Mr. WILSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6087) to reinstate Joe Burton Coursey in the West Point Military Academy, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was read.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WEFALD, on account of illness in his family.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 10000. An act to consolidate, codify, and set forth the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December 7, 1925;

H. R. 11318. An act to provide for the publication of the act to consolidate, codify, and set forth the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December 7, 1925, with index, reference tables, appendix, etc.; and

H. R. 12208. An act granting the consent of Congress to Aurora, Elgin & Fox River Electric Co., an Illinois corporation, to construct a bridge across Fox River in Dundee Township, Kane County, and State of Illinois.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8941. An act for the relief of Turpin G. Hovas;

H. R. 11989. An act for the relief of Caleb W. Swink;

H. R. 12642. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Trumbull County, Ohio, to construct a free overhead viaduct across the Mahoning River at Niles, Trumbull County, Ohio; and

S. 2868. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 30, 1926, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WASON: Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Commerce (Rept. No. 1567). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 12963. A bill for the relief of Adam B. Ackerman, alias Aunkerman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 12859. A bill for the relief of Thomas Murphy; with amendment (Rept. No. 1568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4321. A bill authorizing the redemption by the United States Treasury of 20 war-savings stamps (series of 1918) now held by Dr. John Mack, of Omaha, Nebr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 13141) amending the statutes of the United States as to procedure in the Patent Office and in the courts with regard to the granting of letters patent for inventions and with regard to interfering patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 13142) to prevent the pollution by oil of navigable rivers of the United States; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HUDSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 287) creating a commission to investigate the operation and administration of the civil service retirement law and to make report with recommendations to Congress; 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. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 13143) for the relief of the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce and Capt. Charles G. Dobbins, Army disbursing officer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 13144) for the relief of Sanitarium Co., of Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 13145) granting an increase of pension to Lydia J. Marchand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 13146) granting a pension to Catherine V. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 13147) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Trampe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 13148) granting an increase of pension to Melissa Gill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 13149) granting a pension to Agnes O'Neill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 13150) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGRADY: A bill (H. R. 13151) granting an increase of pension to Margaret R. Geisinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY: A bill (H. R. 13152) authorizing the President to appoint Samuel O. Neff, formerly a captain in the United States Army, to the rank of second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 13153) for the relief of the heirs of James Killingsworth; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. QUAYLE: A bill (H. R. 13154) granting a pension to William G. A. Bonck; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 13155) granting a pension to Susan E. Slater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 13156) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Plants; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13157) to allow credits in the accounts of Harry Caden, special fiscal agent, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 13158) granting an increase of pension to Ella G. Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13159) granting an increase of pension to Margie Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13160) granting an increase of pension to Hattie Corey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 13161) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2978. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of sundry residents of Madera County, Calif., urging passage of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2979. By Mr. BECK: Petition of sundry citizens of Elroy, Wis., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2980. By Mr. BIXLER: Petition of sundry residents of Forest County, Pa., urging further relief of Civil War veterans and dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2981. Also, petition of sundry residents of Sharon, Pa., urging further relief Civil War veterans and dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2982. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Roy Miller and sundry residents of Sharon, Pa., urging further relief for Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2983. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of Mrs. Zerelda Plew and 42 other citizens of Switzerland County, Ind., urging relief for Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2984. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition urging that legislation be passed at this session of Congress increasing pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2985. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of Ida M. Chard and 61 other voters of Almont, Mich., urging immediate action on the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2986. By Mr. DOUGHTON: Petition of sundry citizens of Ashe County, N. C., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2987. By Mr. DOWELL: Petition of sundry residents of Marion, Iowa, urging passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2988. By Mr. DRIVER: Petition signed by various citizens residing in Clay County, Ark., urging immediate action on the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2989. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of sundry citizens of Washington County, Idaho, for relief for Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2990. By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Petition of sundry citizens of Cecil and Wicomico Counties, Md., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2991. Also petition of sundry citizens of Salisbury and Charlestown, Md., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2992. By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of 137 voters of West Union, Iowa, urging immediate consideration and passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2993. Also, petition of 64 voters of Mason City, Iowa, urging immediate consideration and passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2994. Also, petition of 23 voters of Westgate, Iowa, urging immediate consideration and passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2995. By Mr. HICKEY: Petition of C. A. Coulter and other citizens of South Bend, Ind.; also petition of C. M. Bushey and other citizens of Knox, Ind., urging the early passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2996. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of R. L. Thomas and 32 others, residents of Wenatchee, State of Washington, for the passage of the Civil War veterans' pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2997. By Mr. HOGG: Petition of Margaret Trowley Lewis Tent, No. 24, National Alliance Daughters of Veterans, of Fort Wayne, Ind., asking for increases in pension for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2998. By Mr. HOWARD: Petition of Elwood M. Peebles and others, of Macy, Thurston County, Nebr., in behalf of increased pensions for Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2999. Also petition of Walter S. French, of Monroe, Platte County, Nebr., in behalf of increased pensions for Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3000. By Mr. HUDSPETH: Petition of sundry residents of the city of El Paso, Tex., urging favorable action on the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3001. By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: Petition of Albert Asbell and other citizens of Peoria County, Ill., urging immediate and favorable consideration of the Elliott pension bill for the relief of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3002. Also, petition of Mrs. Jane Schuster and other citizens of East Peoria, Ill., urging immediate and favorable consideration of the Elliott pension bill for the relief of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3003. Also, petition of Mrs. Elvira Pearson and other citizens of Peoria, Ill., urging immediate and favorable consideration of the Elliott pension bill for the relief of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3004. Also, petition of E. A. Mitchell and other citizens of Chillicothe, Ill., urging immediate and favorable consideration of the Elliott pension bill for the relief of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3005. Also, petition of Mrs. C. C. Bradley and other citizens of Peoria, Ill., urging immediate and favorable consideration of the Elliott pension bill for the relief of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3006. Also, petition of Mrs. Amelia M. Ferner and other citizens of Washington, Ill., urging immediate and favorable consideration of the Elliott pension bill for the relief of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3007. Also, petition of Mrs. Marie Gill and other citizens of Peoria, Ill., urging immediate and favorable consideration of the Elliott pension bill for the relief of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3008. Also, petition of Mrs. Rose Spencer and other citizens of Neponset, Ill., urging immediate and favorable consideration of the Elliott pension bill for the relief of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3009. Also, petition of T. A. Knock and other citizens of Peoria, Ill., urging immediate and favorable consideration of the Elliott pension bill for the relief of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3010. Also, petition of M. E. Tarp and other citizens of Elmwood, Ill., urging immediate and favorable consideration of the Elliott pension bill for the relief of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3011. By Mr. IRWIN: Petition of sundry citizens of Mason County, Ill., urging Congress to take immediate steps to bring the civil service pension bill to a vote; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3012. By Mr. KELLY: Petition of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging immediate passage of bill increasing pensions for veterans of Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3013. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of 44 residents of Marcellus, Mich., requesting relief for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3014. By Mr. KIESS: Petition of sundry citizens of Nelson, Pa., favoring legislation granting increased pension to Civil War soldiers and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3015. By Mr. KING: Petition signed by D. E. Russell and 126 other citizens of Cambridge, Ill., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and the widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3016. By Mr. KNUTSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Clear Lake, Minn., favoring Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3017. By Mr. LINEBERGER: Petition of 35 citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., urging passage of Elliott bill, granting relief to veterans of Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3018. Also, petition of over 100 citizens of Long Beach, Calif., urging passage of Elliott bill for relief of veterans of Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3019. By Mr. LOZIER: Petition of sundry citizens of Norborne, Mo., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3020. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Sullivan County, Mo., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3021. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Trenton, Mo., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3022. By Mr. McKEOWN: Petition signed by Mrs. Eliza A. Hoover, J. B. Chastaine, Mrs. Rebecca Johnson, Mrs. Lucinda K. Duncan, and others, all citizens of Seminole County, Okla., urging the immediate and favorable consideration of the Elliott pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3023. Also, petition signed by Anderson Fitzgerald, R. D. Vaughn, H. R. Cole, and many others, all citizens of Mannsville, Okla., urging the immediate and favorable consideration of the Elliott pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3024. By Mr. MAGRADY: Petition of numerous citizens of Shamokin, Northumberland County, Pa., urging immediate consideration of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3025. By Mr. MICHAELSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., for increased pensions for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3026. By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of citizens of Newark, Ohio, urging passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3027. Also, petition of Sons of the Union Veterans of the Civil War, urging passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3028. By Mr. NELSON of Maine: Petition of sundry citizens of Vassalboro, Me., urging the immediate passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3029. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Clyde and Mallory Steamship Cos., opposing the passage of the Cummins-Graham longshoremen's and harbor workers' compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3030. By Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island: Petition of Louise Lavender, of Woonsocket, R. I., urging immediate action on the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3031. By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: Petition of sundry voters of New Orleans, La., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3032. By Mr. OLDFIELD: Petition of sundry citizens of Clay County, Ark., urging prompt and favorable action on H. R. 4023, known as the Elliott pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3033. By Mr. REECE: Petition of various citizens of Claiborne County, Tenn., urging action on Civil War pension bill at the present session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3034. By Mr. SHREVE: Petition of Mrs. O. P. Burdick and 70 citizens of Union City, Pa., asking for immediate consideration of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3035. By Mr. SIMMONS: Petition of sundry citizens of Paxton, Nebr., urging passage of Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3036. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Lincoln County, Nebr., urging passage of Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3037. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo County, Nebr., asking passage of Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3038. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of Mr. Edwin Erich and 88 others of Tolley, N. Dak., urging the enactment of legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3039. By Mr. SMITH: Petition signed by 59 residents of Gooding, Idaho, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3040. By Mr. STALKER: Petitions signed by 102 citizens of Elmira, N. Y., voters of the thirty-seventh congressional district of New York State, urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3041. By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Petition of W. F. Lee, adjutant, Lew Gove Post, No. 100, Grand Army of the Republic, Manhattan, Kans., urging that bill granting increase of pension to Civil War veterans and their widows be enacted into law at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3042. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Apollo, Pa., urging immediate action on the pending bill to increase the rates of pension for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3043. By Mr. SWANK: Petition of sundry voters of Norman, Okla., on Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3044. By Mr. SWING: Petition of certain residents of San Bernardino, Calif., urging immediate action by Congress on the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3045. Also, petition of certain residents of Orange, Calif., urging immediate action by Congress on the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3046. By Mr. SWOOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Kane, Pa., urging passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3047. By Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia: Petition of J. A. McGinnis and others, praying for the passage of pending legislation granting pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3048. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of sundry voters of Delphos, in the fifth Ohio district, urging the enactment of Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3049. By Mr. TILSON: Petition of William V. Blair and other residents of Meriden, Conn., asking for increase in pension for Civil War veterans, their widows, and dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3050. By Mr. UNDERWOOD: Petition of sundry citizens of Ross County, Ohio, urging passage of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3051. By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of soldiers and widows of soldiers of the Civil War asking increase of pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3052. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of Edgar E. Sancomb and other residents of Chevy Chase, Md., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, June 30, 1926

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

Our Father, our God, we thank Thee that in the opening of another day of duty we can be assured of Thy guidance and seek always the wisdom which cometh from above. Thou knowest the purposes of each and how each one desires to fulfill the high commission committed to him. We pray, our Father, that in all these days of responsibility the consciousness of Thy nearness may be fully realized. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday, June 23, 1926, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ernst	La Follette	Sheppard
Bayard	Fernald	McKellar	Shipstead
Bingham	Ferris	McMaster	Shorridge
Blease	Fess	McNary	Simmons
Borah	George	Mayfield	Smoot
Bratton	Gerry	Metcalf	Stanfield
Broussard	Gillett	Moses	Steck
Bruce	Glass	Neely	Stephens
Butler	Goff	Norbeck	Swanson
Cameron	Gooding	Norris	Trammell
Capper	Hale	Oddie	Tyson
Caraway	Harrel	Overman	Underwood
Copeland	Harris	Pine	Walsh
Couzens	Harrison	Pittman	Warren
Cummins	Heflin	Ransdell	Watson
Curtis	Howell	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
Dale	Johnson	Reed, Pa.	Williams
Deneen	Jones, N. Mex.	Robinson, Ark.	Willis
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Robinson, Ind.	
Edge	Kendrick	Sackett	
Edwards	King	Schall	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10827) to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6087) to reinstate Joe Burton Coursey in the West Point Military Academy.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13040) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1926, and June 30, 1927, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 2868. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6087. An act to reinstate Joe Burton Coursey in the West Point Military Academy;

H. R. 8941. An act for the relief of Turpin G. Hovas;

H. R. 11989. An act for the relief of Caleb W. Swink; and