

passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, for increase of Spanish War veterans' pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

1788. By Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma: Petition from Robert D. Slack and 65 other citizens of Collinsville, Okla., praying for increase of Spanish-American War pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

1789. Also, petition of M. Wood and 111 other citizens of Vera Township, Okla., petitioning Congress for increase of Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1790. Also, petition of Clyde Jones, of Hominy, Okla., and five other Oklahoma citizens, urging early enactment of House bill 3397; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1791. Also, petition of R. O. Dunigan and 12 other citizens of Tulsa, Okla., urging early enactment of House bill 3397; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1792. Also, petition of M. J. Westbrook and 118 citizens of Hominy, Okla., petitioning Congress to increase the pension allowance to veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1793. Also, petition of C. R. Maple and 72 other citizens of Washington County and Bartlesville, Okla., praying for increase of pension to veterans of the Spanish-American War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

1794. Also, petition of E. E. Eckardt and 226 other citizens of Hominy, Okla., praying for an increase of pension for veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1795. By Mr. PARKS: Petition of citizens of Stamps, Lafayette County, Ark., urging Congress for the passage of House bill 2562, granting an increase of pension to Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

1796. By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: Petition of William Sever, G. W. Arnold, and M. W. Staples, M. D., and other residents of Pleasant Plains, Ill., urging the passage of bills providing for increased rates of pensions for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

1797. By Mrs. ROGERS: Petition of Winfield Temple and other residents of Marlboro, Mass., urging that legislation be passed granting further relief to the Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1798. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of citizens of Adair County, Mo., for more liberal pensions to veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1799. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Petition of A. Tipton and numerous other citizens of Smith County, Tex., urging passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

1800. Also, petition of Rev. S. W. Riley, of Tyler, Tex., and numerous other citizens of Smith County, Tex., requesting the passage of an old age pension law; to the Committee on Labor.

1801. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of citizens of Owens, Kanawha County, W. Va., urging passage of the Civil War pension bill carrying rates as proposed by the National Tribune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1802. By Mr. STOBBS: Petition of residents of Worcester, Mass., urging passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

1803. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition signed by Dr. J. W. Smiser and others, urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill increasing the pension of veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1804. By Mr. TILSON: Petition of citizens of Branford, Conn., praying for the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to men who served in the Spanish War; to the Committee on Pensions.

1805. Also, petition of citizens of Branford, Conn., praying for passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to men who served in the Spanish War; to the Committee on Pensions.

1806. By Mr. UNDERWOOD: Petition of Clara Fosnaugh and other residents of Amanda, Ohio, asking Congress not to recommend the calling of an international conference by the President of the United States, or the acceptance by him of an invitation to participate in such a conference, for the purpose of revising the present calendar, unless a proviso be attached thereto definitely guaranteeing the preservation of the continuity of the weekly cycle without the insertion of blank days; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1807. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of residents of Owosso, Mich., urging more liberal pension legislation for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1808. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition from United Spanish War veterans of San Francisco, urging the enactment of House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

1809. Also, petition from voters of San Francisco, Calif., urging the enactment of a Civil War pension bill, carrying the rates proposed by the National Tribune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1810. Also, petition from electors of the county of San Francisco, Calif., urging the enactment of the Knutson bill (H. R. 2562); to the Committee on Pensions.

1811. By Mr. WHITLEY: Petition of the James Smith Circle, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Rochester, N. Y., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill proposed by the National Tribune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1812. Also, petition of Ernest D. Thompson and other residents of Rochester, N. Y., urging the passage of legislation providing increased pensions for the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish-American War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

1813. By Mr. WOOD: Petition of residents of Hammond, Ind., asking legislation to increase rates of pension paid to the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish-American War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, December 11, 1929

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 4, 1929)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. FESS. 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:

Allen	Fletcher	King	Shortridge
Ashurst	Frazier	La Follette	Simmons
Baird	George	McCulloch	Smith
Barkley	Gillett	McKellar	Smoot
Bingham	Glass	McMaster	Steck
Black	Glenn	McNary	Stelwer
Blaine	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Sullivan
Blease	Gould	Moses	Swanson
Borah	Greene	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Hale	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Brock	Harris	Nye	Townsend
Brookhart	Harrison	Oddie	Trammell
Broussard	Hatfield	Phipps	Tydings
Capper	Hawes	Pine	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hayden	Pittman	Wagner
Connally	Hebert	Ransdell	Walcott
Copeland	Heflin	Reed	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Dale	Jones	Sackett	Watson
Dill	Kean	Schall	Wheeler
Fess	Keyes	Sheppard	

Mr. HATFIELD. My colleague the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is confined to his home by illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

HOLIDAY GREETINGS TO SENATOR BROOKHART FROM ANTARCTICA

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, when Commander Byrd was forming his expedition for the South Pole, one of my old riflemen, Sergeant Czegka, of the Marine Corps, came to me and asked a recommendation to the commander as a mechanic for the expedition. I gave him that recommendation and he was accepted. On yesterday I received the following radiogram:

[Radiogram received by the New York Times]

BYRD ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION,

111WFA50, Little America, December 5.

The Hon. SMITH W. BROOKHART,

United States Senate, Washington:

Merry Christmas and happy New Year from Little America, Antarctica.

CZEGKA.

SALVAGE VESSEL FOR SHIP DISASTERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, preliminary plans and specifications of a salvage vessel for use in ship disasters, which, with the accompanying plans, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS OF PUBLIC LANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a communication from the Commissioner of the General

Land Office, reporting relative to the withdrawals and restorations of public lands as contemplated by statute, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

DISPOSITION OF EFFECTS OF CERTAIN DECEASED PERSONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his recommendation for the early enactment of legislation for the disposition of effects in the General Accounting Office of persons dying while subject to military law, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS

Mr. BLAINE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Platteville and vicinity, in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRAZIER presented the petition of W. C. Treumann and 74 other citizens of Grafton and vicinity, in the State of North Dakota, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a petition of sundry citizens of New Windsor, Md., praying for the passage of legislation to establish a Federal department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

FEDERAL RADIO COMMISSION

Mr. DILL, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 2276) continuing the powers and authority of the Federal Radio Commission under the radio act of 1927, as amended, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 56) thereon.

REPORTS ON NOMINATIONS

Mr. BORAH, as in open executive session, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. SACKETT, as in open executive session, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, reported the nomination of Edwin P. Morrow, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Board of Mediation, which was ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 2584) granting a pension to Bramble B. Ownby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 2585) for the relief of the American Foreign Trade Corporation and Fils d'Aslan Fresco; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 2586) granting a pension to Walter J. Gamal (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 2587) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to lend tents and camp equipment for use at the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans, to be held at Biloxi, Miss., in June, 1930; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2588) authorizing the payment for the attendance of the Marine Band at the Confederate Veterans' reunion to be held at Biloxi, Miss.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 2589) authorizing the attendance of the Marine Band at the Confederate Veterans' reunion to be held at Biloxi, Miss.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK:

A bill (S. 2590) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the water between the mainland at or near Cedar Point and Dauphin Island, Ala.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2591) to provide for the commemoration of the action at Tuscaloosa, Ala.;

A bill (S. 2592) to provide for the commemoration of the siege of Blakely, Ala.;

A bill (S. 2593) to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Burnt Corn, Ala.;

A bill (S. 2594) to provide for the commemoration of the surrender of the forces commanded by General Taylor to General Canby at Citronelle, Ala.;

A bill (S. 2595) to provide for the commemoration of the historic events which occurred at Fort Williams, Ala.;

A bill (S. 2596) to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Talladega, Ala.;

A bill (S. 2597) to provide for the commemoration of the historic events which occurred at Fort Mitchell, Ala.;

A bill (S. 2598) to provide for the commemoration of the historic events which occurred at Jackson Oak, Ala.;

A bill (S. 2599) to provide for the commemoration of the massacre of Fort Mims, Ala.;

A bill (S. 2600) to provide for the commemoration of the siege of Spanish Fort, Ala.;

A bill (S. 2601) to provide for the commemoration of the historic events which occurred at Fort Tombebee, Ala.;

A bill (S. 2602) to provide for the commemoration of the historic events which occurred at Fort St. Stephens, Ala.;

A bill (S. 2603) to provide for the commemoration of the historic events which occurred at Fort Jackson (Fort Toulouse), Ala.; and

A bill (S. 2604) to provide for the commemoration of the historic events which occurred at Fort Stoddard, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 2605) to amend section 9 of the Federal reserve act, to permit State member banks of the Federal reserve system to establish or retain branches in foreign countries or in dependencies or insular possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2606) to provide for the disposition of revested Oregon & California Railroad Co. and Coos Bay Military Wagon Road Co. grant lands after the timber thereon has been sold and cut; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 2607) authorizing the transfer from the War Department to the United States Veterans' Bureau of the Fort William Henry Harrison Military Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 2608) for the relief of William C. Rives; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) to authorize the merger of street railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 106) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the privileges of Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BROOKHART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 180), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That so much of paragraph 1 of Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate as reads "Committee on Pensions, to consist of 11 Senators" is amended to read as follows:

"Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of 13 Senators, to which shall be referred all legislation and other matters relating to pensions, government life insurance, and death or disability compensation, hospitalization, and allowances of persons in the military or naval service of the United States and their beneficiaries, and all legislation and other matters relating to the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and its branches."

ASSISTANT IN THE SECRETARY'S OFFICE

Mr. PHIPPS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 181), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to employ an assistant in the office of the Secretary of the Senate on the efficiency roll, to be paid at the rate of \$3,180 per annum out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XII

Mr. BINGHAM submitted a resolution (S. Res. 182), which ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Resolved, That the first sentence of paragraph 3 of Rule XII of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"3. No request by a Senator for unanimous consent for the taking of (1) a final vote on a specified date upon the passage of a bill or joint resolution, or (2) final action upon a matter of high privilege shall be submitted to the Senate for agreement thereto until, upon a roll call ordered for the purpose by the Presiding Officer, it shall be disclosed that a quorum of the Senate is present."

FREIGHT RATES AND RAILROAD VALUATIONS

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, the country is confronted with the possibility of an ultimate increase in freight rates in the neighborhood of half a billion dollars annually. If this takes place, Congress alone will be responsible.

On May 20, 1929, the United States Supreme Court rendered a judgment in the case of the St. Louis & O'Fallon Railroad Co., three Justices dissenting and one not participating. Unless Congress intervenes, as there was no constitutional question involved, this decision will ultimately result in an increase in the valuation of the railways of the country to the extent of a possible \$9,000,000,000, or some 43 per cent—from \$21,000,000,000 to about \$30,000,000,000. This, it is unnecessary to state, will mean an increase in freight rates ultimately, an increase that will have a profound effect upon the inland communities of the country and especially the great Middle West, to say nothing of its effect upon the great majority of our people wherever they may live. Of course, this increase in freight rates will not take place immediately, but such a burden will be placed upon the shoulders of the people sooner or later, because the railroads will be in a position to compel the Interstate Commerce Commission to afford rates as high as the traffic will bear.

This judgment of the Supreme Court resulted from a report and order by the Interstate Commerce Commission valuing the property of the O'Fallon Railway Co. for purposes of rate making and also for recapture; that is, to determine the amount of the excess earnings above 6 per cent, one-half of which is subject to recapture by the Government. The O'Fallon Railway Co., dissatisfied with the weight given by the Interstate Commerce Commission to current costs of reproduction, and therefore a lower valuation than claimed, appealed to the United States district court, which, with three judges sitting, held with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The railroad company appealed from this judgment directly to the Supreme Court, which is possible in such cases, and this highest tribunal reversed the court below, holding that "whether the commission acted as directed by Congress was the fundamental question presented. If it did not, the action taken being beyond the authority, was invalid."

It is evident from the above facts that the commercial, industrial, and farming interests of the country are menaced with ultimate higher railroad rates—rates that may well be as high as the traffic will bear—and that these higher rates will not be due to the Supreme Court's decision but to the provisions contained in the Esch-Cummins law respecting the valuation of railroad property.

Therefore Congress is responsible for the situation confronting the country, inasmuch as Congress enacted the Esch-Cummins law. However, as there was no constitutional question involved in this case, it is apparent that Congress can correct the situation by placing its stamp of approval upon the Interstate Commerce Commission's interpretation of the valuation provisions of the transportation act of 1920 in connection with the O'Fallon case.

On the other hand, should Congress quiescently accept the statutory interpretation indicated by the Supreme Court in this connection, Congress alone will be responsible and blamable for the burdens that the ultimate increase in railroad rates will saddle upon the country, notwithstanding the fact that in recent years the railroads have enjoyed the highest degree of prosperity in their history.

Mr. President, to meet this situation, in order that Congress may take action, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce the joint resolution which I am sending to the desk, and I further ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 104) relating to valuation of the property of common carriers under the interstate commerce act, as amended, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for the purposes of rate making and recapture of earnings under the interstate commerce act, as amended, the valuation of the property of any common carrier subject to such act shall be determined in accordance with the principles and methods approved in the report and order of the majority of the Interstate Commerce Commission in Finance Docket No. 3908, excess income of St. Louis O'Fallon Railway Co., and Finance Docket No. 4026, excess income of Manufacturers Railway Co., dated February 15, 1927.

Mr. HOWELL. I ask also that the joint resolution may be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska a question?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. If the Interstate Commerce Commission has no further interpretation from Congress in regard to the act in question, and if then it shall be guided by the ruling of the Supreme Court, will that mean that five or six billion dollars will be added to the valuation of the railroads, upon which a further increase in freight rates will be inflicted upon industry as well as upon the agriculture interests of the country in time to come?

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, it will mean a possible increase of the rate bases of the railroads from twenty-one billion to twenty-nine billion dollars, or 43 per cent; and, necessarily, it will mean an ultimate increase in freight rates, not merely for the agricultural communities of the Middle West but for all industries. The decision was based upon the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission in arriving at its valuation in the O'Fallon case did not follow the direction and intent of Congress. Therefore, it is a matter for Congress to deal with. If Congress shall place its stamp of approval upon the method adopted by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the O'Fallon case, then it will follow that that method will hold for all of the railroads, and, as a result, there will be no increase in the valuation of the railroads and no ultimate increase in freight rates.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me further?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield further to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. McMASTER. If that be true, if a 43 per cent increase in freight rates should follow, the burdens which will be inflicted upon agriculture in certain of the Northwestern States will be almost unbearable. For example, in South Dakota, when the price of wheat is at the low point of around 80 cents a bushel, and it now requires from a third to a fourth of the total selling price of that wheat to pay the freight rate, if there should be added in the future 43 per cent to that freight rate, the burden which would be imposed on the farmers would be absolutely unbearable. It would place such a penalty upon agricultural producers that they would be unable to exist under those circumstances.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, if the higher valuations are to prevail, and the resulting freight rates follow, there is no question but that we shall have nullified everything we have done so far as farm relief is concerned; but, understand me, it does not necessarily follow that increased freight rates will be immediately put into effect. For years to come, however, the railroads of the country will be in a position to compel the Interstate Commerce Commission to grant the highest freight rates the traffic will bear.

Mr. GOULD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield first to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. GOULD. The question which the Senator from Nebraska is discussing, it seems to me, has two sides to it. The Senator from Nebraska has referred to the possibility of freight rates being advanced; but the increased valuation of railroads would increase taxes, would it not? That is certain, for the railroads are taxed on the valuation of their property. The suggestion of an increase in freight rates, I think, is pretty far-fetched. The possibility which the railroads are now fearing is a decrease in rates, for in order to haul the grain from the West to the Atlantic coast seaports, they have got to meet the competition of the Canadian railroads, and, as I understand, they are about to reduce their freight rates anyway. So an increase in taxes and a reduction of freight rates are more probable contingencies. I think we need not become very much frightened about what the railroads are going to do under the ruling of the Supreme Court in the O'Fallon case.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HOWELL. I will yield in just a moment.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will shorten further discussion on this question, because I want to go on with the tariff bill.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine has referred to transcontinental rates which are merely a portion of the rate structure. So far as any increase in tax rates is concerned, I am not so optimistic as the Senator from Maine

apparently is. Probably increased valuation would make some difference in the taxes of railroads, but that would not make anything like the difference to the communities all over this country that the possible increase of freight rates would make if the valuation of the railroads should be increased 43 per cent.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. So far as the question of increased taxes is concerned, taxes are a part of the operating expenses of the railroads and when taxes are increased that further increases the rates, does it not?

Mr. HOWELL. There is no question about that.

Mr. BROOKHART. I should like to ask another question. The Senator said that there is involved a possible increase in railroad valuation of about eight billion or nine billion dollars, and that is true. Nevertheless, as I read the O'Fallon decision it is not a command to the commission to increase the rates but it is left within their discretion. There is, however, a command to the commission to consider the subject of reproduction new as an element; but the amount of consideration they shall give to that element is left to the discretion of the commission, and under the O'Fallon case they might consider it without increasing valuation.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, so far as that is concerned, the O'Fallon Railway Co. insisted upon a valuation which was practically equal to reconstruction new, less depreciation, and, in my opinion, the railroads of the country will be able to go to the Interstate Commerce Commission and demand a similar basis of valuation. If they are not allowed it, then they may appeal to the court; and in the case of the Indianapolis Water Works it will be remembered that the court held very largely for reproduction new at spot prices. Therefore we are confronted with the situation I have outlined. What I propose is a joint resolution which shall make it clear that it is the intent of Congress that the method followed by the Interstate Commerce Commission in valuing the O'Fallon Railway is the method that shall be utilized hereafter in such valuations.

Mr. DILL and Mr. BROOKHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield first to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DILL. I should like to know whether the Senator thinks that such a proposal as he has offered here would be sustained as legislation by the courts? As I understand, the Senator proposes to make the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission the law on the subject of the valuation of railroads. I am in full sympathy with the Senator's position.

Mr. HOWELL. The Supreme Court held that the majority of the Interstate Commerce Commission had not followed the direction and intent of Congress, and therefore that its order was void. Justice Brandeis, in the initial sentence of his dissenting opinion, said that the fundamental question involved was one of statutory construction; and Mr. Justice Stone stated in his opinion that there was no constitutional question involved. Therefore it may be inferred that this is a matter which Congress can deal with, and if Congress will promptly deal with it we will be saved a possible increase in valuations and railroad rates.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will now let us proceed with the consideration of the tariff bill. I consented that this matter be brought up with the understanding that the discussion would not take more than a few moments.

Mr. HOWELL. I did not intend to take as long a time as has been occupied.

Mr. SMOOT. I know the Senator did not, but I wish now we could proceed with the tariff bill.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I should like to interrupt the Senator from Nebraska once more.

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. I am entirely in sympathy with the Senator's idea, but the Supreme Court held that the commission had not considered the question of reproduction new, as was so announced in the opinion of the commission, and that they must consider it. I think it is true, substantially as the Senator has stated, that the commission figured in that cost, and if they simply put the statement in their former opinion that they did consider it and left the value the same, I believe it would be approved by the Supreme Court. However, it is also proper that Congress should take the responsibility and do something along the line of the Senator's resolution.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, as a matter of fact unless Congress shall act, Congress will be responsible and blamable

for a possible great increase in freight rates; it will not be the responsibility of the Supreme Court of the United States.

REVISION OF THE TARIFF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLEN obtained the floor.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. ALLEN. For what purpose?

Mr. DILL. In order that I may submit a report.

Mr. ALLEN. I am only going to take a very few minutes. I yielded yesterday for a report on a measure which took 45 minutes.

Mr. DILL. Very well.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, yesterday morning in connection with a request which I made that there be printed in the Record some advice contained in an advertisement paid for and presented to us by the country press of Minnesota some remarks were made by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] which have brought a reply which I desire now to read. The telegram is from Mr. Herman Roe, the publisher of the Northfield News, of Northfield, Minn., and is as follows:

NORTHFIELD, MINN., December 11, 1929.

HON. HENRY J. ALLEN,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

If Senator NORRIS is correctly quoted in the Associated Press dispatch to-day referring to page advertisement signed by more than 140 Northwest editors appealing to Congress for speedy action on tariff bill, permit me as one of the signers who contributed to defray the cost to say I would welcome an opportunity to testify before lobby committee or any other Senate committee. Every other publisher who indorsed this appeal would welcome such an opportunity, and joins me in resenting Senator NORRIS's unjustified and unwarranted reference to these editors and their newspapers as pretending to be friends of the farmer. As real friends of the farmer, who come in contact with farmers daily, this group of editors of home-town newspapers can assure the Senator from Nebraska that the farmers of our State, with very few exceptions, indorse the statements made by the editors and add their emphatic appeal for more action and less oratory, so that a tariff law embodying President Hoover's recommendations may be enacted.

HERMAN ROE,

Publisher Northfield News.

The Northfield News is listed in the American Newspaper Annual Directory, which is the official publication of the American Newspapers Publishers Association, as a Republican paper, established in 1876. It is the oldest paper in Northfield, with the largest general circulation.

The circulation of the newspapers which signed the statement to Congress totals 495,350. An examination of the list reveals the names of many publishers well known to the public. There are nearly 150 of them. Many of them have been publishers of their papers for more than a quarter of a century; three or four of them for a longer period.

Eighty-four of these editors publish the only newspapers in their respective communities; 31 of the remainder publish the leading papers. In one community, Windom, a town of 2,200 population, both newspapers joined in indorsing the advertisement. Both metropolitan dailies in Duluth, the Herald and News-Tribune, and the Minneapolis Journal—daily, 116,164; Sunday, 166,258—also signed the statement.

These papers have been a part of the warp and woof of Minnesota civilization, as country editors have always been a part of the civilizations they have helped to cherish. They have gone up and down with the fluctuations of pioneer days. Their characters have stood the test, as is revealed by their circulations, because no man is under a more constant scrutiny than the country editor who submits each week to the readers of the old home paper the best that is in him. No country newspaper rises higher than the character of its publisher; the cumulative judgment which his readers pass upon him from week to week is inescapable.

These editors and publishers hold their missions in life just as high as do we hold ours here in this Chamber. A reflection upon their integrity means just as much to them as a reflection upon our integrity means to us. These men have made continual sacrifices. Their honest courage has led them often into places that have threatened the very existence of the papers they have loved and cherished.

Therefore Mr. Roe does not make lightly the suggestion that he be permitted an opportunity, along with his associates, to answer here the aspersions cast upon him here. If these Min-

nesota editors and publishers have committed an offense in their assumption that they had a right to advise us, then we had better have it out.

It has been the habit of publishers in this country for a good many years to give advice along the lines of government. Every publisher feels that an intelligent interest in public affairs is a part of the general obligation he assumes toward the public. I imagine these Minnesota editors were considerably surprised yesterday when they discovered that their advice to us had been received with suspicion and irritation rather than with the respectful consideration to which they doubtless thought it was entitled.

It may be, Mr. President, that if we are sufficiently severe with those who continue to criticize us, we may stop the flood of criticism which fairly deluges the United States Senate these days. Whether or not we can do this, we have at least revealed to the country that we are not insensible to the criticism, and that our skins are very tender when pricked by "country editors."

I am about to make a statement, Mr. President, that may surprise the Senator from Nebraska; but it is my deliberate belief that these Minnesota editors thought they had a right to differ from the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska and still be regarded as honest men. Therefore we should have them come here in order that they may know something of that attitude of mind which, while reserving the right to criticize them, does not accord to them the right to criticize us.

Mr. TYDINGS subsequently said (during the delivery of Mr. COPELAND'S speech):

Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the course of the Senator's argument, but if he will yield at this point I desire to state that I have in my hand a short editorial of three paragraphs from the Kansas City Star, and I ask the indulgence of the Senator to have it read from the desk and that it may appear in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. ALLEN] this morning about the newspaper indorsement from Minnesota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. COPELAND. If that may be done properly, I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that if any Senator objects to it the Chair will hold that by such yielding the Senator from New York would lose the floor. The Chair rules that the Senator can yield only for a question unless he is willing to lose the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would like to have the editorial read at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. COPELAND. If there is no objection from any Senator I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read the editorial, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Times, November 29, 1929]

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL IS RIGHT

The Star congratulates the Wall Street Journal on its accurate diagnosis of the tariff situation in the following comment:

"With the close of the special session of Congress there ends a chapter of which no Republican can be proud. The general public will breathe the line from Hamlet, 'for this relief much thanks.' The special session was a political maneuver intended to strengthen the Republican Party machine through favors granted to the manufacturing interests, by advances in the protective tariff, irrespective of sound business considerations. So far from helping the party the result has been disaster and the machine is a wreck."

Both the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate, which handled the bill, are dominated by the manufacturing interests that sought "advances in the protective tariff, irrespective of sound business considerations." The advances also were sought irrespective of the pledges of the party and the expectation of the country.

The whole difficulty with the tariff revision was that it was after the old formula. That formula will not work under existing conditions.

The West and South are asserting themselves. The farmers and stockmen and allied agricultural interests are approaching a wide and effective organization. They know what they want. They know they are entitled to it. The East is not going to ride them any more so far as the tariff is concerned. If the tariff bill becomes a law, there will be at least a visible approach to a square deal for agriculture.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I merely wish to add that the Kansas City Times, which gave voice to the editorial, is the morning edition of the Kansas City Star.

Mr. NORRIS obtained the floor.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may submit a report from a committee?

Mr. NORRIS. All right; I yield to the Senator.

(Mr. DILL, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably Senate bill 2276, which appears elsewhere in to-day's proceedings.)

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the remarks of the Senator from Kansas rather unworthy of a statesman, unfair, and unjustified. If he will calmly think over what I said, he must reach the conclusion, I think, as must the newspaper editors in whose defense he speaks and in whose behalf he talks reach the conclusion, that I am only exercising what the Senator from Kansas says they want to exercise—the right to disagree.

I have not condemned them. I have not said that the newspaper editors who signed that advertisement were not honest men. The Senator protests too much. I never was suspicious of their honesty or the Senator's fairness until he jumped at an unjustified conclusion; and if the editors agree with what he said, and the aspersions that he has tried to cast, I would be suspicious of them.

So far as I know, they are fine gentlemen. I have no quarrel with them. They are entitled to their judgment, to their opinion, and they have a right to pay other papers to advertise their opinions. If I did that, I would probably be condemned by the kind of editors that the Senator is talking about; but it is all right for them. I have no fault to find with it and have not criticized them for it; but they have certain ideas about the tariff with which I disagree. Although they are seeking to give me advice as to what to do, I claim the right of an American citizen to decline to obey; and the Senator is criticizing me and saying that I have cast aspersions upon those editors.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. I think the word the Senator used in regard to them, which stirred them up, was the word "Grundy."

Mr. NORRIS. "Grundy?" I do not remember now what I said about Grundy. Maybe I owe Mr. Grundy an apology.

Mr. ALLEN. No; I think not. I would not go so far as to say that; but it seemed to be rather an inescapable conclusion, from the attitude the Senator took yesterday morning and what he said, that he was intimating that these editors had been paid by Grundy, followed, as it was, by the statement of the Senator from Minnesota that he had understood that somebody had recently bought 300 newspapers—in Minnesota.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have not read my remarks or looked at them since they were made. Did I say anything of that kind? If I made any such remark, I certainly would apologize publicly. I never thought of such a thing as accusing those editors of having been bought by Grundy. Maybe I intimated that they agreed with Grundy.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator stated that.

Mr. NORRIS. If they do agree with Grundy they ought to suspend publication, because Minnesota is one of the States that Grundy has wiped off the map.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; I know it is.

Mr. NORRIS. So they must not try to give advice if they are part of Grundy's outfit, because that is what Grundy kicks about.

He does not want any advice from Minnesota. I am glad to see what they have to say; but I am going to tell why I disagree with them, and why that advertisement is the same argument that is made by Grundy and all of the big high-tariff barons in this country. It is contrary to the benefit of the American farmer, and, if carried to its ultimate conclusion, will drive every American farmer out of business. That is what I am going to show right now.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska further yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield again to the Senator.

Mr. ALLEN. May I refresh the memory of the Senator from Nebraska touching the content of these statements from these Minnesota editors? I have not read from Grundy a single statement to that effect. Their idea, if the Senator from Nebraska will permit me, was that we should hurry forward with the tariff making, that we should increase the agricultural rates, that we should hold to the present Fordney-McCumber rates on industries, because under those rates they had gained the impression that the country had prospered; and, if the Senator from Nebraska will permit me, there was not really a first-class excuse to hook up these men with Grundy.

Mr. NORRIS. Why, they are advocating the same thing that Grundy is advocating.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. That is the reason; and, if the Senator will permit me to go on in my own time, and subside, that is what I am going to show right now.

Mr. ALLEN. Very well.

Mr. NORRIS. They are advocating the same doctrine that Grundy advocates. Grundy says, "We do not want to decrease any of these high-tariff rates. We must keep our hands off the tariffs levied upon the manufactured articles of the East." That is Grundy; that is Grundyism; and that is this advertisement in so many words. They say the same thing.

Here is one thing they say that Grundy does not say: They say, "Levy higher tariffs on agricultural products." As far as I know, Grundy has not said that. These men say, "Let the tariffs remain on the Aluminum Trust, on the Steel Trust, on all of the monopolistic outfits that are living and growing fat and making millions out of an unjust tariff that the consumers of America, the farmers among them, must and do pay." "Do not touch them," says Grundy. "Do not touch them," say the editors in their advertisements. "Vote a lot of increases on farm products, and go home."

They may be right. Grundy may be right. I concede that they have the right to their opinion. Grundy has the right to his. But when they seek to give me advice, to tell me how I must vote on this question, I say, "No; I do not believe you. I think you are wrong. I think the farmer to-day is suffering not so much from lack of tariff on his products as from an overabundance of tariff on the things that he has to buy"; and that is what I have been advocating. That is what I believe in. These men who seem to be thin-skinned, these newspaper men who make their living by criticizing other people, can not stand even a disagreement from a public man without denouncing him; and the Senator from Kansas appears to be their willing mouthpiece here upon the floor of the Senate.

I am surprised at him. I am dumbfounded that he has taken such a narrow-minded position as he has. If these men advise us what to do, we have a right to criticize them, as they have the right to criticize us.

We could vote a dollar a bushel on wheat, and then we could go to the farmer and say, "See what we have done for the wheat farmer—levied a tariff of a dollar on wheat, \$2 on oats," and so on through the farm schedule. The farmers of the United States, intelligent as they are, would know, when we did it, that we were practicing deception upon them, although we had followed the advice of the newspaper editors, who say they represent the farmers. God save the farmer from such unholy representation as that!

I am exercising my right, as I did yesterday, to criticize that position.

Mr. ALLEN rose.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator want to interrupt me?

Mr. ALLEN. I did not want to interrupt the very easy flow of the Senator's argument.

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ALLEN. The statement which the Senator from Nebraska makes this morning, if he will permit me, is a very reasonable statement, much more reasonable in its general tone than that to which our friend out in Minnesota took exception.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator call my attention to any language I used yesterday that was wrong? If I have made a statement that is not borne out by what I believe to be the truth, I would be very glad to apologize for it.

Mr. ALLEN. If I may refresh the Senator's recollection—

Mr. NORRIS. Very well; I have not read it since I made the statement.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from Nebraska said:

The Senator from Kansas has kindly agreed to put in the names of the publishers and the names of the newspapers that back this statement and have paid for it. I want the farmers of Minnesota to know what their so-called country newspapers, which are pretending to be friends of the farmers, are really signing, what they are paying for in the way of propaganda. I hope that the lobby committee will send for some of these men and ascertain how much they are paying, who solicited the payments, and how all this has been brought about.

If that is not a clear aspersion upon the motive of a man who pretended to be honestly advising the Senator from Nebraska, and who, if the Senator will permit—

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has made his statement now. I hope he will not try to make an argument in my time. I yielded to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The understanding of the Chair is that the Senator from Kansas still has the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. The Chair misunderstands the fact, I will inform him, as any Member of the Senate will be glad to advise him if he will make the inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair made the inquiry from what he considered the proper authority, the clerks at the desk.

Mr. NORRIS. The clerks must have been asleep. In order to establish the validity of my claim to the floor, I am now going to ask the Senator from Kansas if he claims the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will determine it by recognizing the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not asking recognition. I had the floor before the present occupant of the Chair went into the Chair, and every Member of the Senate who was present knows it. The Senator finished his remarks, surrendered the floor, I took the floor, yielded to the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL], and when he got through took the floor again and was recognized, without, as far as I know, any Member of the Senate claiming that I did not have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In view of the chronology stated by the Senator from Nebraska, he still continues to be recognized.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Chair for having finally concluded that I am entitled to do what I have been doing here for some time. I am not willing to have the Chair get the opinion that I am trying to get something to which I have no right. So I feel vindicated.

Mr. President, I still am not convinced by the Senator from Kansas that I should apologize. Somebody paid for that advertisement in the Washington Post, and probably it was in other papers. What is the object of it? A lot of newspaper men have joined together, they say, and paid for it. I thought immediately that it would be a difficult thing to go out and get three or four hundred men to get together and pay for a joint advertisement, but if they say they did I will accept that. I am not going to be contentious about it.

What were they doing? Here are 300 newspaper men in Minnesota paying the Washington Post for a paid advertisement in order that they may tell Congress what to do, and when some Member of the Senate is not obeying them implicitly, and the Senate itself, rather neglectful of that advice, is still going on to discuss the tariff, the Senator from Kansas takes the floor in their defense.

What is the object of their advice to us? Does it follow that we are owned by those men? Does it follow that when they say "adjourn to-morrow" we must do it? Have we not the same right to criticize them that they have to criticize us? I know this will bring an avalanche of criticism upon me and will be reproduced in my State by editors who agree with that editor that the way to help the farmer is to raise the tariff on agricultural products, and I say that is buncombe and fraud and deceit. It will not bring relief to agriculture, and I say that any honest man with average ability who will study the question to a reasonable extent will reach the conclusion that what I say is true.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE and Mr. ALLEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that his judgment in this matter is borne out by the history of recent tariff experience? When the act of 1922 was passed, the so-called representatives of agriculture were given the opportunity to write the duties upon agricultural products which they felt they needed, if in exchange they would permit the industrialists to write the duties which they desired upon industrial products. Since 1922 we have had a continuous complaint from the agricultural sections of this country that the Fordney-McCumber Act, passed under those circumstances, was placing agriculture at a great disadvantage with industry under that act.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, as I remember history, the Senator from Wisconsin has stated it correctly. It is another instance of logrolling in tariff making. The so-called farm leaders in this body, as I understand, got together and fixed their own tariffs. I will plead not guilty; I was not one of them. I did not believe in it then, any more than I do now. Then the manufacturing interests got together and fixed their tariffs, and they put them both in the law. One is effective and the other is not effective, as everybody knows.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In this logrolling process, if I understand the Senator from Nebraska, instead of the farmer engaging in

doing the rolling of the log, he got rolled over by the logs which others were rolling.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and if we follow the advice of the Minnesota editors, he is going to be rolled over again. He will wake up some day to a realization of that.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. ALLEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Along the lines of the observation made by the Senator from Wisconsin, it might be well to note that, according to the Bureau of Economics, Department of Agriculture, during the year ending March 15, 1927, 1 out of every 55 farms in the United States was sold under a mortgage foreclosure or for nonpayment of taxes, and in the State of South Dakota, for example, and that vicinity, the proportion was 1 out of every 30 or less. That is the way the last tariff assisted agriculture.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. The Senator states that in South Dakota 1 out of every 30 was sold under foreclosure. In the neighboring State of Iowa I understand 1 out of every 10 was sold under foreclosure.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN. What the editors from Minnesota objected to in yesterday's statement by the Senator from Nebraska was the aspersion to which I have called the Senator's attention. To-day, in behalf of those editors, I am objecting to the misrepresentation which the Senator has made in his statement touching what they are advising. If I may take a moment to tell him what I mean, they are not advising the so-called Grundy program.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, let me say to the Senator, they probably make some statements in their advertisement with which I would not disagree. If somebody will give me a copy of that I will read explicitly what I think lines them up with Grundy.

Mr. ALLEN. I think that would be a very good idea.

Mr. NORRIS. Has anybody the newspaper here? The advertisement is printed in small type in the RECORD. Has the Senator from Kansas the newspaper article here?

Mr. ALLEN. I have not the newspaper here, I regret to say.

Mr. NORRIS. It will take me some time to pick it out of this fine print. I do not read the part, now, to which I had reference, but something I agree with:

We do not believe the tariff bill should now be held up indefinitely.

Neither do I. I am just as anxious to expedite it as they are, but probably in a different way. I am not anxious to expedite it by overlooking the fact that, in my humble judgment, we ought to decrease some of the tariffs in existing law, where I think they are entirely monopolistic and are extremely burdensome, not only to the farmers but to all consumers. I can not now pick it out, but they make this argument that we should not stop to fool with the rates excepting rates on farm products. They do not state that in so many words, but that is the result of their argument, "Attend to some rates on farm products, and stop."

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I object to, and that is what I say is wrong, and that is what I say will ruin the farmers of Minnesota, as well as of the balance of the country. That is what I say is already the cause of a great deal of the farmers' difficulty.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield further to the Senator now.

Mr. ALLEN. Later I will take the floor in my own right.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well. A man has a right, whether he is in the Senate or out, whether he is a newspaper man, or a banker, or a stockbroker, or a farmer, to state just what those Minnesota editors said in their advertisement. This is a free country. We ought to have a free press, and although I do not agree with what they said, I would defend them in their right to say it.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. NYE. Does the Senator understand that this advertisement which appeared in the eastern press during recent mornings has had as one of its purposes the offsetting of what has been done by the advertisement published by the Minneapolis Tribune?

Mr. NORRIS. Probably; I do not know what their motive is.

Mr. NYE. Does the Senator have any reason to believe at all that perhaps some of these editors and some of these papers

whose names appear in connection with the advertisement have been perhaps misinformed and misled into permitting their names to be incorporated in this advertisement?

Mr. NORRIS. I have no information on that subject.

Mr. NYE. If the Senator will yield—

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

Mr. NYE. When this advertisement came to my attention, I observed that the names of two North Dakota newspapers appeared in connection with it, and I could not understand the appearance there of the name of the Fargo Forum, in view of the fact that the Fargo Forum was upholding the work which the coalition was doing here, upholding that work in its own way. So I wired the publisher of the Fargo Forum and recited to him the contents of this advertisement, recited to him, too, that the effort would be made to demonstrate that the Minneapolis Tribune had been misinterpreting to the people here in the East the attitude of the West. I have received this morning an answer from that publisher. Will the Senator consent to having it read at this time?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. NYE. I send the telegram to the desk and ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

[Copy of telegram]

FARGO, N. DAK., December 10, 1929.

HON. GERALD P. NYE,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Consent to the use of the name of the Fargo Forum and Minot Daily News was given by me over the telephone after casual reading of the statement. We contributed \$50 for the Forum and \$10 for the Minot Daily News, payable to A. B. Gilbert, secretary, Minneapolis. I would be deeply grieved if my signing of this appeal would in any way reflect on or be a handicap to the unselfish and splendid work for agriculture carried on by Fred Murphy, of the Minneapolis Tribune. I had but one desire, and that was to aid if possible the passage of a tariff bill that would help agriculture without unnecessary detriment to other interests in our Nation. These are the facts in a nutshell, and I thank you for the opportunity to make this statement. I know I do not have to tell you that there is no mercenary interest influencing the policy of the Fargo Forum, even though we make many mistakes. Kindest regards,

NORMAN B. BLACK,

Publisher the Fargo Forum.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it is quite evident that the publisher of that paper permitted his name to be inserted and made a contribution after talking with somebody over the telephone. Does anyone here think that over the telephone in that conversation this advertisement was read to that man, or was he given a sort of synopsis of what they were going to use? It is fair to assume, I suppose—I take for granted that it is under the reading of that telegram—that at least this man had no opportunity to know what was in the advertisement, and I take it that he does not agree with the proposition that we should not interfere with any tariff rates except those on the farm schedule.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN. Is it the Senator's understanding from the reading of this message that the editor of the Fargo Forum repudiates the statement?

Mr. NORRIS. No; he does not yet know and he did not know when he sent the telegram what the statement was, very likely. He has never yet read it. That is the kind of men whose names are attached to the advertisement, and probably not 1 in 10 ever read it before he signed it.

Mr. ALLEN. Would the Senator think it would be possible over the telephone to disclose to an intelligent editor, like the editor of the Fargo Forum, the contents of this advertisement?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes; I think so. The Senator must realize that unless this outfit have a whole lot of money like Grundy has, they can not afford to call up 300 miles over the long-distance telephone and read something that covers a page of a newspaper.

Mr. ALLEN. But these Minnesota country editors, I think, have sufficient money to afford it.

Mr. NORRIS. Probably they have. I am not disputing it. They may have more money than Grundy has. They are advocating the same thing Grundy advocates in that paragraph.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. They are advocating exactly the same thing that the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] advocated, for

which I voted, for which the Senator from Nebraska voted, namely, that the making of the tariff should relate wholly to agricultural products and that the other items be not discussed. The Senator from Nebraska voted for that and I voted for it. I was sorry when it failed to pass. That is what these editors are favoring.

Mr. NORRIS. And I was sorry when it failed to pass, but I was glad it did not pass when we got on further and saw that there was a majority in the Senate which was in favor of making a bill that would do justice to the farmer away beyond the agricultural schedule. I was glad that it did not pass when we were able to put in the administrative features which are now in the bill, and I am convinced that every honest believer in the assistance that ought to be given to American agriculture was likewise glad; so I am glad that that proposal was not agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. ALLEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Assuming that the editor of the Fargo Forum and the other editors desire by this advertisement to bring about what some of us voted for earlier in the matter, the proper recognition of agriculture in the tariff bill without disturbing the industrial rates as they existed in the act of 1922, is there anyone who can contend that the bill we are now considering, either as it came from the House or as it came from the Senate Committee on Finance, complies with that suggestion or that idea?

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN. May I ask if the Senator has any objection to the rural editors of Minnesota, whose business engages them to an intelligent attention to every act of Congress, advising us that in their judgment the business condition of the country would be better off if we would go ahead and pass the tariff bill with the agricultural rates amended, leaving the other rates, under which the country has been prosperous, as they are? The situation is as we found it when the Senator from Idaho presented his resolution. Does the Senator from Nebraska criticize these editors for their assumption of the right to advise us on that point as they did?

Mr. NORRIS. I have said very explicitly, and the Senator from Kansas certainly knows that I have said it over and over again, that I do not criticize them. Let them criticize all they want to. That is their own right, as I said a while ago. Even if it was a matter of criticizing me, I would defend them in their right to do it. Constructive criticism is always a help, I may add, and with the right kind of motive behind it a proper criticism of Congress or of the Senate or of the President or of the courts or of anybody will eventually bring good; so I am not objecting to criticism.

Mr. ALLEN. Would the Senator object, upon that further acquaintanceship with this article to which I invite his consideration, to clarifying his statement so that they may know that he did not intentionally mean to do them an injustice in the statement which he made in which he said that their attitude in this advice or in this advertisement is exactly the attitude of Grundy?

Mr. NORRIS. Perhaps I ought to take out the word "exactly." But their attitude at least in parts of it is exactly in agreement with Mr. Grundy. Mr. Grundy does not want us to lower any tariff and neither do these men. They say so. "Adjourn and go home," they say. That is what Grundy said.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. Let me answer one question before the Senator asks another.

Mr. ALLEN. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. NORRIS. So when I say there is an agreement with Grundy I mean it and the facts prove it. They have so demonstrated now by their own statement and the statements of Grundy. It may be, when they say we ought to increase the farm rate, that Grundy will disagree with that suggestion. I do not know. As far as I know Grundy has not expressed himself on the subject. We might have him testify. He perhaps would agree with the Minnesota editors.

Mr. ALLEN. Have I not sat here and heard the Senator state that Mr. Grundy was asking for an increase of every item? These men asked for an increase of no item except the items in the agricultural schedule, in which they do ask for an increase.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not say that Mr. Grundy was asking an increase of every item. Mr. Grundy, as he testified, was one of the prime movers in making this bill. He said so. He said, "We bought it and we paid for it and it is ours. We want to have the money made good now with which we have bought

this business. We bought it. You are our trustees. You are our chattels and you must do our bidding." That is what Grundy wanted.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. The names of four newspapers from the State of South Dakota are included in this list. Three of those newspapers from South Dakota are daily newspapers—the Press and Dakotan, of Yankton, the Huronite, of Huron, and the Rapid City Journal, of Rapid City. I think it would be enlightening to the Senate to ascertain the attitude of these three daily newspapers in reference to tariff questions and questions in general, and particularly their attitude toward industry.

When the McNary-Haugen bill was up for consideration these three newspapers at times gave the bill half-hearted support and at other times actually ridiculed that bill and attempted to undermine the position taken by Senators from the Northwest and attempted to poison the minds of the public in the State of South Dakota in reference to that measure. When the coalition in the Senate inserted the debenture plan in the farm relief bill they ridiculed the debenture plan and said that all of those who voted for the debenture plan were simply blocking farm legislation, and that the members of the farm bloc in the Senate as well as certain Democrats in the Senate were simply professional friends of the farmer.

Without going further into the political philosophy of the three papers referred to, I desire to quote, if the Senator from Nebraska will permit me to do so, an editorial which was taken from the Press and Dakotan, of Yankton, S. Dak., under date of October 22, 1920. In that editorial they termed the result of the activities of the coalition here in the Senate as "making a mess out of the whole tariff proposition."

Then they went on to quote an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, of Boston, in reference to the farm bloc, and because of their preceding statements in reference to that editorial they give full consent to the statements contained therein. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me to enable me to quote a paragraph from that editorial?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McMASTER. That will give an accurate understanding of the idea of these three newspapers at least in the State of South Dakota as to what they think a tariff bill ought to be. Here is the editorial—

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, may I inquire if this is an editorial from one of the papers referred to?

Mr. McMASTER. It is from one of the papers named in the list inserted in the Record yesterday by the Senator from Kansas. I quote from the editorial as follows:

Bloc domination, made possible by illogical coalitions, is not an exemplification of democratic government. Through the organization of blocs in legislative bodies there is made effective, as in the present alignment in Washington, what actually amounts to minority rule. It can not be maintained that the insurgent Republican Senators are, by insisting upon the form of tariff legislation now proposed, aiding in carrying out the party pledges to which they at least tacitly committed themselves when elected or by which they are nominally bound by the party platform.

The tendency toward aggressive insurgency and the somewhat more confusing conditions resulting from the illogical coalition in the Senate would not be seriously regarded were it not for the fact that they result in holding up, if not the final defeat, of a legislative program popularly approved and definitely outlined long in advance by the administration. At present, as matters stand, an Executive veto will prevent the final adoption of what the President may regard as unwise economic laws. But the apparent deadlock will as certainly prevent the enactment of needed remedial legislation.

Now, catch the import of this last paragraph:

Thus it must be concluded that the people of the United States are not being satisfactorily served under the existing arrangement. Those adjustments which had been promised to industry can not be made so long as the present order exists. It is realized, meantime, where the responsibility for this condition rests.

That is the philosophy acceded to and assented to and believed in by one of the three newspapers whose names were put in the Record yesterday by the Senator from Kansas—that we are not going to give industry the rates that Grundy wanted for industry.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN. Would it necessarily follow, because of the attitude which this editor has upon the coalition, that all of the 140 newspapers in Minnesota who maintain their own attitudes should be entirely disregarded because this one editor in the State of South Dakota had that peculiar idea of the coalition?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, nobody claims that. The Senator from South Dakota has not claimed that.

Mr. ALLEN. Probably I take his remarks too seriously.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; they ought to be taken seriously.

The Senator said because there are three newspapers which we have discovered and exposed that it does not follow that the others are in the same class with them. No one claims that they are. I am not claiming that a single one of them is not conscientious in its belief and in what it advocates, not for a moment. But I think they are advocating a doctrine that will ruin agriculture. All through that advertisement is the same theory—"build for manufacturing, build for manufacturing, and we will have a market for the products of the farm. It does not make any difference how high that tariff is—it may be touching the sky. Stand for it. Let it stand, and to meet it add more tariff on wheat and corn and oats and barley." The Minnesota farmers raise wheat, an enormous amount of it. Suppose we would say to-day, "Your principal product is wheat. We will give you \$2 a bushel tariff on wheat, higher than anybody's tariff, and you will be happy and will live happy ever afterwards."

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN. It is perfectly natural that these rural editors of Minnesota should be in favor of a high protective tariff system. Those of us who have been engaged in publishing newspapers have taught that all our lives.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not object to that; nobody has found fault with them because they believe in a high protective tariff system. I have said, and I am willing to concede, that they are conscientious; but my theory is—and they have a right to criticize it—and I think that is the theory of the people who are trying to help the farmer by a reduction of the tariff, that behind the tariff wall, if the tariff be made sufficiently high, there can be built up a monopoly that will wreak vengeance upon the consumer and operate to the injury of all consumers who are compelled to buy their products on this side of the tariff wall. In other words, protectionists as we are we believe that a tariff can be made so high that it will be an injury instead of a blessing.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ALLEN. Does the Senator believe, then, that the Fordney-McCumber rates are so out of line as to deserve the castigation he has administered upon his imaginary tariff bill?

Mr. NORRIS. Of course I think they are too high; I have said so a thousand times; and there is no secret about that. Those who think they are too low of course criticize me and do not agree with me. I concede they may be right and I may be wrong, and they have the same right to their opinion that I have to mine; but I will criticize them when they take that stand, as they criticize me when I take my stand.

Mr. ALLEN. Does the Senator agree that a man may believe in the Fordney-McCumber rates and still be reasonably intelligent and honest?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes; Grundy is reasonably intelligent.

Mr. ALLEN. I said "and honest."

Mr. NORRIS. There are many men who are making millions every month or two out of a high tariff who are reasonably intelligent; there are Senators on this floor who want to raise the tariff rates to the sky, who have never as yet found tariff rates high enough to suit them, and yet they are reasonably intelligent. Oh, there are any number of reasonably intelligent men who, if they had their way, would, in my judgment, ruin every farmer in America and make farmers peons and slaves, although they would not want to do that.

Mr. ALLEN. May I say that the Senator from Nebraska is in an unusually generous mood this morning? [Laughter.]

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McMASTER. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. ALLEN] as to the attitude of the Senator from Nebraska regarding certain rates in the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922, let me say that the Senate went on record about 18 months ago, by a vote of 52 to 32, to the effect that there were schedules in that act which were excessive.

Mr. NORRIS. That is a very good suggestion, and I think the Senator for making it. That was before the Senator from Kansas came to the Senate; he was not here when that action

was taken, so that he may be reasonably intelligent and yet not know anything about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two about the pending amendment. I had the floor last night when we took a recess, but in some manner it was taken away from me this morning. However, I will let that go.

Mr. President, I want to say to the Senate—I wish I could say it to the whole country—that I feel sadly disappointed at the action of the Senate on the wool schedule, not only on the votes which have been taken but, because of the indications as to the result, of the votes which are still to be taken. It has been stated and reiterated several times on the floor of the Senate that, so far as the wool schedule is concerned, it is a contest, a battle, between the wool producer and the wool manufacturer. Mr. President, did it ever occur to Senators that there is a consumer in this country? Have we forgotten the consumer? If we say that nobody is interested in this controversy except the wool producer and the wool manufacturer, what about the consumer? He pays the bill; it is on his back that we are placing the burden. Do not mistake that. By the sweat and the toil of the consumer this burden must be borne and this debt must be paid. So it seems to me that if we want to be fair, whether we are manufacturers or producers, we ought to give some consideration to the man who foots the bill, the poor consumer, unrepresented before the Finance Committee, unrepresented before the Tariff Commission, unrepresented before the Senate of the United States. Yet it is upon his bended back that we are going to pyramid this burden. Have we forgotten him, Mr. President? We have gone astray, it seems to me, in looking after the interest of the other two parties, and given no consideration to the real man who must bear the burden and suffer the consequences of our act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have not forgotten all the consumers. We have selected out a chosen few and we are going to reduce their income taxes in a day or two.

Mr. NORRIS. I presume we will do that very thing; but, Mr. President, for one, from the very beginning of the discussion of the wool schedule, I have voted against every proposed increase in that schedule, whether it was claimed to be for the benefit of the farmer or for the benefit of the manufacturer or both of them, and, so far as I now know, I expect to vote against any increase that may be proposed during the further consideration of the schedule.

What about the wool schedule? In a broad, general sense let us look at the woolgrowing business and the wool-manufacturing business. For seven years we have had a tariff of 31 cents a pound on wool. That is a pretty high tariff; I think it is an unusually high tariff. Under that tariff the sheep men have been reasonably prosperous, much more prosperous than has the ordinary farmer. Excluding for the moment what I call the sheep-ranch men, the men who make their main business that of producing wool, and taking the farmers of America, under this tariff schedule they will pay \$5 in the increased cost of living for every dollar they get for their wool or for their sheep. If we exclude all but those farmers this schedule will bring to them a net loss, as I look at it.

Under the existing law we have a tariff on rags. That is a misnomer, and I am sorry the product is called rags because it is a high-class article. The coat I have on is made out of rags; I think the coat of my friend from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is made out of rags; and, while I am not sure, I think the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR] wears that kind of clothing. Perhaps he makes it himself in his own factory, so that he knows about it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, let me remind the Senator that we heard it stated yesterday that rags do not go into worsted cloth at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Is the suit worn by the Senator from Michigan of worsted?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think it is.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not know whether it was worsted or silk.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am scarcely an expert, but I should say that the suits worn by both Senators are made of worsted.

Mr. NORRIS. It may be worsted, but I call it wool. It is fuzzy and fluffy and at times it is necessary to brush it off.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not carded wool, I will say to the Senator, but is a worsted.

Mr. NORRIS. It is not a carded wool?

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well. Mr. President, I only regret that in the wool business rags are called rags. The term is rather obnoxious. The Senator from Montana said he had a senti-

mental feeling and was opposed to letting in rags, and yet, as has been demonstrated from the clothing and the blankets on exhibition here, rags go into very fine materials, better than I have been able to get or many other Senators have been using. However, be that as it may, the present tariff on that kind of material is 7½ cents a pound. By the way, under the wool schedule imports of rags have been growing less and the exports have been growing greater, indicating that we have a sufficient tariff to protect the man engaged in the business. His condition has been improving all the time. With a tariff duty of 7½ cents a pound on rags, we import a good many; in fact, we have to import wool in some form, for we do not and can not produce enough to satisfy the demand of our own people. So we do not want to embargo imports; we have to let some of them in or go out of the wool business entirely, in so far as clothing is concerned.

As I have said, a large amount of wool rags is imported, and a large amount of wool rags is exported. The figures have been given here; they run into the millions. The imports are greater than the exports. That must be the case, because, as I have said, we do not produce sufficient wool for our own needs. The committee proposes now to increase that tariff rate from 7½ cents to 24 cents, which is an increase of 200 per cent. Where is the consumer now? Where is the man who bears the burden and pays the bill? It is proposed to increase the tariff 200 per cent over the existing law, although, so far as I know, it is universally conceded that under existing law those in the wool business have been doing pretty well. So, Mr. President, I have regretted to see increased rates provided in this schedule, many of them being increased in the name of the American farmer.

O Mr. President, how many sins have been committed in the name of the American farmer! If we are going to increase tariff rates beyond reason and justice simply because they are farm rates, then we will put the American farmer in the Grundy class; then we will put the American farmer in the class of those who try to get all they can; in a position where he will trade when he can, where he will have no regard for honesty or justice in the making of tariff schedules. I do not concede that the farmers of America want their representatives to take that attitude, and, so far as I am concerned, I will not take it, no matter who demands that I shall take it.

When we are considering a tariff, conceding for the sake of the argument that we must have and ought to have a tariff on wool and wool products, we ought to consider the consumer. He must not be crowded out of this equation. Common honesty demands that we consider him. Common justice demands that we consider him. When we are called upon to increase a tariff on wool rags by more than 200 per cent over a tariff that is already working pretty well in the interest of the manufacturer and the producer, I feel like calling a halt in the name of common, ordinary justice.

As I say, I regret that we have made these increases. I regret that according to my idea as to what is just and fair we have added to the burdens of all the people who toil in our country, all the people who must wear clothing. We have added to their cost of living, already too high, already away above where in common justice it ought to be; and, Mr. President, we can ride this horse to destruction.

Did it ever occur to you that if people have to they can get along without wool? Did it ever occur to you who want to pyramid this tariff—and we are reminded, on every vote we take, "Why, you increased the tariff on raw wool; we must increase it on all these other things"—did it ever occur to you that you can put it so high that people will not be able to buy wool clothing unless they are millionaires, and the combination and the monopoly that are reaping the profit out of this high tariff will then have to control silk and cotton and rayon and everything that can be used as a substitute for wool?

Already, Mr. President, there is a controversy between some of the leading wool manufacturers of the country as to whether or not we ought to increase this tariff. There are many who take the position that we have reached a point where it would be dangerous to the business of the producer of wool and the manufacturer of wool to add any more to the tariff, because every time you add to the tariff you give that much more inducement for substitutes to come into the market and take the place of wool.

The poor consumer has not unlimited means. He can not reach all of these prices that are going to be pyramided and held up. Therefore, it seems to me that we are going too far. It is unnecessary for the prosperity either of the producer or of the manufacturer, and it is increasing the burdens of the already overburdened consumers of America.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I was very glad to hear the Senator from Nebraska speak as he did for the benefit of the

consumer. I think that all of us should consider him, and I believe that the consumer is represented by all of us here.

Mr. President, with due regard for the wishes of the wool-growers and with appreciation of the needs of manufacturers of woolen goods, I offered this substitute amendment for the proposed rate upon wool rags recommended by the Committee on Finance.

This amendment gives to the lowest bracket the rate set forth in the House bill; it gives an increase of 50 per cent upon rags valued between 30 and 50 cents per pound, and makes an increase of 100 per cent upon rags valued at more than 50 cents a pound.

Throughout the discussion the protests upon the part of the proponents of the high rate of 24 cents per pound have been against the type of rag exhibited here from which long and most useful fiber can be extracted.

I must admit there is justice in the protest against admitting such fiber with a duty of 7½ cents, as under the present law, when good raw material can be derived therefrom comparable to many types of wool entering at present with a duty of 31 cents per pound.

On the other hand, it seems unwise to me, not only because of woolen manufacturers but because of woolgrowers, to have the cheaper rags, from which it costs more to extract the wool fiber, bear a rate increased more than 200 per cent.

Such a rate will injure a large part of woolen manufacture and react against the wool producer by destroying a considerable market for his product. With the recovered wool fiber the woolen manufacturer mixes new wool. How much new wool he can use in his blend depends upon the price of rags. Raise the price of rag by increasing the duty, or by increasing the demand for the already insufficient domestic supply, and you will decrease the amount of new wool these mills can buy.

The use of rags in woollens has not increased in the last few years. Rather, the use of scoured wools in these fabrics has increased to a marked degree since 1914, as shown by the reports of the census. Wool manufacturers as a whole have not desired increased duty upon wool. They prefer a cheaper rather than a more expensive raw material. However, realizing the needs of the woolgrowers, and being protectionists themselves, they have stood aside and are resigned to the proposed new rate upon wool.

It should be borne in mind that unless wool manufacturers are successful, the woolgrowers will have no market for their wool; they can not sell it abroad in competition with lower costs of production in foreign lands.

Wool manufacture is very technical. This is not the place, even if there were time, to explain in detail the use of fiber reclaimed from waste and rags.

I feel compelled, however, to note here that the rag that pays the assessed duty per pound pays it not only upon the fiber contained therein but upon the cotton linings attached to them, upon the threads, upon buttons, and upon the dirt and dust.

Those who use these rags, all bearing the same rate of duty, can testify how great the shrinkage is between the weight of the rag as imported and the reclaimed fiber available for use.

Statements made here about the increased cost of woolen cloth can be substantiated by thoughtful manufacturers.

I could testify from my own experience as to the depressed conditions in woolen manufacture. Why, through New England now notice has gone forth that 10 woolen mills are going to be stopped. I do not manufacture woollens made from rags, and the concerns with which I used to be connected and with which I still have some connection have not used a rag in a quarter of a century; so I feel that I am justified in taking the stand I do, as it is nothing personal to me.

While it is desirable to help the woolgrowers, it is most undesirable to put out of business a branch of an industry that is not only useful but needful. It serves large numbers of our people who are dependent upon woolen manufacturers for a type of clothing that is within their means. That branch has not asked for increased protection upon the low-cost goods.

I trust the woolgrowers will appreciate that manufacturers are their friends, and that woolen manufacturers are sincere in their belief that the higher rate upon rags will injure woolgrowers as well as themselves.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the debate on yesterday was closed with a very powerful address by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], characterized by the ability with which his addresses are usually made. One feature of it was particularly impressive in character—that in which he found to be marching in unison those of us from States in which the woolen industry is of consequence, and who look with no particular dread upon an embargo duty on the importation of the cast-off rags of Europe, and Mr. Grundy, a manufacturer of worsted, having in view the destruction of his rivals in busi-

ness, the producers of woolen goods. The only trouble with that, Mr. President, is that Mr. Grundy appears not to be a producer of worsted at all. Otherwise, I believe the statement is without exception.

I ask the attention of the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGHAM in the chair). The attention of the Senator from Georgia is desired by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say that Mr. Grundy appeared not to be interested in woolens?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; I understood the Senator to argue—in fact, he did argue—that Mr. Grundy, a manufacturer of worsted, was desirous of having this high duty upon rags to be used in the production of woolen goods produced by his rivals in business, and he found Mr. Grundy marching in unison with those of us who are advocating a higher duty upon rags for some other reason. I advise the Senator that the statement made by him is unexceptionable except in the particular that Mr. Grundy is not a manufacturer of worsted; at least, that is the testimony that was adduced before the lobby committee.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, Mr. Grundy is a manufacturer of worsted yarns.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. A manufacturer of yarns; yes.

Mr. BLAINE. Worsted yarns only. That is quite comparable with the manufacture of worsted fabric. It is worsted yarn. He is a manufacturer of worsted yarn.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The testimony is as follows:

Senator WALSH of Montana. What is your corporation?

Mr. GRUNDY. William H. Grundy & Co.

Senator WALSH of Montana. And they are engaged in what branch of the wool manufacturing?

Mr. GRUNDY. The combing of wool and spinning of worsted yarn—

Mr. BLAINE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana (continuing reading):

Senator WALSH of Montana. Do you do any weaving?

Mr. GRUNDY. No; we do not.

Senator WALSH of Montana. Just produce the yarn?

Mr. GRUNDY. Just produce the yarns and tops.

Senator WALSH of Montana. Are you engaged in any other business?

Mr. GRUNDY. No; and not very much engaged in that.

A little more of the testimony is interesting, but not particularly pertinent to this. It follows:

Senator WALSH of Montana. Just what do you mean by that, Mr. Grundy?

Mr. GRUNDY. Well, I have been devoting a great share of my time to the industrial problems of Pennsylvania, and in recent years cooperating with the Republican organizations there in its work, and I am free to say that as I have gotten older that has occupied much more of my time than my business.

Senator WALSH of Montana. Practically all your time?

Mr. GRUNDY. Practically all my time.

I thought these facts ought to be before the Senate in connection with the suggestion that Mr. Grundy was interested in driving his rivals out of business.

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

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not mean to leave the impression that Mr. Grundy was a weaver of worsted. He is making worsted yarns, and I call the Senator's attention to the fact that that allies him with the worsted industry as against the woolen manufacturer necessarily, and that the wastes and rags can not be used in the making of worsted yarn.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, on yesterday the senior Senator from Montana said that the contest over paragraph 1105 was between the farmers of the West and the industrial East. My analysis of the situation leads me to an entirely different conclusion.

This contest has been going on for many decades. It is a contest between the worsted-woolen manufacturers on the one hand and the carded-woolen manufacturers on the other hand. That is the struggle to-day, and the farmer's interest in this matter is largely the interest of all consumers.

There are something like 6,300,000 farmers in the United States. There are something like 430,000 woolgrowers. A large number of those woolgrowers are not farmers. Many of them are millionaires, whose fortunes have been made out of the wool industry, through the production of sheep upon the western plains, where the grazing cost was a very small item. But including all who produce wool, there are 430,000 out of a total of 6,371,000 farmers in the United States.

When we analyze this proposition, we find that the contest is between those two struggling interests, the worsted industry and the woolen industry, with nearly 6,000,000 farmers who will be

the victims if the worsted industry succeeds in jacking up the tariff rates on wool wastes under paragraph 1105.

Sensors who are interested in increasing this rate have told me that they had thrown their fortunes in with the fortunes of the worsted industry because the worsted industry used more of their products. Let us examine that.

According to the census of manufactures in 1927, the carded-woolen industry used 186,000,000 pounds, 130,000,000 of which was virgin wool. The worsted industry used only 128,000,000 pounds of virgin wool in that year. The woolen industry, therefore, from the standpoint of the consumption of virgin wool, has been more favorable to the woolgrower than has been the worsted industry. But that is not all.

The statistical report for 1925, the latest year for which we have statistics upon the subject of manufactures by specified industries, contained in the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1928, shows that there are 711 manufacturing plants engaged exclusively in the use of carded wool. They are scattered all over the country; they are everywhere. The backbone of the carded-wool industry is not in the industrial East. The backbone of the woolen industry is in no one locality. The carded-wool industry is everywhere.

Let us examine the worsted-wool industry. There were only 329 establishments engaged in that industry in 1925, as compared with 711 establishments engaged in the carded-woolen industry. The carded-wool industries, generally speaking, are small industries. Many of them are located in the smaller cities of our country. They are owned locally.

Mr. President, by the record it is shown that this is not a contest between the farmers of the West and the industrial East. This has been a contest for decades, as I said, between the worsted industry and the woolen industry. In 1909 Senator Dolliver, of Iowa, led a little band of 12 insurgents in this Chamber in their protest against the combination of worsted manufacturers and those engaged in the growing of wool in large quantities, not as farmers, but as financiers. There was a combination then between the wool producers, represented by those financiers, and the worsted industry, and that combination exists to-day.

Who is at the head of the worsted-wool industry in the United States? Mr. Joseph R. Grundy, of Pennsylvania, a manufacturer of wool-worsted yarns, as he testified. He is here representing the worsted industry. He is the man who is demanding that Congress carry out the demand of those who subscribed \$700,000 in Pennsylvania as an investment in government, an investment from which they expected to derive dividends in governmental favors, and a part of those dividends are the dividends they will obtain under paragraph 1105.

Let us look into that for just a moment. Take noils, for instance, and I quote from the Summary of Tariff Information of 1929, which is in the hands of every Member of the Senate, page 1689. It says:

Noils are the shorter fibers removed by the comb in the manufacture of wool into tops. Noils are not used in the worsted mills where produced, but are sold and constitute an important raw material for use in woolen mills.

That is the business in which Mr. Grundy is engaged. That is the business in which Mr. Grundy's associates are engaged. That is the business in which many of his associates who contributed to the \$700,000 campaign fund in Pennsylvania are engaged. Those are the gentlemen who are here demanding that Congress respond in giving them governmental favors so that they might receive dividends upon their campaign contributions. Why, Mr. Grundy produces noils as a by-product of worsted yarn.

Why is Mr. Grundy interested in the question of noils and rags? Sensors know that there is only 0.16 per cent of rags used in the manufacture of worsted goods or worsted yarn. That is the information given to me by those who represent the Tariff Commission. Wastes and noils used in worsted goods and worsted yarns are only 2.65 per cent. The fact is that the by-products of the worsted industry go into the clothing and fabrics and merchandise produced by the carded-wool manufacturers.

What are the exact things that Mr. Grundy wants? He wants two things. He wants a higher rate on noils, because noils are the product of his mill and the product only of his mill and the mills of his associates in the worsted industry. He has a financial interest in it. He also wants a tariff upon the wool wastes—call them rags or whatsoever they may be called—because the wool wastes go into the woolen industry, and in the woolen industry's production of woolen goods it uses 21.94 per cent of rags and 18.46 per cent of noils and wastes in the manufacture of its products. If Mr. Grundy can get the tariff rates on noils and rags so high as to place an embargo upon those two

particular items, Mr. Grundy knows full well that he can get a strangle hold on the carded-woolen industry in America, and Mr. Grundy's institution and his associates' institutions engaged in the worsted industry will be the beneficiaries. I want to analyze what will happen under those circumstances.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask this question for enlightenment. Are not yarns utilized in the manufacture of woolen goods as distinguished from worsted goods?

Mr. BLAINE. There is 41.2 per cent of wool in the scoured condition used in the woolen-goods manufacture.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And the production of yarns is a process in the production of the woolen goods?

Mr. BLAINE. Oh, yes; there must be yarn before the fabric can be produced.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, in the production of those yarns we have noils.

Mr. BLAINE. We have noils as the by-product of worsted material, but the woolen goods people are not the manufacturers of noils. The noils come from the manufacture of worsted material.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I supposed that noils came from the manufacture of all yarn.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I did not understand how we could produce yarn without the noils.

Mr. SMOOT. The process of carding the wool is not the same as when it is worsted. The worsted is combed and the other is carded. In the combing the shorter fibers and some of the longer fibers come out of the wool itself before the top is made; I mean between the beginning of the working of the wool and the time when it is made into a top. That is the process during which the noil is formed. There is no waste to speak of except the flyings, either as they come from the top of the card or the bottom of the card, in the carded-woolen process. I do not mean to say there is no waste at all.

Mr. BLAINE. There must be a trifle of waste.

Mr. SMOOT. I say there is some waste. In the carding it is the small pieces half an inch long or so, the second clippings of the wool. The Senator knows that in clipping the wool sometimes they make two clippings, and there is a little short wool that is in the fleece. If that is not taken out in the wash, when it gets upon the card there are flyings that go up in the air, or they may be found at the bottom of the first or second breaker. That does not happen with the worsted people. In the making of worsted that is drawn out and requires a longer fiber of wool than the carded people require.

Mr. BLAINE. I think we understand the process as stated by the Senator. The Tariff Commission reports as follows:

Noils are the shorter fibers removed by the comb in the manufacture of wool into tops. Noils are not used in worsted mills where produced but are sold and constitute an important raw material for use in woolen mills.

Mr. SMOOT. And every pound of that takes just that many pounds of wool.

Mr. BLAINE. I am going to discuss that.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator deny it?

Mr. BLAINE. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the Senator does not know or does not understand the working of the plant.

Mr. BLAINE. I do not think the Senator will disagree with me when I get through.

Mr. SMOOT. I certainly will disagree with the Senator if he says that is not the process.

Mr. BLAINE. I do not think the Senator wants his statement to stand as he made it, that every pound of the wool wastes displaces a pound of wool.

Mr. SMOOT. I said noils.

Mr. BLAINE. Oh, noils?

Mr. SMOOT. That is what we were talking about.

Mr. BLAINE. I submit that is largely so.

Mr. SMOOT. That is where it is used.

Mr. BLAINE. I know, but in the use of noils, even then a pound of noils will not equal in utility a pound of virgin wool.

Mr. SMOOT. In the carded process?

Mr. BLAINE. When it goes into the fabricated material there is some loss, unavoidably so.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and we have it in the washed wool.

Mr. BLAINE. But not so much of it.

Mr. SMOOT. We have the same loss in the washed wool. In the scoured wool there is more loss going through the first and second breakers than there is with the noils going through the same first and second breakers.

Mr. BLAINE. It is a very inconsequential matter whether there is a little more waste or a little less waste. It is wholly unimportant in the discussion of this matter. I am making the contention that when the worsted industry in this country is able to jack up the tariff on wool wastes, especially on noils and wool rags, to the extent that the rate is prohibitive and constitutes an embargo, then Mr. Grundy and his associates have succeeded in putting the carded-wool industry to a disadvantage. When the carded-wool industry must buy its wool wastes, especially noils, which constitute a substantial amount in their manufacturing, from Mr. Grundy and his associates, then, of course, it is placed at a disadvantage. The wool industry is handicapped when it is compelled to buy Mr. Grundy's waste by-products.

Mr. SACKETT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. SACKETT. For information, I would like to ask if the woolen industry was not in fairly good shape before the 1922 tariff act, when we had practically no rags coming into the country at all? They had to use virgin wool then, did they not? There were practically no rags coming into the country before the 1922 tariff law was enacted, as I understand it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, yes.

Mr. SACKETT. A very small amount. The imports previous to 1913 were an average of only 414,000 tons of rags.

Mr. BLAINE. The Tariff Commission does not give me that information.

Mr. SACKETT. That is the information that is in the Senate committee hearings.

Mr. BLAINE. It would be necessary for me to have had that information to analyze whatever proposition the Senator is making.

Mr. SACKETT. I am only asking for the Senator's knowledge.

Mr. BLAINE. Perhaps it is my fault, but I do not appreciate the point that the Senator makes.

Mr. SACKETT. The point I am making is simply that as I understand the testimony the amount of rags imported into this country from 1890 to 1909 was practically nothing. At the same time the wool industry was in a fairly good condition financially. Now the Senator makes the point that if we can not get rags, the woolen industry will be injured and destroyed. I was making the comparison that if they got along then I should think they could get along now.

Mr. BLAINE. The Senator is going back to 40 years ago. The change in manufacture has been so great, the change in process so material, that the comparison the Senator would make on the basis which he has stated would mean nothing. The whole change in the woolen industry, especially, and in the uses of woolen materials has been almost revolutionary, and there is no way by which we can apply any such ancient yardstick to present conditions.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think the point raised by the Senator from Kentucky is one that ought to have the very serious attention of the Senator from Wisconsin in the discussion of the subject. I can not concede that, while some improvement has been made, there has been anything radical in the development of the manufacture of woolen goods or worsted goods since the year 1920. The Summary of Tariff Information gives the figures back only to 1919. There were only 4,000,000 pounds of all manner of wool wastes admitted in that year. In 1920 there were 6,000,000 pounds, and in 1921 there were 9,000,000 pounds. In 1922 there was a jump to practically 49,000,000, a large amount of which was evidently introduced in anticipation of the passage of the act. In 1923 it dropped to 26,000,000; in 1924, 31,000,000; in 1925, 31,000,000; in 1926, 29,000,000; in 1927, 31,000,000; and in 1928, 35,000,000, about what it was in 1925. So the woolen mills seem to have survived all right enough during that period.

Mr. BLAINE. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that we had free wool, beginning with the Underwood-Simmons tariff law in 1913 to 1922, and free noils, free wool rags and waste, and since wool rags have carried a duty of 7½ cents only.

Mr. SACKETT. We also had free wastes, did we not?

Mr. BLAINE. But we had free wool.

Mr. SACKETT. We also had free wool.

Mr. BLAINE. The manufacturers would not use wastes when they could obtain the virgin wool without paying a duty upon it. They used virgin wool, and the figures given by the Senator from Montana show that they did not use many wool rags.

Mr. SACKETT. That would depend upon the price of wool and the price of wastes. If wastes at that time were very low, say, they were 10 cents a pound, and wool was 60 cents a pound, would not the manufacturers use wastes?

Mr. BLAINE. Manufacturers are going to use the best quality of material when they can obtain it cheaply, and the figures quoted by the Senator from Montana demonstrate that they used virgin wool largely, not many wool rags.

Mr. SACKETT. Yes; but they could not obtain it cheaply.

Mr. BLAINE. When wool is free the use of rags and noils is displaced.

Mr. SACKETT. All that is done in that event is to take the duty part off the cost of wool and the duty part off the cost of waste, and there is a relative value as between the two. This is all a new business, according to the Tariff Commission report, from 1922 and on.

Mr. BLAINE. When the woolen manufacturers had free wool, as they had for years, it does not seem sensible to suggest that the rags or noils or any other wool waste could possibly be a competitor.

Mr. SACKETT. Of course they could.

Mr. BLAINE. The virgin wool could be obtained duty free and there was little wool waste imported when wool was free.

Mr. SACKETT. The tariff has not anything to do with it, necessarily.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I find myself entirely unable to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin. The virgin wool would cost very much more than the rags if both were admitted free. Of course, in order to reduce the cost of production, the manufacturer would be disposed, as a matter of course, to use rags if they could make an acceptable garment. In any circumstances, it would cost him more to make a garment of the virgin wool than to make one partly of rags, whether there was a duty or not; in other words, we would expect an importation of rags, whether there were a duty on virgin wool or not.

Mr. BLAINE. When there was no duty on rags there was probably little production of rags. The manufacturer was not interested in the by-product; it was of no consequence whatever in the mind of the manufacturer, because it had not come to the point where economic necessity demanded the use of wool wastes. The virgin wool alone, out of which could be manufactured the cloth, was sufficient.

Mr. SACKETT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield to me for just a moment, I desire to say that during the period of free wool and free wastes there were imported into this country an average of 9,950,000 pounds of wastes for all the years that tariff provision was in effect. That was 25 per cent, practically, of the total imports during the last five years, and it indicates that under free wool and free wastes manufacturers were purchasing a certain amount of wastes.

Mr. BLAINE. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that if wool rags and wastes were not imported, such of those articles as we produced could be used domestically.

Mr. SACKETT. But 9,950,000 pounds were imported.

Mr. BLAINE. Of all wool wastes—not rags in 1921. That is inconsequential, compared to an importation of 35,000,000 pounds to-day. Besides, the importations in 1921 were in anticipation of tariff legislation in 1922.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I merely rise to call attention to the fact that under the figures given us here the actual price upon which the duty is based is from 25 to 30 cents a pound, so that the rags must have been worth from 25 to 30 cents a pound, if there were no duty on them at all, and certainly that would justify sorting and picking them in this country.

Mr. BLAINE. The Senator from Montana is drawing a conclusion without any justification in fact. There is nothing in the record to justify it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The record discloses the facts.

Mr. BLAINE. The record is that the imports of wool rags and mungo and flocks, beginning with 1914 only ranged from 1,000,000 to 3,000,000 pounds a year while we had free wool, and free wool wastes and they would have little effect upon the woolen industry. Moreover, the Senator is talking about the price of wool rags after the tariff act of 1922. The woolen industry used 56,690,000 pounds of wool rags and clippings in 1927, and of that amount in 1928 21,000,000 pounds rep-

resented the importation of rags alone. Of wool wastes, rags, and noils the imports were 35,000,000 pounds, while the imports of noils in 1928, both carbonized and uncarbonized, were nearly 9,000,000 pounds. These imports were for 1928. So when Mr. Grundy can jack up the tariff rates on the imports of noils and rags of course he is going to receive the benefit of every single penny of the rate imposed. The effectiveness of the tariff rate on noils will be 100 per cent. When the woolen industry undertakes to purchase noils from Grundy those woolen industries will pay not only their value, but in addition thereto 23 cents to 30 cents a pound duty as was fixed by the Senate yesterday. That means that the woolen industry is going to be depreciated because Mr. Grundy is going to receive greater profits.

So with rags. If Mr. Grundy can keep out of the domestic production 21,000,000 pounds of imported rags, it is going to increase the cost of domestic rags accordingly, and as those increases continue to mount, as Mr. Grundy may be able to control, then, of course, Mr. Grundy will have a death grip upon the carded-woolen industry of this country. By the proposals of the Finance Committee and the votes of the Senate yesterday he is getting exactly what he bargained for in the campaign of 1928 when he collected \$700,000 in Pennsylvania for campaign purposes.

Grundy is interested more in rags than he is in noils, perhaps; his profit from noils will be considerable; but the fact that he will force his worsted yarn into competition with the woolen industry with the handicap imposed on that industry means that Mr. Grundy will be the one who will profit by this proposed legislation. So, Mr. President, I repeat that the fight is not between the farmers of the West and the industrial East; the fight is between the worsted industry and the woolen industry, and if the worsted industry wins the farmers lose, for 6,300,000 farmers will pay more for their clothing and the clothing of their families, and you will find that there will be some of them who can not afford to pay the prices Mr. Grundy and his associates will fix for worsted yarn and worsted fabric. They will be unable to purchase those fabrics and the clothing made from them, with the result, as I stated the other day, that the demand for the wool of the 430,000 woolgrowers will be cut down according to the consumers' strike, which will come about because of the inability of those who can not afford worsted yarn and worsted clothing to buy woolen clothing.

The whole theory of this proposition is to raise the tariff rates so that wool wastes, principally noils and rags, will be elevated to the level of virgin wool. When 35,000,000 pounds of wool wastes, that go into the woolen industry, are displaced then the woolen industry is bound to be injured and the consumer is bound to be gouged. Wool wastes do not displace any American wool; there is no American wool to be displaced. The production of American wool is more than 200,000,000 pounds under the amount required in domestic consumption. So, Mr. President, when we impose an exorbitant rate upon wool wastes we extract from the American public profits for the worsted industry and for Mr. Grundy and his associates. When you protect rags and noils you are not protecting virgin wool. Farmers do not grow noils—that is Grundy's business.

Nearly 6,000,000 farmers among us, the workingmen, the great body of the common people of the United States, will be compelled to go without the comforts of all-wool garments, except at excessive costs.

So, Mr. President, I can conceive of no argument that will successfully controvert my proposition that these increased rates on noils benefit only the worsted industry at the head of which is Mr. Joseph R. Grundy. The increase will benefit him and his associates. It will burden all the American people who are compelled to use woolen garments made out of carded wool in combination with wool waste. Mr. President, I seriously suggest that if this program goes through, we are then giving a vote of confidence to Mr. Grundy. He gets the high tariff, the 23 to 30 cents a pound, on his noils. He puts the rate on rags so high that their use will be restricted. He thereby creates a condition where his worsted yarns and the worsted yarns of his associates will be forced upon the consumers, when they have the ability to buy, and those who have not the price will go without. I seriously suggest that if these rates prevail in this tariff bill, then, in honor to ourselves, we should strike from the Record the report of the committee investigating lobbying that was introduced in the Record yesterday with reference to Mr. Grundy.

Mr. President, this contest is not going to stop here. It did not stop here in 1909. What happened in those days? In 1909, under the Payne-Aldrich bill, noils bore a duty of 20 cents a pound. Mr. Grundy won 20 years ago. Rags of wool bore a dutiable rate of 10 cents a pound. Mr. Grundy again won.

As I said at the opening, that great statesman, that great patriot, Senator Dolliver, who could see beyond State lines and sectional interests, who regarded it as his duty to legislate for the general welfare, stood in his place in the Senate and properly characterized the Payne-Aldrich bill and Schedule K. The then President of the United States went to Winona, Minn., and there made a speech. It has become a part of the history of our country. He then condemned the enactment but with apologies. He recognized 20 years ago that certain wool-growers were in a combination with the worsted-woolen industry, headed by Mr. Joseph R. Grundy, but he said, "What could he do?" In the subsequent campaign, due to a public sentiment that resulted in a political revolution, President Taft carried, as I understand, but two States—Vermont and Utah.

We have a parallel case here. Senators may talk as they please about this being a fight between the farmers of the West and the industrialists of the East, but there is no single fact of record to support that statement. Every single fact of record denies the validity of that contention, just as much today as was the case in 1909.

Against the bill, the Payne-Aldrich bill, Senator Dolliver led the fight against Schedule K.

In the same tariff debate was another great character, leading a fight on other schedules.

Those two Senators joined their great ability, their great statesmanship, their great independence, and marched side by side in opposition to the Payne-Aldrich bill. Those two men to-day are loved by every American citizen—the man upon the farm, the man in the shop, the man in our countinghouses. They are gone; but I can almost hear the reverberations of their voices to-day, and we ought to catch the spirit of their patriotism and their loyalty to the common welfare. It seems now that before us are the warning hands and the pleading voices of the then Senator from my own State, the senior Robert M. La Follette, and the then Senator from Iowa, Jonathan P. Dolliver. They refused to yield to the influence of the Grundys and certain financial interests interested in the production of wool. There was that little band of 12 insurgents, none of them deserters from the cause then, none of them following a false prophet. They stuck to their course, and the verdict of the American people in 1912 overwhelmingly approved of the stand they took.

Mr. President, what followed the enactment of Schedule K I need not further describe; but I am going to make a prediction here this afternoon. As much as I regret it, I confess that the so-called farm group in the Senate of 1929 will meet its Waterloo if it follows a leadership that carries us along the way with Mr. Grundy and his associates and certain large wool-growers.

I confess that if this program goes through, that leadership can not justify an assault on the industrial rates carried in this bill. As the Senator from Nebraska has said, it is not the high rates on agricultural products that will bring about an equality between industry and agriculture. That equality must be brought about in another way. It must be brought about by scaling down the extortionate rates upon those items, those commodities, that enter into the cost of farm operations.

What excuse will we make when we are through with the farm schedules and farm rates which will be ineffective are found to be boosted higher and higher? The industrial East will find justification in the boosting of these agricultural rates for an increase in their industrial rates, and it will not only be an excuse, but they will come with a cause which they may be able to justify, in my opinion. If these agricultural rates are not effective, then of course we have buncoed the farmer. If they are effective to the extent of the imposition of those rates, then of course there will be an increased cost of living for every industrial section, and for everyone.

However, I know, and every other Senator here knows, that not a single agricultural rate has been increased that is going to be 100 per cent effective. I do not believe there is a Senator here who will contend that the farm rates will be 50 per cent effective. I think, if we would acknowledge the fact, we would find that scarcely any agricultural increase will have any effect in the enhancement of the prosperity of agriculture.

Mr. President, I do not expect, by anything we may say here, to change the opinion of a single Senator. So far as I am concerned I am willing to proceed with a roll call on every single one of these increases; but I would feel that I had been recreant to my duty as a Senator if I remained silent in the situation we now have in the Congress.

I hope that there will be a little band of Senators in 1929 who will follow the dictates of their own consciences and stand above State or sectional interest, as did the little band of 12 insurgents in 1909.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not desire to make a speech, but I do think it quite opportune to say a word, in view of the eloquent observations of the Senator from Wisconsin, with reference to the great debate which took place in the Senate in 1909 upon Schedule K in the Payne-Aldrich bill. I was in the Senate then, and I can recall with feeling the spell which was thrown upon this body by the great speeches against the iniquity of that schedule by Jonathan P. Dolliver and Robert M. La Follette, sr.

The Senator from Wisconsin is correct when he says that the result of the discussions which took place in the Senate at that time upon that schedule led to the widespread agitation within the ranks of the Republican Party in this country which brought about the political revolution of 1912, when the Republican candidate for the Presidency received the electoral votes of only two small States in the Union and the Democratic candidate was elected by an overwhelming vote.

In view of the statements made by the Senator from Wisconsin, in view of the history that had its beginning in that debate upon the woolen schedule, I think it is appropriate to put into the RECORD the rates of Schedule K upon raw wool and upon the waste products of wool in the Payne-Aldrich law of 1909, and the rates the Senate has already voted or will vote upon the same products in the pending bill as soon as the pending amendment is disposed of.

I want to read those rates. I have here in parallel columns the rates of the Payne-Aldrich law, out of which grew the political revolution to which I have referred, and the rates upon the same products which the Senate has voted or will soon vote into the pending bill.

On top, slubbing, roving, and ring wastes the rate in Schedule K, Payne-Aldrich bill, was 30 cents a pound; the rate in the Senate committee amendment to the pending House bill is 34 cents a pound, 4 cents higher than the rate in the Payne-Aldrich bill.

On garnetted waste the rate in the Payne-Aldrich bill, Schedule K, was 30 cents; the Senate committee rate in the pending bill is 26 cents, a little bit lower, with two relatively unimportant exceptions the only rates that are lower.

On noils the rate in Schedule K, Payne-Aldrich bill, was 20 cents a pound; the Senate committee rate is 30 cents a pound on noils carbonized and 23 cents on other noils.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator refer to the pending bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator ought to make that clear in the RECORD.

Mr. SIMMONS. When I refer to the Senate committee rate, of course I mean the rate in the pending bill.

On thread or yarn wastes, in Schedule K, the Payne-Aldrich bill, the rate was 20 cents a pound; the Senate committee rate in the pending bill is 25 cents a pound, 5 cents a pound higher.

Card and burr wastes, carbonized, Payne-Aldrich rate, Schedule K, 20 cents a pound; Senate rate, present bill, 23 cents a pound.

Wastes not specifically provided for—that is the catch-all clause—Payne-Aldrich rate, Schedule K, 20 cents a pound; Senate rate, present bill, 24 cents a pound.

Shoddy, Payne-Aldrich rate, Schedule K, 25 cents a pound; Senate rate, present bill, 21 cents a pound.

Mr. GEORGE. And that has not been fixed by vote in the Senate, but the Senator from Utah has given notice that it would be fixed on the basis of about 7 cents higher than the rag-wastes rate.

Mr. SIMMONS. The wool extract rate has been fixed. Wool extract, Payne-Aldrich bill, Schedule K, 20 cents a pound; Senate rate, present bill, 21 cents a pound.

Wool rags, Payne-Aldrich rate, Schedule K, 10 cents a pound; Senate amendment rate, 24 cents a pound; and the pending amendment provides, I believe, for 18 cents a pound.

Flocks, which is unimportant, under the Payne-Aldrich rate, Schedule K, was 10 cents, and under the present Senate bill is 8 cents.

So that, Mr. President, practically every important rate of the paragraph under consideration already acted upon by the Senate is higher than the rate carried in Schedule K, which brought about that tremendous revolution of 1912, unhorsed the Republican Party and put in power the Democratic Party. The rates are higher than in Schedule K, except the rate on flocks, shoddy, and garnetted waste. There is another rate which has not yet been acted upon, as the Senator from Georgia just indicated.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, did the Senator give the rate upon scoured wool or wool in grease in the Payne-Aldrich bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall be very glad to give it.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator is going to give a picture of the situation, he ought to give it.

Mr. SIMMONS. The rate on scoured wool in the Payne-Aldrich bill on class 1 was 33 cents and on class 2 was 36 cents; 1 cent lower than the rate in the present bill as adopted by the Senate with respect to first class and 2 cents lower than the Payne-Aldrich bill on wools of the second class.

Mr. SMOOT. What I had reference to was that in 1909 the rate of duty on wool in the grease was 11 cents a pound.

Mr. SIMMONS. In the grease 11 cents a pound on first class and in the grease 12 cents a pound on second class, and then it was provided that scoured wool should be three times those amounts, one consequently being 33 cents and the other 36 cents.

Mr. SMOOT. In explanation of the figures I want to say that where there was a rate of 11 cents a pound on wool in the grease and that wool shrank only 50 per cent, then the scoured wool itself was only 22 cents a pound instead of 34 cents a pound.

Mr. SIMMONS. But the pending bill puts scoured wool and clean content wool upon the same basis and taxes them both at 34 cents. The argument the Senator makes is against him instead of for him.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the Senator does not understand it or he would not say that.

Mr. SIMMONS. I know the Senator from Utah, if he will pardon me for saying so in all kindness, has repeatedly said to Senators on both sides of the Chamber as we have discussed this question that we do not know anything about it, and his attitude and his expression impliedly mean that he knows all about it.

Mr. SMOOT. I made no such statement unless it was by way of correction, and there is no Senator whom I have corrected who has said I was not correct.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know about that. I would not permit the Senator from Utah to make that statement unchallenged as broadly as he has made it. He interrupted me on yesterday and attempted to correct me, but I did not admit that I was wrong and he was right. I knew that I was right and he was wrong in that particular.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not recall the circumstance, but if I corrected the Senator I know I was right.

Mr. SIMMONS. Exactly. That is the attitude the Senator has occupied all the time, that he knows he has been absolutely infallible upon this subject.

Mr. SMOOT. Following the position taken by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am willing to admit the Senator is an experienced man in questions affecting wool. He is interested or has been interested in the manufacture of woolen goods and has studied it very thoroughly. He has his head crammed full of statistics, but I think the Senator gets his statistics sometimes very badly mixed.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has a right to think anything he desires, but when we take into consideration the Payne-Aldrich rate of 11 cents on grease wool in 1909, I remind him that that never gave the producer of wool in this country 33 cents on scoured wool. That was based upon the supposition that all wool shrank 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent, which would give a rate of 33 cents on scoured wool. There was no scoured wool imported because they could import the grease wool at 40 or 50 per cent, and scour it, and so the domestic producers never got that protection.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will admit that in practice, after the bill was enacted into law, the importers of the country took advantage of the vagueness of the law and brought in the lower class of goods, but that does not remove the fact that wool in the grease of the first class was 11 cents and wool scoured was 33 cents and wool in grease of the second class was 12 cents and scoured wool was 36 cents. The average rate in the Payne-Aldrich bill upon wool is practically the average rate in the present bill upon clean content or scoured wool. The present bill so far as the tariff rate is concerned puts scoured wool and clean-content wool exactly in the same category and imposes an average tax of about 34 cents a pound.

Mr. President, I did not rise, as I said, for the purpose of making a speech, but merely to put some facts in the Record. I thought in view of the statements made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] in reference to Schedule K that this comparison between the rates of Schedule K in the Payne-Aldrich law and the Senate rates in the pending bill would be appropriate and enlightening.

Mr. President, I do not wish to enter into a discussion of the effect of placing the duty upon rags and wastes at the specific rate provided in the pending bill. Senators have discussed that question until I think the Senate is probably somewhat weary of it. Certainly the ground has been adequately and very effectively covered. I do not think there is any question in the minds of fair-thinking, impartial-thinking people about the gen-

eral statement that the situation with which we are now confronted with reference to the relative rates upon the wastes of wool and upon wool itself is largely the outcome, if not entirely the outcome, of the fierce controversy that is going on in the country to-day between the worsted manufacturers and the woolen manufacturers. The worsted manufacturers are evidently more powerful, influentially at least, than the woolen manufacturers.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And numerically also. Sixty per cent of the wool business is represented by the worsted interests and 40 per cent by the woolen manufacturing interests.

Mr. SIMMONS. The great lobby that came here headed by Mr. Grundy, who for 25 years has been the chief lobbyist in behalf of high duties, especially upon the manufactured products of wool, are the ones who prevailed in this contest. The contest began in the committee. In that committee, Mr. President, the majority membership was composed very largely of representatives from New England, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. Mr. Grundy, as the representative and head of the lobby, was enabled not only to inaugurate but to bring to successful accomplishment in the committee the desires of the worsted industry with respect to these rates. The woolen manufacturing industry depends largely upon imported wool rags.

The duties upon such rags were too low to suit Mr. Grundy. They brought about a competition with the worsted manufacturers that he did not like. It was that influence which prevailed in raising the rate upon rags out of which the cheap clothing is made on which the poor people of this country must rely for warm clothing, blankets, and so forth. They are required to pay not altogether as high rates as those on clean wool but in many instances approximately as high rates.

The question was asked here yesterday why these high rates were wanted. Mr. President, the rate on clean wool is not a prohibitory rate; it is not an exclusive rate. It is not made prohibitory, however, for one reason, and one reason only; and that is we do not produce enough wool in this country to supply the demand of the manufacturers, and therefore it was necessary to fix the rate below the prohibitive point.

However, when we come to rags, a product used in the woolen mills and imported in large quantities, the duty is raised to a prohibitive point. Mr. Grundy and his associates, the worsted manufacturers, use all new wool. They would not have that rate prohibitive; but their competitors use rags which are imported, which are not produced in this country, and so they would have the rate on rags prohibitive.

Mr. President, if this fight stopped with the conflict of interests between the worsted and woolen manufacturers, it would be bad enough. I have long anticipated that the time would come under the Republican Party's prohibitive system of tariff taxation when different interests of this country would be arrayed in hostile camps, one seeking to destroy the other, because the other was producing a substitute for its goods, and that the end would be a sharp internecine warfare among the manufacturers of this country with each other. Here is the beginning of that warfare, Mr. President. It was sought even in this bill in other instances to inject the same principle of destroying one industry in order that a competing industry might be benefited, destroying an industry producing a substitute article in order that the industry producing the primary article might be benefited. Fortunately that principle has not been adopted to any considerable extent; fortunately for the country and for its industries that effort succeeded in but few instances; and the outstanding instance in which it did succeed was in the fight between the worsted and the woolen manufacturers over the duty upon wastes and rags. The great captain of industry and lobbyists was successful in his fight when his own industry was affected and was enabled here to deal almost a fatal blow to a competitive industry and to force poor people either to go cold in winter or to buy the high-priced goods which the worsted manufacturer produces from clean-content wool.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATERMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator to-day and on yesterday very emphatically and very ably, as he always does, pointed out that the motive behind the increased duty on wool was to force the American people to buy the much more expensive clothing which is made from virgin wool. Does the Senator recall that on yesterday another motive was suggested, namely, that the consumers of America could buy clothing made from domestic rags which are now used for making paper and felt roofing? I should like the Senator's views about the sug-

gestion that the levying of this duty might lead to the American people buying clothing made of rags now used for making paper and felt.

Mr. SIMMONS. The rags which we produce in this country and which are used in the way the Senator from Massachusetts indicates are sold for 7 cents a pound, while the wool rags that we get from abroad are sold for 28 cents a pound. The proposition is to force the poor people of the country to wear clothing made out of 7-cent wool in preference to wool clothing made out of 28-cent wool, which is all wool and not half cotton and half wool.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In other words, it is a choice between a millionaire's clothes and felt-roofing clothes?

Mr. SIMMONS. Exactly; that remark covers the situation, Mr. President. The 7-cent wool rags, so called—which are mostly composed of other material than wool—would be diverted from use in making paper and roofing, and the poor people of the country would either have to wear clothing made from that kind of rags or go cold in winter. But, Mr. President, let me pass that. I must not exhaust my strength unnecessarily, for it is not great.

The point I have discussed, however, is not the most serious question involved in this controversy. The most serious thing is the effect upon the consumers of the country. Not all of the consumers are interested in it. Only one class of consumer is interested in it, but that class is relatively a very large one and is made up of people who can not afford to wear the fine-spun woolen clothes such as the Senator from Utah and I wear. Shall they be mulcted to help out one industry as against another? Shall we disregard the interest of those people who are more and more to be the wards of the legislative body in imposing taxes because of their lesser ability to pay taxes than others? Are we to disregard their interest; submerge it in a fight between two competitive industries for the market, when the consequences will be so grave not only to the pocket-book but to health?

If there be one thing that is certain, it is that our climate, even in sections where it is most moderate, it is necessary during certain seasons, in the interest not only of comfort but in the interest of health, that the people should have something to wear which is warmer than cotton, silk, or rayon. The people to whom I refer are not able to buy silk and rayon except to a very limited extent. Oh, yes they could buy cotton, and if I were to speak out of my own interest or the interest of my section, I would say, "Yes; let us force them to buy and wear cotton clothing and covering"; but, Mr. President, I would be unworthy of a seat in this body if I could cast a vote against the poor people, the laboring people, the toiling masses, of the whole country in order to subserve a local, selfish interest.

Mr. President, I did not intend to be led into a discussion along that line, and I am sorry that I have indulged in it. However, I wish to make a further statement. The rate on wool is specific, and the rates on waste and rags are specific. We can not bring the duties on a basis of parity by means of specific rates such as have been suggested here. If the rates were ad valorem, it would be different. The price of wool rags is less than half the price of wool. The specific rate on the lowest grade rags, therefore, ought to be less than one-half of the rate on wool. The rate on wool being 34 cents, if the rate of 18 cents on rags, as proposed by the Senator from Indiana be converted into an ad valorem, it amounts to 67 per cent. I believe I am correct about that.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is correct on the average value of the imports.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is correct, based on the average value of the imports for the year 1923, while the average ad valorem upon wool is only 48 cents. Am I not correct in that?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senate thoroughly understand the statement, that, based upon the imported value of the product imported into the United States in 1928, in order to bring about a parity, the specific rate on rags when converted into an ad valorem rate should reach 48 per cent, or the same as on wool, but, instead of making it 48 per cent ad valorem, the same as on wool, it is proposed here to make the ad valorem rate on rags nearly 68 per cent.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The rate varies from 24 per cent ad valorem to 115 per cent, the average being what the Senator has stated; and the rate in ad valorem terms proposed originally by the committee would vary from 33 per cent to 160 per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was giving the figures furnished me by a very eminent statistician.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator was correct in stating what the average ad valorem would be.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, we ought not to permit an outrage of that kind. If a parity between these products is desired, let us have a parity; but here the proposition is, upon an ad valorem basis, to put a rate on wool that is equivalent to an ad valorem rate of 48 per cent and to put an ad valorem rate on rags and waste of 68 per cent. The thing has been reversed. The higher ad valorem ought to be on wool and the lower ad valorem ought to be on rags; but the ad valorem on rags has been made one-third higher than the rate on wool.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. SIMMONS. What is the correct rate? I have had it worked out by the Actuary of the Treasury, recognized as the greatest authority in this country upon questions of this sort, and his accuracy has never been questioned. The Treasury of the United States relies absolutely and implicitly upon his estimates and his accuracy. He advises me that if these specific rates are to be put upon an equality the rate on these rags ought not to be in excess of about 12½ cents. I have not the fractions, but that is about what it is.

Mr. President, I can not support the committee amendment or the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I should like to cooperate in these matters as far as I can. This is an agricultural product. Wool is a product of agriculture. I want to be liberal with wool and liberal with all of its by-products, as I want to be liberal with agriculture; but, Mr. President, wool is one of the things that has been generally very highly protected. The two great industries of the United States that have been highly protected through many years have been wool and sugar; and it has been the consensus of opinion in this country and of experience that the duties imposed upon these agricultural products were effective—if not 100 per cent effective, very nearly 100 per cent effective. They have prospered. Especially the wool industry has prospered. It is already at an advantage, and it has had that advantage ever since 1922, surely, over the other products of agriculture.

Why should these rates be prized up so much higher than they are in the present law? The present law was written by the Republican Party in response to the demand that the Payne-Aldrich rates be cut down, under the influence of the great revolution that had taken place in this country, because they were too high. The present law did not restore the Payne-Aldrich rates. They were saner when the present law was enacted than they are now, Mr. President. They did not dare do it then; but what they did not dare do then, the Committee on Finance, through its chairman, and the Senate sanctioning their action, have dared to do now and here. They not only dared to restore the Payne-Aldrich rates notwithstanding the almost unanimous denunciation and repudiation of those rates by the people when they refused the candidate who stood for them the votes of all the States except the smallest two in the Union; the Finance Committee not only dared restore those rates, so dramatically and so historically repudiated and trampled under foot by the indignation of the American voters but they actually dared in the pending bill to raise those Payne-Aldrich rates!

Mr. President, I have here certain data prepared upon wool. They are of a general character. They apply to all the actions of the Senate under the paragraph we are now considering and the paragraph we have already acted upon. I wish to put those data in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. The tables were prepared for me by an expert of high authority and accuracy, undisputed in the Committee on Finance, as in the department to which he is attached.

I also wish to put in the RECORD a sort of condensed statement of the contents of the document to which I have just referred, and I ask that this appear before the complete document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WOOL AND WOOL WASTES
Production of improved wools

	United States production	
	Pounds	Pounds
1922.....	2,000,000,000	263,713,000
1927.....	2,600,000,000	322,553,000
1928.....	(1)	376,713,000

¹ Not compiled.

Sources of wools in order of production: Australia; United States, about 13 per cent of total production; Argentina; New Zealand; South Africa.

Imports of improved wools and of hair

	Amount	Value	Value per pound
	<i>Pounds</i>		
1919.....	348,051,000	\$179,233,000	\$0.515
1928.....	89,800,000	35,554,000	.396

From 1923 to 1928, both inclusive, we imported 968,311,715 pounds of these wools, with a clean content of 585,414,134 pounds, or 60.46 per cent; average shrinkage, 39½ per cent.

Production of wool wastes

The statistics of domestic production are very unsatisfactory. Most of the soft wastes are consumed in the mills where they are produced. The census reports show the production of wastes for sale only. These follow:

	Noils and wool waste		Recovered wool fiber		Total reported	
	Pounds	Value	Pounds	Value	Pounds	Value
1919.....	54,675,858	\$25,040,863	58,786,504	\$20,644,001	113,462,362	\$45,684,864
1927.....	49,809,499	18,733,525	40,823,333	10,709,485	90,632,832	29,443,000

Imports of wool wastes

Average annual imports for consumption of wool wastes and by-products:

	Pounds	Value
Tariff act 1909.....	414,394	\$175,970
Tariff act 1913.....	9,950,525	2,937,855
Tariff act 1922 up to (to Dec. 31, 1927).....	30,563,752	13,246,648

	Pounds	Value	Value per pound
Imports, 1919.....	4,321,589	\$3,956,575	\$0.916
Imports, 1928.....	35,060,844	15,109,256	.431

Rags, imports of wool rags

	Pounds	Value	Value per pound
1923.....	11,397,464	\$2,812,193	24.7
1925.....	21,472,530	6,458,345	30.1
1928.....	21,637,826	6,212,241	28.7

Old wool rags, known as "kints," come from clothing, wholly or in part of wool, such as suits, dresses, sweaters, and stockings.

New wool rags, known as "klips," come from the cutting tables of ready-made suit and cloak houses, tailor shops, etc.

Inferior rags enter largely into roofing felts, and also are exported.

Our exports of rags are as follows:

	Pounds	Value	Unit value per pound
1919.....	31,476,118	\$5,538,440	\$0.176
1928.....	17,398,432	1,365,994	.079

The United States produced about 12.4 per cent (in 1927) of the world's production of wool, but consumed 16.2 per cent. That is, although she produced more wool in 1928 than for any previous year, by over 28,000,000 pounds, she was compelled to import about 90,000,000 pounds improved wool in addition to over 35,000,000 pounds of wastes, etc., and even then the sum of her production plus her imports are much less than for many prior years.

This sum for the year 1923 was over 656,000,000 pounds; for 1927 it was 593,000,000 pounds; and for 1928 it was 466,000,000 pounds.

The truth of the matter is that the people can not afford, or will not now pay, the price for manufactures of wool, such price being increased as it is by the duties of the 1922 act. The consumption is rapidly decreasing; not (at any rate for the last year) because of change in fashions but because of its cost. More shoddy is being used by the men and other cheaper materials by the women. If duties are still further

increased, it will be of no benefit to the producers of wool, because less and less of it will be used, and prices will still further fall.

The Department of Labor, in their tables of wholesale prices, gives that of wool for 1923, Ohio medium, as 53.8 cents per pound. For 1927 it gives the similar price at 44.7 cents, a decrease of 17 per cent in four years.

WOOL

(Paragraph 1101)

(1) Wools and hair in the grease: That shorn from the animal without any cleaning; that is, the natural condition.

(2) Washed wools and hair: Washed with water only, on the animal's back, or on the skin (Senate added "if clean content is higher than 77 per cent it shall be considered as washed.")

(3) Scoured wools and hair: Such as have been otherwise cleansed. (Senate added "not including claking, burr, picking, or carbonizing.")

(4) Sorted wools or hair, or matchings: Wherein the identity of individual fleeces has been destroyed, except that fleeces classed or skirted, or both, shall not be considered sorted or matchings, unless the backs have been removed.

(5) The official standards of the United States for grades of wool as established by the Secretary of Agriculture on June 18, 1926, shall be the standards for determining the grade of wools.

Duty on carpet wools. This paragraph strictly specifies the wool that may be included therein. It covers wools that have not been improved and are dutied as follows:

Wools and hair of the camel

	1922 act	House bill	Senate committee bill
In the grease.....	12 cents per pound.	24 cents clean content.	24 cents clean content.
Washed.....	18 cents per pound.	do.	Do.
Scoured.....	24 cents per pound.	24 cents scoured.	27 cents clean content.
On the skin.....		23 cents clean content.	22 cents clean content.
Sorted or matchings.....		26 cents clean content.	25 cents clean content.

The 1922 act and bill provide that this class of wool may be imported in bond, to be manufactured into yarns for the manufacture of carpets, rugs, and other floor coverings. If this wool is so used, within three years, the duty shall be remitted or refunded. If not so used, the above duties shall be levied, collected, and paid, together with 20 cents per pound (1922 act) or 50 cents per pound. (Both House and Senate committee bill.)

(Paragraph 1102)

The duties on wool n. s. p. f. and hair of certain animals are as follows:

	Act of 1922	House bill	Senate committee bill
In the grease or washed.....	31 cents pound on clean content.	34 cents pound on clean content.	31 cents pound on clean content.
Scoured.....	31 cents pound.....	34 cents pound.....	34 cents pound on clean content.
On the skin.....	30 cents pound on clean content.	33 cents pound on clean content.	29 cents pound on clean content.
Sorted or matchings.....	Not specified.....	36 cents pound on clean content.	32 cents pound on clean content.

In addition, the House bill included a provision that wools n. s. p. f. not finer than 44's should pay rates smaller than the finer wools. The Senate committee eliminated this. The rates in the House bill on this wool was:

- In the grease or washed, 24 cents pound on clean content.
- Scoured, 24 cents pound.
- On the skin, 23 cents pound on clean content.
- Sorted or matchings, 26 cents pound on clean content.

Carpet wools are imported in large quantities from China, British India, the United Kingdom, the Near East, and Argentina. Practically none is of domestic production.

Total imports of carpet wools

	Pounds	Value	Value per pound
1919.....	96,853,408	\$37,009,188	\$0.382
1923.....	125,526,033	25,713,363	.205
1925.....	142,278,407	42,416,342	.298
1928.....	155,187,620	39,651,231	.256

Imports of improved wools and hairs

	Pounds	Value	Value per pound
1919	348,050,678	\$179,232,543	\$0.515
1923	267,725,261	92,890,584	.351
1925	165,422,158	85,891,486	.519
1928	89,800,288	35,554,479	.396

These imports are largely from Australia, followed in order by Argentina, Uruguay, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom.

Production, improved wools

	1922	1927	1928
	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds
World	2,000,000,000	2,600,000,000	
United States	263,713,000	322,553,000	376,713,000

Australia, the United States, Argentina, New Zealand, and South Africa lead in wool production. The United States produces about 13 per cent of the world production.

WOOL WASTES AND BY-PRODUCTS

Top, slubbing, and roving wastes consist of broken bits of top, slubbing, and roving and is usually known as lap waste.

Ring waste is made up of broken ends on roving and spinning frames, and on mules, which lap around the rolls. When this is cut or pulled off it retains a circular or ring form.

Garnetted waste is waste that has passed through a garnett machine—a cylinder with iron teeth. This reduces the waste to soft fluffy stock suitable for carding.

Noils are the shorter fibers removed by combing in the manufacture of tops. Noils are not used in worsted mills, but are sold to the woolen mills, and are an important raw material for them. Noils contain vegetable matter in the form of straw and burs, etc. By carbonizing, these are removed by the action of chemicals without injury to the wool.

Thread or yarn wastes are pieces of yarn broken or damaged at the spinning machine, or after spinning. It is hard and must be garnetted before it is ready for reworking.

All other wastes n. s. p. f. include mainly bur and card waste. Bur waste consists of pieces of wool clinging to burs, which have been separated by the bur rollers on a card or on a bur picker. Card waste is made at the card, mainly short fibers imbedded in the wire card clothing.

Shoddy is the common name for any wool fiber reclaimed from soft woolen rags.

Wool extract is wool fiber extracted by carbonization from rags that contain a mixture of wool and cotton.

Mungo is wool fiber recovered from hard-spun fatted and fulling hoods. It is inferior in length of staple and in spinning qualities to shoddy, and is usually known as low-grade shoddy.

Woolen rag—a tariff term—includes wool rags containing either worsted or woolen yarns. Old wool rags, known as knits, are obtained from discarded clothing, wholly or in part of wool. New wool rags, known as clips, are clippings from the cutting tables of ready-made suit and cloak houses, tailor shops, etc. Wool rags are usually reduced to shoddy, and the reclaimed wool fiber is used largely in woolen manufacture. Rags too inferior for this are utilized in roofing felts.

Flocks are short fluffy fibers resembling pulverized wool removed from wool fabrics during the napping, shearing, and fulling process and are unfit for spinning and are utilized in the fulling process to give body and weight to cheap fabrics and for rubber-coat materials, but more largely in the manufacture of felts, embossed wall papers, and for stuffing toys.

PRODUCTION

No complete data available. Most of these soft wastes are used in the mills which produce them. Census reports give the following:

Year	Noils and wool wastes		Recovered wool fiber	
	Pounds	Amount	Pounds	Amount
1923	55,826,915	\$19,362,318	55,050,968	\$13,678,804
1925	44,630,005	18,166,758	67,543,476	19,056,896
1927	49,809,499	18,733,525	40,823,333	10,709,485

Massachusetts is the largest producer of the above. Imports of wool wastes and by-products:

Year	Amount	Value	Value
			Per lb.
1919			\$0.916
1921	4,321,589	\$3,956,575	.352
1923	9,969,410	3,505,393	.412
1925	26,784,121	11,026,646	.477
1927	34,490,353	16,462,291	.416
1928	31,688,287	13,189,306	.431

The above tables show that when the duty on wool was low, in 1919, we imported, in value, five times as much improved wool as we did in 1928 with a high duty, while in the case of wool wastes and by-products, in 1928 we imported in value four times as much as we did in 1919 when these wastes were free. That is, the high duty succeeded in forcing the consumer to wear more shoddy than when wool paid a lower tax. These imports consist chiefly of wool rags, some noils, and thread waste.

	Act of 1922	House bill	Senate committee bill
PAR. 1105. WOOL WASTES, ETC.			
Top duties slubbing, roving, and ring wastes.	31 cents per pound.	34 cents per pound.	34 cents per pound.
Garnetted waste	24 cents per pound.	26 cents per pound.	26 cents per pound.
Noils, carbonized	do	28 cents per pound.	30 cents per pound.
Noils, not carbonized	19 cents per pound.	21 cents per pound.	23 cents per pound.
Thread or yarn wastes.	16 cents per pound.	18 cents per pound.	Do.
Wool wastes, n. s. p. f.	do	do	23 cents per pound, carbonized; 16 cents per pound, not carbonized.
Shoddy	do	do	21 cents per pound.
Wool extract	do	do	Do.
Mungo	7½ cents per pound.	10 cents per pound.	10 cents per pound.
Wool rags and flocks.	do	8 cents per pound.	24 cents per pound, wool rags; 8 cents per pound, flocks.
Wastes of the hair of angora and cashmere goats, alpaca, etc.	Same as wool wastes.	Same as wool wastes.	Same as wool wastes.
PAR. 1106. WOOLS AND HAIR, ADVANCED			
Advanced in any manner beyond washed or scoured condition, including tops, but not further advanced than roving.	33 cents per pound plus 20 per cent.	37 cents per pound plus 20 per cent.	34 cents per pound plus 20 per cent. ¹

¹ Carbonizing is deemed an advancement.

Production, partly manufactured

Year	Quantity	Value	Value per pound
	Pounds		
1919	9,899,257	\$14,503,666	\$1.465
1923	21,120,118	23,926,823	1.133
1925	18,055,405	23,613,251	1.308
1927	18,283,332	20,808,114	1.138

This industry is mainly located in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

Imports

Year	Quantity	Value	Value per pound
	Pounds		
1919	732,879	\$848,675	\$1.158
1923	3,980,452	2,426,718	.610
1925	334,711	270,051	.807
1927	249,341	379,849	1.523
1928	112,967	92,537	.819

YARNS OF WOOL OR HAIR

(Paragraph 1107)

Woolen yarns are made from scoured wool or a mixture of wool, wool waste, shoddy, or cotton, by carding and then spinning.

Worsted yarns are made from scoured wool by carding, backwashing, gilling, combing, drawing, and then spinning.

Woolen yarns are usually made from short clothing wools, and may contain mixture of shoddy, wool waste, or cotton.

Worsted yarns are usually made from long combing wool, and contain nothing but virgin wool with the short fiber or noils removed.

Mohair and alpaca yarns are usually spun on the worsted principle. Camel hair, which is long, is spun on the worsted principle. The shorter hairs and noils are spun by the woolen system.

Production

Year	Woolen yarns	Worsted yarns
	Pounds	Pounds
1909	170,763,843	183,940,695
1914	205,629,111	182,944,184
1919	232,477,278	144,334,245

Production for sale

Year	Woolen yarns		Worsted yarns	
	Pounds		Pounds	
1919	28,959,769	\$33,166,552	74,385,846	\$185,180,372
1923	49,577,202	33,049,421	113,467,590	191,568,782
1925	44,449,281	34,357,596	83,419,345	144,501,462

Pennsylvania is the principal producer of woolen yarns for sale. Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island are the principal States producing worsted yarns for sale.

The United Kingdom is the largest foreign producer and exporter of wool yarns, followed by Germany and France.

Imports: Yarns of wool, mohair, alpaca, etc.

Year	Quantity	Value	Value per pound
	Pounds		
1919	376,777	\$831,695	\$2.207
1923	5,617,321	7,238,370	1.289
1927	339,461	545,455	1.607
1928	215,396	405,615	1.883

Worsted yarns and mohair yarns are chiefly imported. Imports of woolen yarns are negligible.

Exports are small. Imports of these yarns consist of specialties, in which labor is an unusually large part of the total cost, and are small as compared with our production.

Duties on yarns made wholly or in chief value of wool

Valued at—	Act of 1922	House bill	Senate committee bill
Not more than 30 cents per pound.	24 cents per pound plus 30 per cent.	Not more than 50 cents per pound; 27 cents per pound plus 30 per cent.	37 cents per pound plus 35 per cent.
More than 30 cents; not more than \$1 per pound.	36 cents per pound plus 35 per cent.	More than 50 cents to \$1 per pound; 40 cents per pound plus 35 per cent.	37 cents per pound plus 35 per cent.
More than \$1 per pound, not more than \$1.50 per pound.	36 cents per pound plus 40 per cent.	40 cents per pound plus 40 per cent.	37 cents per pound plus 45 per cent.
More than \$1.50 per pound.	do.	40 cents per pound plus 45 per cent.	37 cents per pound plus 55 per cent.

DRESS GOODS AND OTHER LIGHTWEIGHT FABRICS OF WOOL

(Paragraph 1108)

Wool woven fabrics weighing not more than 4 ounces per square yard are almost exclusively of worsteds. Included in these lightweight goods are linings, dress goods, buntings, flannels, and men's shirtings. These linings are made with warp of cotton and with filling of mohair, alpaca, or wool. Dress goods are usually for women's and children's garments, exclusive of cloakings, the heavier fabrics. Bunting is a light, loosely woven fabric used for flags and decorations. Lightweight flannels are usually for infants' wear and men's shirts.

Production, under this paragraph, is not segregated, but is decreasing because of the smaller quantity of material now required for a modern woman's dress, and because of rayon.

Imports

Year	Quantity	Value	Value per pound
	Pounds		
1919	487,567	\$1,289,719	\$2.645
1923	855,454	1,617,255	1.891
1927	1,352,357	2,749,719	2.033
1928	1,045,053	2,094,705	2.004

Duties—Woven fabrics, weighing not more than 4 ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool

Valued at—	Act of 1922	House bill	Senate committee bill
Not more than 80 cents per pound.	37 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	40 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	46 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.
More than 80 cents, not more than \$1.25 per pound.	45 cents per pound wool content plus 50 per cent.	50 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	Do.
More than \$1.25, not more than \$2 per pound.	do.	50 cents per pound plus 55 per cent.	46 cents per pound plus 55 per cent.
More than \$2 per pound.	do.	50 cents per pound plus 60 per cent.	46 cents per pound plus 60 per cent.

Duties—Woven fabrics, weighing not more than 4 ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool—Continued

Valued at—	Act of 1922	House bill	Senate committee bill
Warp wholly of cotton or other vegetable fiber:			
Not more than \$1 per pound.	36 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	40 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	37 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.
More than \$1, not more than \$1.50 per pound.	do.	40 cents per pound plus 55 per cent.	37 cents per pound plus 55 per cent.
More than \$1.50 per pound.	do.	do.	37 cents per pound plus 60 per cent.

WOVEN FABRICS, CLOTHS, AND OTHER HEAVYWEIGHT FABRICS OF WOOL

(Paragraph 1109)

These include fabrics weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, woven of worsted or woolen yarns. They consist principally of men's suitings, overcoatings, and women's cloakings.

PRODUCTION

The production statistics do not separate the light from the heavy fabrics. The following is our production of all-wool piece goods.

Total production of woolen and worsted piece goods:

Year	Pounds	Square yards	Value
1919	307,942,005	509,158,601	\$714,869,297
1921	253,348,282	471,611,138	533,315,153
1923	344,155,404	581,981,503	700,201,778
1925	292,307,705	525,719,887	611,719,460

Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Maine, New Jersey, and Connecticut are the principal producers of woolens and worsteds.

The production of woolens and worsteds in Great Britain, in 1924, was 449,506,000 square yards, valued at \$358,004,072, or considerably less than that of the United States.

Imports

Year	Quantity	Value	Value per pound
	Pounds		
1919	2,222,541	\$5,815,788	\$2.617
1923	9,911,042	18,510,632	1.868
1925	9,578,571	19,574,943	2.044
1927	9,720,505	19,244,068	1.980
1928	8,683,282	17,050,192	1.965

In 1927, 91 per cent of the total quantity of wool cloths imported were woolens. Since the war, the United Kingdom has been the source of about 75 per cent of the total value of these fabrics imported into the United States. Our exports are small, being less than a million dollars a year.

Duties—Woven fabrics of wool, weighing more than 4 ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool

Valued at—	Act of 1922	House bill	Senate committee bill
Not more than 60 cents per pound.	24 cents per pound plus 40 per cent.	26 cents per pound plus 40 per cent.	46 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.
More than 60 cents, not more than 80 cents per pound.	37 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	40 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	Do.
More than 80 cents, not more than \$1.25 per pound.	45 cents per pound, wool content, plus 50 per cent.	50 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	Do.
More than \$1.25, not more than \$1.50 per pound.	do.	do.	46 cents per pound plus 55 per cent.
More than \$1.50 per pound, not more than \$2 per pound.	do.	50 cents per pound plus 55 per cent.	Do.
More than \$2 per pound.	do.	50 cents per pound plus 60 per cent.	46 cents per pound plus 60 per cent.

PILE FABRICS

(Paragraph 1110)

These goods consist of a foundation cloth covered wholly or in part by short projecting ends or loop produced in the weave with an extra set of threads. These are divided into two classes, (1) filling piles, as corduroy, and (2) warp piles, as plush and astrachan. Filling piles is always cut; warp pile may be either cut or loop. Practically all pile fabrics with a warp of wool, mohair, or alpaca, the foundation fabric is of cotton or other vegetable fiber. Wool has qualities, is little used as pile. Those with mohair pile constitute the bulk of pile fabrics.

PRODUCTION

Statistics of production are not complete.

The principal producing States are Maine, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania.

Imports

Year	Quantity	Value	Value
	<i>Pounds</i>		<i>Per lb.</i>
1919.....	7,365	\$23,074	\$3.133
1923.....	246,731	434,437	1.761
1927.....	365,988	886,421	2.422
1928.....	297,697	743,567	2.498

Our imports are a small part of our consumption.

Duties on pile fabrics, cut or uncut, whether or not the pile covers the whole surface, made wholly or in chief value of wool, and manufactures, in any form made or cut from such pile fabrics

If pile is—	Act of 1922	House bill	Senate committee bill
Wholly cut or uncut....	40 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	44 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.	41 cents per pound plus 50 per cent.
Partly cut.....	do.....	44 cents per pound plus 55 per cent.	41 cents per pound plus 55 per cent.

WOOL BLANKETS, AND SIMILAR ARTICLES

(Paragraph 1111)

A wool blanket is a heavy woven fabric made of wool or of wool and cotton, fuller or shrunken to a high degree, and giggered or napped until the individual fibers of the component yarn are raised and form a pile-like surface on both sides of the cloth.

The characteristics of a blanket are: (1) The heaviness or thickness of the goods; (2) the closeness or even obliteration of the weave by fulling; (3) the high nap on both sides of the fabric.

Production

Year	Pounds	Square yards	Value
1919.....	23,457,743	28,076,410	\$26,318,843
1923.....	25,131,429	35,923,647	22,703,410
1925.....	23,771,142	36,161,428	25,029,220

This shows that the yardage of blankets has been unaffected by conditions affecting the production of wool cloths; the introduction of rayon, and the change in fashions. Of course, some blankets have been eliminated by the use of rayon quilts.

Imports

Year	Pounds	Value	Value per pound
1919.....	20,350	\$38,263	\$1.880
1923.....	243,585	243,097	.998
1925.....	296,050	364,979	1.233
1927.....	602,536	639,732	1.062
1928.....	662,101	720,789	1.089

The most serious competition of wool blankets is the all-cotton blanket. Since the introduction of the all-cotton blanket in 1919, the quantity and value of our production has exceeded that of wool blankets of all kinds. Since the more universal use of well-heated houses, the use of blankets is decreasing.

Duties—Blankets and similar articles, including carriage and automobile robes, and steamer rugs made of blanketing

(Wholly or in chief value of wool, not exceeding 3 yards in length)

Valued at—	Act of 1922	House bill	Senate committee bill
Not more than 50 cents per pound.	18 cents per pound plus 30 per cent.	20 cents per pound plus 30 per cent.	28 cents per pound plus 36 per cent.
More than 50 cents, not more than \$1 per pound.	27 cents per pound plus 32½ per cent.	30 cents per pound plus 36 per cent.	Do.
More than \$1 per pound, not more than \$1.50 per pound.	30 cents per pound plus 35 per cent.	33 cents per pound plus 37½ per cent.	31 cents per pound plus 37½ per cent.
More than \$1.50 per pound.	37 cents per pound plus 40 per cent.	40 cents per pound plus 40 per cent.	38 cents per pound plus 40 per cent.

FELTS, NOT WOVEN, WHOLLY OR IN CHIEF VALUE OF WOOL

(Paragraph 1112)

These are known as pressed felts and are made by matting or felting together wool or hair, under the influence of moisture, heat, and pressure. The property of felting is peculiar to wools and some hairs.

The best felts are made entirely of merino wools. Other fibers, such as nolls, wool wastes, shoddy, and animal hair and cotton, which do not felt themselves, can be mixed into felt because of the natural crimp of the wool with which mixed.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I desire to say that in case the amendment now before the Senate does not prevail I hope the Senator will present the amendment which he suggested represents the proper ad valorem rate; namely, a specific duty of 13 cents a pound on wool rags.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I should prefer that my colleague and associate on the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who has had this particular schedule in charge and who has managed it with such signal ability, should offer this amendment, if it meets with his approval.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am sure we have all listened with great interest to what the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] has told us. I was impressed, too, by what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] said about the effect that the iniquitous Schedule K had upon the fate of the Republican Party.

I have analyzed for my own benefit the vote yesterday. While we were defeated here in our efforts to bring down the tax upon woolen rags, I may say as a Democrat that I am proud of the fact that with nine exceptions every Member on this side of the aisle voted for what, in my opinion, is the right of the consumer. Those few Democratic Senators who voted the other way have very distinct reasons for doing so. They come from great wool-growing States, where there are great flocks of sheep. I can well understand the urge in those States for an increased tariff upon wool, and their Senators would be going against what they regard as the best interests of their constituents if they voted otherwise.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

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

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator means, of course, that they would be going against what their constituents think to be for their best interests—not what is actually for their best interests.

Mr. COPELAND. That is right. The Senator from Massachusetts and I believe that they made a mistake; that the proposed rate is not for the best interests of the woolgrowers of this country.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There is too much self-interest.

Mr. COPELAND. That is the contention we have made here.

Speaking for myself, while some sheep are raised in my State, and I have no doubt some farmers who own sheep in my State will be resentful for the moment that I am taking the position that I am, when they find out that they are going to get 2 cents a fleece increase, they will forgive me. With 100 sheep they will get \$2, or, if the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is right, 4 cents a fleece, \$4. When they discover the ridiculously small benefit, they will not be very enthusiastic over what the Republican Party has done for them when this schedule is complete.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want the RECORD to show that I made any such statement as that. I am not going to ask the Senator to explain the matter; I shall not take the time of the Senate to do it, but, just for the RECORD, I wish to say that I never made any such statement as that.

Mr. COPELAND. I will ask the Senator from Utah, since he has found fault with the statement I have just made, if the woolgrower of this country gets 3 cents increase in the tariff on wool, how much does the individual woolgrower get on a fleece?

Mr. SMOOT. Take the shrinkage at 50 per cent, and the fleece at 8 pounds—that is four pounds, and 3 cents a pound is 12 cents on a fleece of wool. The Senator can figure that very quickly himself. That is on scoured wool. I never made any such statement as 4 cents.

Mr. COPELAND. How much additional does the farmer in a county in my State get on a fleece of wool by reason of this tax?

Mr. SMOOT. More than likely the wool that is grown in New York would average more than 10 pounds to the fleece; but I am taking now the average of the whole country as 8 pounds to the fleece. That wool as it comes off will shrink 50 per cent, so that gives 4 pounds of clean wool; and that is an increase of 3 cents a pound on clean content, which means 12 cents a fleece. The Senator can figure that, can he not?

Mr. COPELAND. All right. Now I will ask the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE], who has made the statement that the increase to the farmer is from 2 to 4 cents a fleece, how does he figure that?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

Mr. BLAINE. During the discussion of paragraph 1102—that is the wool paragraph—it was admitted by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]—it was admitted by everybody who discussed it; it was not denied—that the tariff was only 50 per cent effective. If it is only 50 per cent effective, then the fleece of wool instead of receiving a benefit of 3 cents receives a benefit of only half of that. Half of 3 cents is a cent and a half. That is on clean content. A fleece of wool of 8 pounds will not yield 8 pounds of clean-content wool. It will therefore average about 1 cent a pound on the farmer's wool at 100 per cent and at 50 per cent only 4 cents. There is no question about that.

Then, Mr. President, when we take other things into consideration, the freight rates from the producer to the Boston market, the commissions, the speculative element, the storage charges, and interest, and all that sort of thing that come out of that 4 cents, there is not over 2 cents left. If I were gambling upon the proposition and had just judges to determine it, I would not gamble that the farmer would get over 3 cents out of this increase in the wool tariff on 8 pounds of wool. Eight pounds is a little more than the average fleece, as I understand it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us not take any theories at all. We are discussing the tariff on clean-content wool, 31 cents. We have increased that clean-content rate 3 cents a pound. Exactly as the wool is to-day, so it will be to-morrow or next year. If it shrinks 50 per cent, that will mean 4 pounds of clean wool to the fleece, and three times 4 cents is 12 cents. There is no doubt about that at all, and all the theory about receiving only 16 cents a pound does not change the situation at all, not in the least.

I have said before, and I say again, that if the wools sheared in the United States were skirted and the taglocks taken out and the wool put in the same condition, there would be 31 cents difference, just the same as the rate of duty, and it is that rate to-day. There is no 16 cents about it.

Mr. COPELAND. How much clean-content wool is obtained from a pound of wool in the grease?

Mr. SMOOT. The shrinkage on the average is 50 per cent; sometimes it is 33½ per cent; sometimes it is 60 per cent. The high average is 50 per cent. So, if a fleece weighs 8 pounds, you get 4 pounds of clean wool. Four pounds of clean wool at 3 cents is 12 cents. That is what they would get out of a fleece. The New York fleece, with the weight they get out of it, would be 13 cents a pound, because of the fact that the shrinkage is not as much in New York as it is where the sheep run in the hills.

Mr. COPELAND. Then the tariff is about 50 per cent effective.

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all. It is fully effective if the wool is in the same condition. There is no doubt about that. Whenever it is washed, the taglocks have to be taken off, and the skirtings have to be taken off, in the assorting of the wool. If the woolgrowers in the Western States would shear their wool at the corral, and then have it skirted and the taglocks taken out of it, just the same as is done with the Australian wool that is shipped to this country, they would get 31 cents on the scoured basis, without a question of doubt, but, no matter where it is, whether it be in Australia or whether it be in the United States, those taglocks have to be taken off the wool. They are not used, can not be used, in making cloth; they are put in the very cheapest sort of blankets, and it would be worth almost as much as the wool is worth to scour them and to get them into shape. In fact, they are thrown into the corral.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. BLAINE. The woolgrowers, or those claiming to represent the woolgrowers on the floor of the Senate, all of them, asked for an increase on wool on the plea that the present tariff was not effective, or on the statement that it was only 50 per cent effective.

Mr. SMOOT. Who?

Mr. BLAINE. The Senator from Montana, the junior Senator from Idaho—

Mr. SMOOT. The junior Senator from Idaho will never say that.

Mr. BLAINE. They said that last year they got hardly anything for the wool, for instance, only 26 cents a pound. Someone said 20 cents a pound.

Mr. SMOOT. That was at the corral, with all the taglocks in the wool, and with all the skirtings on, and with all the burrs in the wool.

Mr. BLAINE. That does not make any difference, the pennies that go into the farmer's pocket from the wool are only so much. Theoretically, on paper, you could figure out the benefits the farmer receives, but when the farmer gets the pay check, he does not get the full benefit of the tariff. He does not get over 50 per cent effectiveness from this tariff, and he does not get all of that, because there are commissions to be taken out, there are freight rates from the place of production to Boston, there is storage, there are speculative elements. There is no farm commodity in which speculation is so general as with respect to wool. So, as a matter of fact, the farmer gets mighty little out of the wool tariff. He does not get one penny over 3 cents out of his entire 8-pound fleece.

Mr. SMOOT. Where did the Senator ever get the information that there was so much involved in the speculation in wool? The great bulk of the wool is shipped on consignment, and is sold on consignment, and whatever it is sold for less the commission the farmer gets.

Mr. BLAINE. The commission merchants in wool are just as plentiful as in the grain trade, or in any of the other trades.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. BLAINE. There is the speculative element, and if the farmer would go upon a farm and raise a flock of sheep, he would find, when he got his pay check, if he had about a hundred head of sheep, that out of this 3 cents increase on the clean content, he would get between two and three dollars extra for a whole flock of a hundred. That is what he would actually get.

I can figure out what the farmer would get theoretically, exactly as the Senator has figured it out, but he does not take into account all of these elements and the actual results on the farmer's pocket. He would contend the same thing with respect to butter, and if the farmer had all of his life's savings invested in a dairy farm, if he had all of his accumulations invested in a dairy farm, he would know without any estimate on paper, he would know without any expert, that he does not get a single penny out of the 12-cent tariff on butter when he produces butter on pasturage during the summer time. I know, Mr. President, because that is my personal experience, and I put that up against the theoretical experiences of those who have the assistance of experts to figure something out on paper. That is all the farmer does get; it is a paper benefit, and not an actual benefit.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we are not talking about butter; we are talking about wool.

Mr. BLAINE. The Senator has made the same claim with respect to butter, and I make the same contention respecting butter. I make the same contention respecting practically all farm products.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. BLAINE. How much does the farmer get out of the tariff on wheat?

Mr. SMOOT. I have made a statement as to that, and I have never said the farmers got 42 cents, have never claimed they did.

Mr. BLAINE. The whole contest has gone on for three years to set up a system whereby the farmer might receive the benefit of the tariff, and everyone who has advocated a farm relief measure, whether it was the administration measure, the McNary-Haugen bill, the debenture, or any other farm relief measure, the whole argument has been upon the proposition that the tariff rates on farm products are not effective.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was discussing wool, and the Senator from New York asked me a question about wool, and that is what I am going to speak of.

Mr. COPELAND. Just a moment before the Senator answers that. The argument of the Senator from Utah about taking out the tags and rags and everything of that sort might be applied to milk. You might take out all of the fluid part of the milk and sell it for the price of the cream. Is not that what the Senator is really proposing?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly not. You can not make cloth out of dirt, can you?

Mr. COPELAND. No.

Mr. SMOOT. You can not make cloth out of grease?

Mr. COPELAND. I agree with that. Still the Senator wants to make wool out of felt roofing.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator does not want any such thing. Not only that, he could not do that if he wanted to. All of that

roofing business is nonsense as far as the rate on rags is concerned, because everybody knows that the rags that go into roofing can not be used in the manufacture of cloth. It is an entirely different proposition, and the price does not amount to anything at all per pound, whereas for the rags that go into cloth the average is 28 to 29 cents a pound.

Let us get back to wool. All of the expenses of which the Senator speaks, for handling the wool—the freight and the commission—would come out of the producer of the wool if the rate were 10 cents, or if it were 20 cents, or if it were 31 cents, or if it were 34 cents. It would be exactly the same. So whatever the producer gets over 31 cents is that much clear gain to him. The fleece will not shrink any more if it is 31 cents than if it is 34 cents. The freight rate will not be any more if it is 31 cents than if it is 34 cents. The commission will be no more if it is 31 cents than if it is 34 cents. Therefore all the increase will come to the man who produces the wool. That is 3 cents on clean-content wool.

The average weight of a fleece of wool in the United States is 8 pounds. The shrinkage is an average of 50 per cent, which gives 4 pounds of clean wool. In the State of New York the average is 4½ pounds, because the sheep do not run in the mountains as they do in the West. So I will confine myself to 4 pounds. The increase is 3 cents a pound, and that makes 12 cents for a fleece. I do not care what argument any living soul makes to the contrary, that is the fact.

Mr. COPELAND. Now, Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, why does not the Senator from New York quit? It is all over now, is it not? Is it not settled?

Mr. COPELAND. Almost, but there is one other matter I want to refer to before quitting.

Mr. NORRIS. I thought the Senator from Utah settled it.

Mr. COPELAND. This is settled.

Mr. SMOOT. It is settled.

Mr. NORRIS. Then there is no use arguing it any further.

Mr. COPELAND. No; there is not, so we will leave that.

Now I want to ask the Senator from Utah about this suit of clothes over here in the corner of the Senate. He brought in a heather-colored suit. What did he say about that suit?

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator mean the red-brown suit?

Mr. NORRIS. No; he means that silken mantle; that yellow thing.

Mr. COPELAND. No; that belongs to Mr. Grundy.

Mr. NORRIS. I thought that was Grundy's.

Mr. COPELAND. In the question I asked of the Senator from Utah I was not referring to Grundy's mantle.

Mr. NORRIS. That is Grundy's mantle.

Mr. COPELAND. I do not mean Mr. Grundy's suit. I mean the suit of the Senator from Utah, that red-brown suit. The Senator brought that in, did he not?

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator did not.

Mr. COPELAND. He had it brought in. He bought that at a store in Washington, to prove to us that one can buy a worsted suit in Washington just as cheaply as one can buy a suit made out of rags. Was not that the purpose of the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I did not say any such thing.

Mr. COPELAND. What did the Senator say?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator brought here a suit of clothes made from part rags and claimed that that suit of clothes was sold for \$25.

Mr. COPELAND. That is, the Senator from Massachusetts did that?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. That was made of part rags and it was a \$25 suit. We go down to the store and we buy a worsted suit made of all wool that sells for \$22.50.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But I give two pairs of trousers with my \$25 suit and the Senator gives only one. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and that would make the rag suit about the same as the worsted suit and no more, and we know there are no rags in the worsted suits.

Mr. COPELAND. I want to refer to that suit of clothes produced by the Senator from Utah. I am not going to mention the name of the firm making it. I saw the name on the coat, but I have no disposition to help advertise the concern.

Mr. NORRIS. Which concern?

Mr. COPELAND. The concern making the red-brown Utah suit. I want to ask the Senator from Utah why he bought the suit at that particular store?

Is it not true that the establishment selling this red-brown heather-colored suit makes a great point of the fact that it buys its yard goods directly from the factory, manufactures its own clothing, and sells without the intervention of pyramided profits?

Mr. SMOOT. It may happen.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Surely the Senator from New York does not mean to insinuate that against my retail-price store the Senator from Utah has set up a wholesale-price store and is comparing wholesale prices with my retail prices? Is that the suggestion of the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator did not suggest that. That is the price in San Francisco and the price anywhere in the United States. They make the goods and sell the goods.

Mr. COPELAND. That is to say, that is the price fixed by this particular concern?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. Why did the Senator select that concern and not go out and buy a suit at random, buy a suit from some concern where the merchant has to go and buy from the wholesale clothier and he in turn through the various pyramiding processes back to the manufacturer of the woolen goods?

Mr. SMOOT. Why did the carded-woolen people go and select the suit over here covered with wool rags and say that that is what we should impose a duty upon? That is why. [Laughter.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am afraid this controversy is going to be the subject of an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission because of the unfair practices indulged in. I think the Senators who run the respective stores ought to stay within the fair-practices provision of the Federal trade act.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. It is conceded now, I think, that we have a case right here in the Senate where there is unfair practice.

The Senator from New York in his very shrewd questioning has made the Senator from Utah admit that he was not following a business course, but that he was violating the ethics of the trade. He was going wrong, and there is no question about it, all because the Senator from Massachusetts went wrong. That, of course, in the estimation of the Senator from Utah, is good reason for going wrong, and I am not sure but what he is right. We ought to call to the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts the great wrong and sin that comes from his wrongdoing. He has misled the Senator from Utah and caused the Senator from Utah to do something which, I presume, he would not do if he had not been driven into it by the unfair competition of the Senator from Massachusetts. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator from Massachusetts has done wrong to the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Massachusetts and I will settle it and no one else need interfere.

Mr. NORRIS. There we go again!

Mr. COPELAND. Conspiracy!

Mr. NORRIS. That shows just how big business gets together and fixes up a job and enters into collusion and the poor fellows who are the consumers have to suffer. Here is the Senator from Utah, a great manufacturer of woolen goods—

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no, no.

Mr. NORRIS. The proprietor of a great, big store over here in the corner on our side of the Senate Chamber, entering into an illegal conspiracy with the proprietor of another big store over on the Democratic side of the Chamber, to mulct the poor public. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. Let us get back to the tariff. I would like to have the tariff discussed now.

Mr. COPELAND. Will the Senator sit down for a moment, and then we will get back to the tariff.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York declines to yield further.

Mr. SMOOT. I will sit down for more than a moment.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator wants to speak now, I will let him proceed.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want to take the Senator off his feet.

(At this point Mr. COPELAND yielded to Mr. TYDINGS to have an editorial read, which appears at the conclusion of Mr. ALLEN's remarks.)

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I want to say a little bit more about this heather-colored suit. I am advised that the makers of that garment fix a price schedule for yard goods they will buy. They go to the factories, take off-style or off-season material, off-style in color or seconds in quality, sometimes worsted goods, perhaps once out of ten times worsted, and the other nine times woolen. They buy this material in the factory at a low price, a price which the concern itself fixes. Then they take that cloth themselves and manufacture it into garments without the intervention of the various trade

processes which are common in the ordinary course of business. Of course, they can sell an occasional worsted garment at a price that will compete with the 2-trousers suit made out of imported rags. That is the fact as I understand it, and I ask the Senator from Utah if that is not true?

Mr. SMOOT. Stein-Bloch, Kuppenheimer, and Hart Shaffner & Marx are, I suppose, the highest grade and largest manufacturers of clothing in the United States. I have sold to each of those three concerns nearly the full product of a mill. They buy from the mill and they buy almost the full production of the mill. That would only be a part of what they would really want or use. They are doing no different than all the other great clothing concerns. They buy direct from the mill, they make the goods, and they sell direct to the trade.

Mr. COPELAND. Just a moment! Do these high-grade concerns of which the Senator speaks sell goods of the same quality and of the same price to the same class of customers as the suit under discussion?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think they would handle any kind of clothing like that shown by the Senator from Massachusetts here. I do not think they would ever buy a piece of that kind. But they do sell suits of clothes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.
Mr. NORRIS. I would like to suggest to the Senator from New York that he asked a very positive question. Did he notice how positively the Senator from Utah has answered him?

Mr. COPELAND. I am going to get an answer, but I have not had it yet.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator from Utah gave a positive, unequivocal answer.

Mr. COPELAND. I want to know about this suit of clothes exhibited by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator about the manufacturers of that suit of clothes that they go to the mill just as the other clothing manufacturers do, and they buy the number of yards of cloth that they want. As far as seconds are concerned, no manufacturer buys all seconds. In weaving sometimes there is a pick dropped and it is not mended in the finishing. It is a pick, perhaps, that would occur once in 10 or 15 yards. For every pick that is dropped in this way, the manufacturer of the cloth is required to allow one-eighth of a yard for that mispick, or so-called second.

Sometimes in a bolt of cloth of 52 yards or 50 yards there may be 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 of those picks. If there are 8 of them, there would be an allowance of 1 yard of cloth. They cut around those picks, just the same as the people making the suit of clothes exhibited on the Democratic side of the Chamber and just the same as the man who made the suit of clothes displayed on the Republican side of the Chamber. There is not a particle of difference.

Mr. NORRIS. That is an answer, I will say to the Senator from New York.

Mr. SMOOT. Not only that, but the suits are sold in all parts of the United States. They are sold direct from the manufacturer to the retailer, just the same as many other concerns in the United States sell their clothing to the retailer.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senate is it fair to exhibit here a suit of clothes made of pure wool, which we would have a right to assume was taken at random from the shelves of a merchant in this city, and represent that all the people can go into the various markets of the United States and buy clothing of pure wool, the argument being that goods made of imported rags are not needed by the American people because worsted goods can be purchased at the same price? I say it is unfair. I do not want to and I do not reflect upon anybody.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know where that suit of clothes came from?

Mr. COPELAND. All I know is the name on the suit.
Mr. SMOOT. I refer to the suit of clothes which the Senator has on the chair beside him?

Mr. COPELAND. No; I do not know anything about it.
Mr. SMOOT. If I am not mistaken, it comes from the American Woolen Co.

Mr. COPELAND. I do not know where it comes from.
Mr. SMOOT. I think that is where it came from.

Mr. COPELAND. Is that some company that we ought to hate?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not hate any of them. They are doing the same identical business that other people are doing.

Mr. COPELAND. Am I being contaminated by touching the suit?

Mr. SMOOT. Some may feel that way; I do not know,

Mr. NORRIS. "Love one another."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that Senators desiring to interrupt must first address the Chair. The Chair is going to have that rule observed hereafter.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I do not care what the Senator from Utah says or how many exhibits he brings here, the fact remains that the poor man who wants to buy a suit of decent clothes can not afford to buy one which is made of worsted and he can not find in the usual run of stores a suit of clothes or an overcoat made of domestic rags that will compare with those which are made from the imported rags.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.
Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator has not forgotten the fact, as pointed out yesterday, that in case an embargo shall be placed upon imported rags the people of America can buy clothing made from domestic rags which are now used to make paper and felt roofing.

Mr. COPELAND. I think we should leave it to the Senator from Nebraska to point out the distinctions that will be made in the future between the true patriots who wear clothing made of felt roofing and paper rags and those who will wear worsted clothing.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield further to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.
Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In view of the unfair competition that has been pointed out by the Senator from New York between the little store I set up here and the big store set up by my distinguished friend from Utah, can he not now understand the reason why we have been so overwhelmingly defeated in every effort to reduce the tariff rate proposed on wool rags?

Mr. COPELAND. I begin to understand it. It is amazing to think that an industry which is well organized and can command the services of a brilliant man like Mr. Grundy, under such leadership, can control legislation. They do not buy legislation; they simply seduce Members of Congress and lead them to vote for these outrageous tariff rates.

I have an interest, and I know every Senator here has, in the poor. The only difference between my position and that of other Senators is that I know more poor than they do. Legislation is now being proposed which will impose a further burden upon every wage earner in America. The Senator from Utah yesterday brushed aside as unworthy of confidence a statement put into the RECORD by the Senator from Massachusetts, a report of the Tariff Commission, pointing out that under the operations of this bill as proposed by the Finance Committee the cost of a suit of clothing such as this [indicating] will be increased \$2.16, and that the cost of an overcoat made of the same material will be increased by \$4.55.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.
Mr. SMOOT. I told the Senate on yesterday that it was not a report of the Tariff Commission which the Senator from Massachusetts produced, and I wish again to say that it was not a report of the Tariff Commission. I make that statement by way of merely a correction.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from Massachusetts put the report in the RECORD. May I ask him by whom it was prepared?
Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It was a compilation or report made by experts of the Tariff Commission with the approval of the Tariff Commission, but I suppose it might technically be said not to have been signed by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator has gone too far in saying that it was approved by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I requested experts of the Tariff Commission to work out a report showing what the increased cost would be.

Mr. SMOOT. The American Woolen Co. submitted certain figures, which they said they wanted the tariff experts to check; and they checked the figures on the basis of which the American Woolen Co. submitted them. That is all.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think it is only fair to say that the premise upon which the report was made was presented to the experts, but the report was worked out by them. Let me suggest to the Senator from Utah and the Senator from New York how useless is the Tariff Commission if it can not give us an estimate of the increase in the cost of commodities to the public by reason of increased tariff duties, providing the

increased duties become effective. It seems to me that it is one of the primary functions of a tariff commission, namely, to give an estimate of how much tariff duties such as are being levied, especially in the pending bill, are going to cost the American people when it is conceded that the duties will be effective. It is no more, in my opinion, than the proper function of the Tariff Commission to furnish such estimates. That is what they have done in this instance; they have furnished an estimate of how much more a suit of clothes and an overcoat will cost, assuming that the duty will be effective in increasing the price.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from Massachusetts has every reason to believe, of course, that the figures he has cited are accurate?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. I refer to the figures which he put in the Record. The Senator believes that they are accurate?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will say to the Senator that they are accurate, and not only that, but some weeks ago five different manufacturers of woolen goods, who were at that time in my office, at my request worked out a computation to show what the increased cost would be in the case of woolen clothing and woolen overcoats. They discussed and argued the matter and went over the figures again and again and reached the conclusion that the figures, which I put in the Record toward the end of the previous session, as to the increase in the case of a suit of clothes being \$2.16 were correct; in fact, if I remember rightly, they said that the increase would be about \$2.79 in the case of a suit of clothes, and in the case of an overcoat the increased price would be about the same as indicated by me. So, from two sources this information has come as to what the increased cost will be.

Mr. COPELAND. Of course, it stands to reason that the purpose of the increased tariff is to increase the price and profits. For what other reason would an increase in the tariff duty be made? We do not revise the tariff rates and increase them merely to clutter up the law books. We do it because we expect the price of the commodity to be increased, so that the people will be driven to the use of pure wool instead of substitutes for wool.

I have no technical knowledge on the subject, but the Senator from Massachusetts has assured us that the experts who have made the computations say that a suit of clothes such as this [indicating] will cost two or three dollars more than it costs now if this bill shall pass, and that an overcoat will cost four or five dollars more.

Mr. President, the people of the United States will know what the difference is when they come to buy their winter garments next fall and next winter. There will be a sure test then, and after a couple of winters there will not be any need to import any rags, for there will be enough rags in the United States from the poor of this country to supply the rags needed to make the garments for those who are well to do.

As has been pointed out there are two branches of this industry—the woolen mills and the worsted mills. There are many woolen mills in my State. I have a letter from the owner of one of them who employs 750 men.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And women.

Mr. COPELAND. It so happens that in this mill the employees are all men. The writer of the letter makes the point that an increase in this rate will mean that many families will suffer if the increase shall go into effect.

A telegram handed me since I came to the floor this afternoon from a concern in my State says:

Any duty over 9 cents a pound really prohibitive, whether 12 or 28 cents a pound. Compromising at anything over 9 cents will defeat your entirely correct argument.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does the Senator from New York know how many woolen mills there are in New York State?

Mr. COPELAND. I do not.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator is aware of the fact that there are 500 in the whole country?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; and many of them are in my State. In the pathetic letters which come to me from those mills the fact is pointed out that they have not been organized; that they have not been brought together in one group, with a great Grundy to lead them, but that they have to depend upon their individual efforts to impress upon the Congress their necessities.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the letter to which the Senator refers came from a manufacturer of felt and not a woolen manufacturer.

Mr. COPELAND. That concern, however, uses woolen rags in making felt, does it not?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it uses rags in making felt; but, of course, felt is not clothing.

Mr. COPELAND. I will ask the Senator to come over and look at some other letters I have; there are plenty of them.

Mr. SMOOT. I say the letter to which the Senator referred is from a felt manufacturer. The reason I doubted that he was a woolen manufacturer was because all the employees of his mill were men. That would not be the case in a woolen mill.

Mr. COPELAND. Is that manufacturer going to suffer any when this increased tariff rate shall be adopted?

Mr. SMOOT. He will have to pay more for his rags.

Mr. COPELAND. Then, even though he makes felt and even though he employs men, he will have to pay more for his rags; and there will be fewer to buy his product. Nobody is going to suffer. Prices are going to be increased for the overburdened poor already breaking under the burden of their bills—oh, no; they are not going to suffer. I wish I could take the complacency and certainty of the Senator from Utah and transplant them into the hearts of the people in my State who are going to suffer next fall when they come to buy these garments.

Here is another side of the matter that the Senator from Utah has not thought about. Has the Senator thought of the fact that when we place an embargo upon European rags, there will be rags in Europe just the same? What are they going to do with them? Are they going to dump them into the flooded Thames or burn them up? They are not. They are going to put them into textiles that will be brought here and sold. With the passage of this bill, and the loss of demand for rags on the part of American importers, there will be a marked fall in the price of the rags on the other side.

Mr. SMOOT. We have provided for that.

Mr. COPELAND. Oh, you have provided for that?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, they get us coming and going. No matter what happens, provision has been made for it. We can not hope to defeat the machinations and skill and mental alertness of Mr. Grundy. He has prepared for all emergencies. I had hoped that by reason of the decline in the price of these rags there might be brought in a textile which could be sold to the poor, if they saw fit to buy it, at a price within their means; but the Senator from Utah assures me, "We have provided for that." Now, what can we do? What can we do?

I notice that the Senator has provided for another thing. Wherever rayon is used as an adulterant, no matter how small the quantity, in several places in the bill there is a provision that a high price shall be put upon the product. Is it not so? That provision is found in paragraph 1309, I believe. Provision is made for it. There is not any trouble about that. Here it is:

PAR. 1309. Knit fabric, in the piece, wholly or in chief value of rayon or other synthetic textile, 45 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem; gloves, mittens, underwear, outerwear, and articles of all kinds, knit or crocheted, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of rayon or other synthetic textile, 45 cents per pound and 65 per cent ad valorem; hose and half hose wholly or in part of rayon or other synthetic textile, 45 cents per pound and 65 per cent ad valorem.

Then there is a general provision made that covers all cases where rayon is used in any quantity whatever. Here it is—silk, paragraph 1208. That refers, then, to paragraph 1309:

Hose and half hose, in part of rayon or other synthetic textile, shall be classified under paragraph 1309.

So we will find here somewhere that if any substitute for wool rags is used, an extra duty will be put on.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator does not want to try to have the Senate believe any such thing as that. This is the silk schedule.

Mr. COPELAND. I know it.

Mr. SMOOT. It has nothing to do with wool.

Mr. COPELAND. But, Mr. President, will the Senator tell the Senate where provision has been made about that in the wool schedule—that if anything except wool rags is used, if it should be rayon or something else, a special duty is provided for it?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is mistaken. I do not want to interrupt him if he does not want to be interrupted, but, really, this has reference to silk.

Mr. COPELAND. Oh, I know it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. In paragraph 1114 (b), relating to hose, half hose, gloves, mittens, and so forth, there is a provision that—

Hose and half hose, in part of rayon or other synthetic textile, shall be classified under paragraph 1309.

That probably is what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. SMOOT. Is that what the Senator from New York means?

Mr. COPELAND. What paragraph is that?

Mr. GEORGE. Paragraph 1114 (b). The provision at the end of subparagraph (b) is that "hose and half hose, in part"—not in chief value, but in part—"of rayon or other synthetic textile, shall be classified under paragraph 1309."

Mr. COPELAND. That is it. They have not overlooked anything.

Mr. President, I know how utterly futile it is to talk about these things. I have been amazed to read the eastern newspapers during the last couple of days. They make almost no reference to the wool schedule or to its significance. I am not finding any fault about that; but it just shows how difficult it is to impress upon the American people at the time of the debate the significance of what is going on.

The people can not be fooled. They are not going to be fooled when they come to vote next fall for Members of Congress. By that time they will know what has been going on here. By that time they will have had the higher prices forced upon them by the shopkeepers of America—and I say that without reflection upon the shopkeepers. They can not help it; but the people can not be fooled. Mark my words, Senators: Unless there is a strong, overwhelming sentiment in your State for these rates on wool because of the raising there of large numbers of sheep—unless there is that to give you aid and comfort, take my word for it that there will be some vacant chairs here when we reorganize the Senate a year from next March. I am fond of a lot of Senators, who, in my opinion, are in danger, and I hope they will take warning.

Mr. President, we are talking about the poor man's wool—as compared with the total consumption of wool, a very small quantity. There could be a concession made on the part of the majority. The Republicans of this Chamber could concede much, lower the rate materially, and not damage the woolgrowers one iota. But you are in the saddle, riding for a fall, in my judgment. Go ahead and pass this tax; increase the cost of the poor man's clothing; make the wage earner of America, struggling now to live, pay more for his overcoat and his wife's cloak and the garments of his children. Go ahead; go ahead. That is your privilege; but I would rather lose my sight and my hearing than to have a part in imposing upon the poor of America the burdens that will be placed there by the adoption of this schedule.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I do not desire to address the Senate at this time; but in order that the RECORD may be complete I should like to have some insertions made in the record of this debate.

First, I request to have read an advertisement by the National Wool Growers' Association entitled "Giving the Public the Facts About Wool," published in *The Outlook* for November 15, 1924. I should like to have that read. It is very short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

[Advertisement by the National Wool Growers' Association, entitled "Giving the Public the Facts About Wool," in *The Outlook* for November 15, 1924]

Fair rates of duty upon imported wools have been established by the Sixty-seventh Congress. The President, through the Tariff Commission, may raise or lower such rates by 50 per cent, according to the occurrence of changes in the relation of home-production costs to those found to obtain in exporting countries * * *.

These fair and impartial provisions of the wool duty form a part of the enlightened new policy expressed by the Congress just adjourned toward the agricultural industry, giving the rural citizenship the same consideration in commercial policies as was previously accorded only to the manufacturing industries.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, at the convention of the National Wool Growers' Association in San Francisco in January, 1925, F. J. Hagenbarth, president, expressed the opinion that the demand for wool would justify an increase of sheep flocks by about 15,000,000 head. With this view S. W. McClure, former secretary of the association, dis-

agreed, as appeared in an article appearing in the *National Wool Grower* for March, 1925.

I would like to have that statement by Mr. McClure inserted in the RECORD, as it points out the possibility of too high a tariff duty upon wool resulting in decreasing the price the woolgrower would get for his product.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

I note that at the national convention in San Francisco it was stated that there was room in the United States for about 15,000,000 more sheep. I feel that this is bad advice, for it would result in decreasing the price of lambs by around 50 per cent. If our sheep stocks were to be increased by 15,000,000, it would mean an increase of ewes by 12,000,000 head, that ought to yield annually 7,000,000 marketable lambs after making deduction for loss and carry-over to maintain the stock. We are now slaughtering in this country around 14,000,000 sheep a year. An increase of 7,000,000 would be just 50 per cent. In my judgment, a 50 per cent increase in lambs would mean a decrease of fully 50 per cent in the present price of fat lambs. In my opinion, if our lamb supplies were increased by even 2,000,000 head, a remarkable decrease in the price would follow. Aside from the decrease in price there would be increased cost of handling all the sheep in the West. Labor would be scarcer, pasture rentals higher, hay and grain dearer. In every way the cost of handling sheep would be increased; yet the income, by reason of overproduction, would be decreased.

Anyhow, I am of the opinion that the ranges of the West are fully stocked, or nearly so. If there is any spare range, some one will find it, and, if they do not, no harm will be done, as some of our range needs a short rest.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that the lamb market is extremely fickle. The appetite for lamb is not general. Only a small portion of our people eat lamb, and before the general public will eat lamb it must sell at about the same price as beef or pork, which would be far below cost of production.

As to the wool side of the question, there is no shortage of wool when the situation is analyzed. We import about one-third of our wool used for clothing; but remember that much of this consists of grades of wool that we do not produce in this country—70s and above, 40s and below, and wools having peculiar qualities. When these grades are subtracted from our imports it is seen that we are fairly well taking care of domestic needs with domestic wool.

The law of supply and demand regulates prices, and any increase means lower prices.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I also ask that a letter from the Berkshire Woolen Co. be printed in the RECORD, together with a table setting forth the tariff duties on wool rags in ad valorem equivalents, based upon the value of rags that have been imported.

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

BERKSHIRE WOOLEN CO.,
Pittsfield, Mass., July 23, 1929.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I am presuming to inclose herewith a communication received this morning from Mr. R. L. Keeney, Somersville, Conn., who was formerly president of the American Association of Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers. This communication has to do with the tariff on wool, noils, and by-products, and it appeals to me as being a very concise statement of the situation.

We will certainly appreciate any possible thing you may be able to do in the interests of the textile industry in New England, and especially in Massachusetts. I am sure that you are so familiar with the present status of the business that it is unnecessary for me to make any further suggestions.

Apologizing for the liberty I am taking, believe me, with kind regards,
Very sincerely yours,

J. R. SAVERY.

[From the office of R. L. Keeney, Somersville, Conn., formerly president American Association of Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers]

JULY 19, 1929.

GENTLEMEN: As a manufacturer of woolen cloth, whether you use virgin wool entirely or wool by-products, such as garnetts, noils, wastes, and shoddies, you should be vitally interested in the move on the part of the woolgrowers at Washington at the last hearing before the Finance Committee to put prohibitive rates on the importation of these raw materials coming under paragraph 1105 in section 11 of the wool schedule.

For your information the brief presented to the Finance Committee by the woolgrowers asked the committee to place prohibitive rates on all such materials. This brief was supported by another brief presented by N. B. K. Brooks, of Boston, working with Joseph Grundy, of Philadelphia, advocating the same prohibitive rates. The brief presented by

Mr. Hobbs, president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, opposed these prohibitive rates, and the writer appeared personally before the committee and as vigorously as possible in the short space of time allowed attempted to convince the Senate Finance Committee that the woolgrowers were wrong, in the first place, in asking for these prohibitive rates, laboring under the misapprehension that they would be benefited in that their wools would be more sought after and prices would be higher, without, however, considering the damage they would be doing to another industry if they succeeded in their purpose. The writer stated that he did not believe the Finance Committee or Congress intended to benefit one industry at the expense of another industry, which they would be doing in this case even if the woolgrowers were right in their assumption that prohibitive rates would benefit them.

Having agreed to reduce the tariff from 34 cents to 24 cents on wools of 44's grade and under and also having enlarged the free list for carpet wools the woolgrowers seemed to feel that they must have something besides 3 cents more on fine wools to compensate them for these concessions they had made to the importers and users of foreign wools.

They have picked out section 1105 and state openly that their purpose is to place a prohibitive tariff on worsted wastes of all description—noils, garnetts, and rags. Their claim is that these materials displace virgin wool and therefore should carry the same or higher duty than virgin wool, which is, of course, absurd. The writer claims that they should carry a relative duty, as they have a relative value.

The Ways and Means Committee of 1922 considered this subject, as did the Finance Committee in the same session of Congress. Their decision was that these wastes, etc., should carry relative duties, as they did in the tariff act passed at that time. The Ways and Means Committee of the House in 1929, after listening to all the arguments of the woolgrowers, were again of the opinion that these materials should carry relative duties, and the Hawley tariff bill added additional duty to these materials only in proportion to the increase on raw wool, approximately 10 per cent.

At a meeting recently in Boston, called for the purpose of considering this matter by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, it was the consensus of opinion of the woolen manufacturers present interested in these materials that no compromise with the woolgrowers whatsoever could be made in regard to these rates as shown in the Hawley tariff bill. Any compromise that would not materially injure the woolen mills would be of no value to the woolgrowers in their purpose to prohibit importation, therefore how could any compromise that they would accept be made? The woolen manufacturers decided emphatically they would make their fight on the rates as passed in the Hawley tariff in the House and stand pat on those rates.

It was the claim of the woolen mills at that meeting that prohibitive duties on the raw materials would not increase the consumption of domestic wool but would increase the use of cheaper shoddies and wastes using less wool than before, because we must keep our fabrics within a certain price range. Any woolen manufacturer knows that it is easier to spin yarns from virgin wool of good, long staple than it is from short wastes and shoddies. We are, however, in a position where we must cater to our customers who demand fabrics at certain prices. To meet those prices we must use cheaper materials than virgin wool.

When asked by the members of the Senate committee if the woolgrowers could eventually furnish 100 per cent of the fine and medium wools consumed in this country, Mr. Hagenbarth replied that the woolgrowers would be able to accomplish that in about 10 years' time. The question in the writer's mind and others was—would there be any woolen mills left at the end of that 10 years to use the wool that the woolgrowers were going to provide?

Mr. Hagenbarth also claimed that the importation of 25,000,000 pounds of wastes, garnetts, etc., displaced 100,000,000 pounds of grease wool, assuming the grease wools shrank 75 per cent. Considering the fact that all the wool grown in this country is consumed by the domestic manufacturers and many million pounds are imported to make up for the deficiency, he was asked where the manufacturers could get this 100,000,000 pounds, and he was forced to admit that they would have to import the 100,000,000 pounds, which would naturally increase costs of domestic wools and probably foreign wools.

Manufacturers of virgin-wool fabrics would naturally be interested in any move on the part of the woolgrowers or others to increase the cost of their raw materials. If manufacturers of medium-priced goods, using wastes, shoddies, etc., are forced to use virgin wool, naturally the price of virgin wool will increase, and, furthermore, the market on virgin-wool fabrics will be much more competitive.

In the writer's opinion, this is why manufacturers of virgin-wool fabrics are nearly as much interested in this attempt to increase prices of raw materials as the users of these raw materials themselves.

If the cost of the raw materials used by woolen mills increases, the competition with worsteds will be very much harder to combat, as the natural tendency of buyers in this country to-day on suitings, especially, seems to be toward worsteds.

The statement is frequently made that even if the Finance Committee decides not to increase these rates as per the request of the woolgrowers, that the woolgrowers will make their fight on the floor of the Senate.

The writer is of the opinion that even if they do they will lose, because the move to place a prohibitive tariff on raw materials will not stand publicity.

President Hoover has repeatedly expressed his views against large increases in tariff rates. He certainly would not favor prohibitive rates on raw materials used by the woolen mills.

Regardless of the amount of importations, whether high or low, of these materials, if the prohibitive rates were placed on these materials we would be confined to our domestic market in our purchases, and in times of large demand the prices might be considerably raised on us as we would have no other source of supply. If we have the foreign market, even with fair tariff rates, we have another source of supply, which tends to balance the prices on these materials in this country. This was shown very clearly when the demand became so heavy for fine noils during the last two or three years. Even with the foreign market the price on fine noils went far higher than anyone would expect it would go.

Although we are in good hands in Washington, the feeling among our friends there is that every move we can make to counteract this drive of the woolgrowers against us should be made. It is, therefore, the writer's opinion that you should immediately take steps to inform your Senators and Congressmen and other Senators whom you may wish to write or any Senators who are members of the Finance Committee of your feelings in regard to this attempt to further cripple the woolen industry.

You may not agree with the writer on some of these points but you must realize that increased costs of raw materials to you will greatly handicap you in meeting competition with worsted manufacturers and also in meeting certain prices that your customers demand in order to keep their garments within certain price ranges.

In writing, do not fail to stress the point that medium-priced overcoatings and suitings carrying a certain fair percentage of wastes, shoddies, noils, etc., together with virgin wool make serviceable, honest fabrics at prices that are within the reach of the average working man who can not afford to pay the terrific high prices he would be called upon to pay if all cloths were made of virgin wool. We are catering to the masses of people, giving them serviceable fabrics to go into garments that can be bought at fair prices.

We, therefore, are entitled to and should have fair consideration of our claims. We are not asking for any increased protection whatsoever except the natural compensatory increase that we would get from any increased tariff on raw wool.

Personally, the writer is of the opinion we would be better off with no new tariff bill whatsoever than with the present tariff bill which they are drawing up at Washington. Three cents a pound on virgin wool is going to be a handicap to both worsted and woolen manufacturers and this increase in cost will probably have to be absorbed by the manufacturer or cutter. Most of you will admit that there is very little room in your margin of profit to absorb any increase of this kind.

Very truly yours,

R. L. KEENEY.

Tariff duties on wool rags in ad valorem equivalents based on value of rags imported

Duty per pound	Value per pound	Ad valorem equivalent of the duty
Act of 1922:		
7.5 cents.....	15 cents.....	50 per cent.
Do.....	22.5 cents.....	33½ per cent.
Do.....	28.6 cents.....	26 per cent.
Do.....	30 cents.....	25 per cent.
Do.....	45 cents.....	16½ per cent.
Do.....	60 cents.....	12½ per cent.
Do.....	75 cents.....	10 per cent.
Senate bill:		
24 cents.....	15 cents.....	160 per cent.
Do.....	22.5 cents.....	107 per cent.
Do.....	28.6 cents.....	84 per cent.
Do.....	30 cents.....	80 per cent.
Do.....	45 cents.....	53 per cent.
Do.....	60 cents.....	40 per cent.
Do.....	75 cents.....	33 per cent.

Rags have averaged 35 per cent as high in price as raw wool, on the British market, the rags being of a grade commercially free of cotton. On the value basis the duty on rags therefore should be 35 per cent as high as the duty on raw wool; i. e., with wool at 34 cents, rags should be 12 cents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. BLAINE. 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:

Allen	Fletcher	Keyes	Smith
Ashurst	Frazier	La Follette	Smoot
Baird	George	McCulloch	Steck
Barkley	Gillett	McKellar	Steiwer
Bingham	Glass	McMaster	Sullivan
Blaine	Glenn	McNary	Swanson
Blease	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Gould	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Greene	Norbeck	Townsend
Brock	Hale	Norris	Trammell
Brookhart	Harris	Nye	Tydings
Broussard	Harrison	Oddie	Vandenberg
Capper	Hatfield	Phipps	Wagner
Caraway	Hawes	Pine	Walcott
Connally	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Hebert	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Heflin	Sackett	Waterman
Cutting	Howell	Schall	Watson
Dale	Johnson	Sheppard	Wheeler
Dill	Jones	Shortridge	
Fess	Kean	Simmons	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment which the Secretary will report.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] moves, on page 173, line 4, after the first semicolon, to strike out the remainder of line 4 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Wool rags, valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, 8 cents per pound; valued at more than 30 cents per pound but not more than 50 cents per pound, 12 cents per pound; valued at more than 50 cents per pound, 16 cents per pound.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would like to address a suggestion to the Senator from Rhode Island. During the course of the debate it has been pointed out that the great volume of wool rags are worth less than 30 cents per pound; therefore that the large percentage of the imported wool rags would fall within the lower bracket, and carry a rate of 8 cents per pound.

I suggest to the Senator that he perfect his amendment by striking out the figures "30" on lines 3 and 4 and inserting "25." That would assure the great bulk of the imported rags based upon present values coming in under the 12-cent rate, and that is about the ad valorem rate which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] pointed out in his able address earlier in the day.

Mr. METCALF. I agree to that suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator modify his amendment?

Mr. METCALF. I modify the amendment as suggested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HEFLIN (when Mr. BLACK's name was called). My colleague [Mr. BLACK] is absent on account of illness in his family. If he were present, he would vote "yea." He is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], who would vote "nay" if present and at liberty to vote.

Mr. HATFIELD (when Mr. GOFF's name was called). My colleague [Mr. GOFF] has a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when Mr. HASTINGS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. HASTINGS] is paired on this vote with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay," and, I understand, the Senator from Arkansas, if present, would vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when Mr. KENDRICK's name was called). The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. I do not know how he would vote if present, and in his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is necessarily detained on official business. His pair has been announced.

I also desire to announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] is necessarily absent on official business, and that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is detained from the Senate by reason of illness.

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHEPSTEAD]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. SCHALL. I would like to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHEPSTEAD]. He has gone South for his health by order of his physician. He is paired on this question with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK].

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—35

Barkley	Fletcher	Hebert	Smith
Bingham	George	Heflin	Steck
Blaine	Gillett	Keyes	Swanson
Blease	Glass	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Brock	Gould	McKellar	Tydings
Caraway	Hale	Metcalf	Wagner
Copeland	Harris	Moses	Walcott
Couzens	Harrison	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Hawes	Simmons	

NAYS—46

Allen	Frazier	McNary	Steiwer
Ashurst	Glenn	Norbeck	Sullivan
Baird	Goldsborough	Nye	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Greene	Oddie	Townsend
Bratton	Hatfield	Phipps	Trammell
Brookhart	Hayden	Pine	Vandenberg
Broussard	Howell	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Capper	Johnson	Sackett	Waterman
Connally	Jones	Schall	Watson
Cutting	Kean	Sheppard	Wheeler
Dill	McCulloch	Shortridge	
Fess	McMaster	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—14

Black	Kendrick	Ransdell	Shipstead
Deneen	King	Reed	Stephens
Goff	Overman	Robinson, Ark.	
Hastings	Patterson	Robinson, Ind.	

So Mr. METCALF's substitute for Mr. WATSON's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I send to the desk my amendment to the amendment and ask to have it reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 173, in line 4, the Senator from Connecticut proposes to strike out "18 cents per pound" and insert "40 per cent ad valorem," so as to read:

Wool rags, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the committee recommended 24 cents a pound on wool rags. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] has moved to insert 18 cents instead of 24 cents a pound. The amendment which I propose to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana places the question of wool rags on an ad valorem basis.

As has been very ably pointed out by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], putting a specific duty as high as 18 or 24 cents a pound on rags amounts in the case of some rags to nearly 200 per cent ad valorem duty, and it amounts in the case of the average rags as imported during the past two years, if the Senate Finance Committee amendment is adopted, to nearly 100 per cent ad valorem. If the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is adopted, it amounts to 65 per cent ad valorem on the average rags, very much less on the high-grade rags, and more on the low-grade rags.

It seems to me that the only fair thing to do is to try to see that the same rate shall apply on the highest type of rags as applies on the lowest type of cheap rags. Having put a rate of 40 per cent ad valorem on the value of the rags, the woolgrowers would get a 24-cent rate on the better or high-grade rags mentioned sometimes as costing 60 cents and more a pound. Rags coming in at a value of 60 cents a pound under a 40 per cent ad valorem rate would pay 24 cents a pound or more.

On the other hand, cheap rags coming in of the character of rags that we export or a little better at 10 cents a pound would only pay 4 cents a pound, whereas the average-price rags coming in at 28 cents a pound would pay a little less than 12 cents a pound; and if the rate which has prevailed several times in recent years of 30 cents a pound for imported rags should again prevail, the rate of 40 per cent ad valorem would give a straight 12 cents a pound duty on the rags.

The manufacturers say that if the rate is raised to more than 10 cents a pound they will have to use less virgin wool and more shoddy from the rags. If the rate is made as high as the Senate Finance Committee recommended, of course it is practically a prohibitive rate and they will have to go to some other kind of substitute. It seems to me only fair that rags brought in of a very fine character should pay an approximately high rate of duty and those of a cheap character should pay a low rate of duty. Therefore by making the rate 40 per cent ad valorem we get a 12-cent rate on the usual or average type of rag produced

and we get 24 cents per pound if the rag imported is 60 cents a pound or better.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, all the rest of the items in this schedule being on a specific basis, clean-content wool itself being upon a specific basis, I see no advantage, but a considerable disadvantage, in departing from the specific basis and going to an ad valorem basis with respect to wool rags.

In the first place, every disturbance in the Old World, whence these rags are to come, every depression in the market in the Old World, would mean that the American producers would be despoiled of just that much protection. Any adverse opinion that operates against the rights of Americans abroad would tend to undermine the wool tariff which we are enacting here for the benefit of the wool producers.

Moreover, there is nothing I know of to prevent the commingling of these rags in great bales. There is nothing to prevent honest declarations being made by importers concerning the value, and by reason of the commingling, the average, the class of rags in the bales would be such that importers would bring the whole thing in at a very low rate—though not the purpose of the Senator proposing the amendment—the whole effect would be to depress and decrease the duty on rags and put it upon such a low plane that it would be an inadequate protection to the growers of wool.

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

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the bales are composed of rags of the make which the Senator suggests, the price offered for the rags in the bale will be in accordance with the ability of the producer of shoddy to pick those rags and make shoddy out of them, will it not?

Mr. STEIWER. Not necessarily.

Mr. BINGHAM. Upon what does the price of rags depend?

Mr. STEIWER. The contracts for the purchase of rags are made in the Old World. They are bought possibly in job lots. They are bought under conditions where labor is cheap. It is possible for those who are in charge of the importing to reclassify and change the bales, to buy in one way and import in another way. I do not believe that we are so lacking in sophistication that we can assume that our Customs Service will get a fair deal upon a proposition of this kind, nor will the producers of wool get a fair deal.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator realizes that a very large percentage of our duties are on the ad valorem basis. It has been frequently said there is some difficulty in securing a proper basis which the Treasury Department may use as a basis.

Mr. STEIWER. Why invite that difficulty when we have had good results from the historical practice of adopting specific duties upon those goods?

Mr. BINGHAM. All I have to point out in answer to the question of the Senator from Oregon is that the reason for inviting it is so that we may not place a 100 per cent ad valorem duty on the rags that go into the overcoatings and suits which are sold at the low prices and a very much lower rate on the rags that go into the higher-priced goods. In other words, it makes a fair rate on the rags when some rags are brought in at 20 cents a pound and others brought in at 60 cents a pound, whereas the 18-cent or 24-cent rate puts a very much higher percentage of tax on the cheaper article.

Mr. STEIWER. And that would mean that less of the cheaper articles would be brought in and more of the better quality would be brought in, and the American consumers would get better goods for their money.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRATTON. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD (when Mr. Goff's name was called). As previously stated, my colleague the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff] has a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. If present, the senior Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when Mr. HASTINGS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. HASTINGS] has a pair on this vote with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. If present, my colleague would vote "nay," and the senior Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when Mr. KENDRICK's name was called). If the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). Again announcing my general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS], I withhold my vote.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). Upon this vote I am paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON]. Not knowing how he would vote upon this question, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HEFLIN. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness in his family. On this question he is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. If present, my colleague would vote "yea."

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—34

Barkley	George	Heflin	Steck
Bingham	Gillett	Keyes	Swanson
Blaine	Glass	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Blease	Gould	McKellar	Trammell
Brook	Hale	Metcalf	Tydings
Caraway	Harris	Moses	Walcott
Copeland	Harrison	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Hawes	Simmons	
Fletcher	Hebert	Smith	

NAYS—47

Allen	Fess	McMaster	Shortridge
Ashurst	Frazier	McNary	Smoot
Baird	Glenn	Norbeck	Steiwer
Borah	Goldsborough	Nye	Sullivan
Bratton	Greene	Oddie	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Hatfield	Phipps	Townsend
Broussard	Hayden	Pine	Vandenberg
Capper	Howell	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Johnson	Ransdell	Waterman
Couzens	Jones	Sackett	Watson
Cutting	Kean	Schall	Wheeler
Dill	McCulloch	Sheppard	

NOT VOTING—14

Black	Kendrick	Reed	Stephens
Deneen	King	Robinson, Ark.	Wagner
Goff	Overman	Robinson, Ind.	
Hastings	Patterson	Shipstead	

So Mr. BINGHAM's amendment to Mr. WATSON's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is upon agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the committee amendment cutting the rate from 24 cents to 18 cents has been agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct.

Mr. BLAINE. I also understand that when the Senator from Indiana proposed the amendment to the committee amendment on yesterday he asked the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the chairman of the Finance Committee, if, in his opinion, a duty of 24 cents was too high. Do I understand that the chairman of the committee said that, in his opinion, a duty of 24 cents was too high?

Mr. SMOOT. I did.

Mr. BLAINE. Now, I should like to ask the Senator why he thinks a rate of 24 cents is too high?

Mr. SMOOT. That has been discussed here for three or four days.

Mr. BLAINE. But I have not heard the Senator from Utah state why he thinks a 24-cent rate is too high.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think there is any use of going into a discussion of that matter at this time.

Mr. BLAINE. I really did not want to embarrass the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no embarrassment at all, but I think we ought to vote upon this question.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, we could not hear the explanation of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. And I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that I am not making any explanation at this time. I desire that the Senate shall vote.

Mr. BLAINE. I understand that the Senator from Utah declines to give the Senate the reasons why he thinks a rate of 24 cents a pound is too high. Of course, the Senate can not compel him to explain, and I am not going to continue to press the matter. I will just leave it there, that a rate of 24 cents is too high. The committee provided a rate of 24 cents, but the chairman of the committee states that it is too high. I should

like to know why 24 cents is too high, and then I might learn why we ought to adopt an 18-cent rate.

Mr. SMOOT. We have been two days discussing the question, and I think the time has arrived when we ought to vote on it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I understand that by a viva voce vote the Senate has approved the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That means that the committee rate of 18 cents has been substituted for the committee rate of 24 cents. In order that those of us who are opposed to the 18-cent rate contained in the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to the committee amendment may go on record, I ask for the yeas and nays upon the committee amendment as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended, on which the yeas and nays have been asked for.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD (when Mr. GOFF's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] has a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when Mr. HASTINGS's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arkansas, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when Mr. KENDRICK's name was called). The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], if present, would vote "yea" on this question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I again announce my general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] and withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HEFLIN. My colleague [Mr. BLACK] is absent on account of illness in his family. He is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

Mr. SACKETT (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] and have just been informed that he has not voted. Therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is necessarily detained on official business.

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON]. I do not know how he would vote on this question. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—46

Allen	Glenn	McMaster	Smoot
Baird	Goldsborough	McNary	Steiwer
Bingham	Gould	Norbeck	Sullivan
Borah	Greene	Nye	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Hatfield	Oddie	Townsend
Brookhart	Hayden	Phipps	Walcott
Broussard	Hebert	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Capper	Howell	Pittman	Waterman
Connally	Johnson	Ransdell	Watson
Cutting	Jones	Schall	Wheeler
Dill	Kean	Sheppard	
Frazier	McCulloch	Shortridge	

NAYS—32

Barkley	Fletcher	Keyes	Steck
Blaine	George	La Follette	Swanson
Blease	Gillett	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Brock	Glass	Metcalf	Trammell
Caraway	Hale	Moses	Tydings
Copeland	Harris	Norris	Vandenberg
Couzens	Harrison	Simmons	Wagner
Dale	Heflin	Smith	Walsh, Mass.

NOT VOTING—17

Ashurst	Hastings	Patterson	Shipstead
Black	Hawes	Reed	Stephens
Deneen	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	
Fess	King	Robinson, Ind.	
Goff	Overman	Sackett	

So the amendment of the committee, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of to-day's business the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is only one other amendment in paragraph 1105, and that is "shoddy and wool extract, 21 cents per pound." There ought to be a difference of 6 or 7 cents a pound there, so as to make it 24 cents.

I offer the following amendment: Strike out "21" and insert "24."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah proposes an amendment to the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The committee amendment is on page 173, line 2, where the committee proposes to strike out "18 cents" and insert "and wool extract, 21 cents." The Senator from Utah proposes to strike out "21" and insert "24," so that if amended it will read:

And wool extract, 24 cents.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, while, of course, those of us who voted against the high rate on rags are opposed to this amendment, the amendment is in line with the action that the Senate has just taken.

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber? I can not hear a word that the Senator from Utah is saying.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will suspend business until the Senate is in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the statement made by the Senator from Georgia is absolutely correct, that the amendment I have offered now is to carry out the equivalent of 18 cents on rags.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true, Mr. President, because, of course, shoddy is the finished product of the rags.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. The shoddy is carded, and that is the way it comes in. There ought to be a difference of either 6 or 7 cents, and I have asked for 6 cents.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, how does the proposed rate compare with the present law?

Mr. SMOOT. The present law is 16 cents, and on wool rags it is 7½ cents.

Mr. COPELAND. How does it compare with the less iniquitous Schedule K—I mean, less iniquitous as compared with the bill we are now proposing to pass? What was it in Schedule K of the Payne-Aldrich law?

Mr. SMOOT. Really, I forget that, Mr. President. I can turn to it in just a minute.

Mr. COPELAND. No; it does not matter. It means higher-cost clothing to the poor, no matter what the rate is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

PROCEEDINGS OF ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, it has been the annual custom of the Senate to print as a Senate document the proceedings of the annual convention of the American Instructors of the Deaf. The Printing Committee unanimously reports the necessary resolution, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and read.

The resolution (S. Res. 183) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the report of the twenty-sixth annual meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document.

THIRTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution from the Committee on Printing to provide for printing as a Senate document the Thirty-second Annual Report of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ending March 1, 1929.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 184) was read, considered by the Senate, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Thirty-second Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1929, be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document.

REDUCTION OF INCOME TAXES

Mr. COUZENS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 133) reducing rates of income tax for the calendar year 1929, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REVISION OF THE TARIFF

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* an open letter appearing in the *Minneapolis Morning Tribune* of December 2, over the signature of F. E. Murphy, publisher of the *Tribune*.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

NOVEMBER 23, 1929.

HON. JAMES COUZENS,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR COUZENS: I am in receipt of your letter which reads as follows:

"Your editorial of October 12 deals with a topic which touches not only me but all of us very closely. I have read it with much interest for the purpose of seeing if I could get anything out of it which would aid in placing agriculture on a parity with industry.

"From several sources in the Senate I have learned of your great interest in this question—an interest which is commendable. This suggests to me that perhaps you could tell me just how much we could revise the tariff to aid agriculture in securing the six additional billion dollars which your editorial indicates it should receive; in other words, your editorial states it now receives approximately \$12,000,000,000, but should receive \$18,000,000,000.

"As a member of the finance committee I have, perhaps, been so close to the job that I do not see the picture as clearly as you do, therefore I am anxious to know just how the pending tariff bill should be written so as to accomplish the unquestionable needs of the situation. It is at least hoped by the friends of agriculture that the Farm Board now in operation will aid to some degree in securing a part of this \$6,000,000,000 additional income to the farmers. The rest of the sum must be obtained through the tariff, but I am unable to say exactly how. Any advice and suggestion you can give me will be greatly appreciated."

Able representing in the United States Senate, as you do, the great agricultural State of Michigan I can easily appreciate the sincerity of your interest in all legislation that pertains to agriculture.

To answer the questions you propounded in your letter we must first come to an understanding as to terms and as to fact.

To begin with it must be understood that there is no such thing as the farm problem. There are a thousand farm problems. It must also be understood that there is no one remedy for the farmer's ailments, but hundreds of remedies.

I haven't any idea that merely by an adjustment of the tariff law the farmer's lost income can be regained. If the problem were that simple it would have been solved long since. Much can be done by the tariff, much can be done by the Farm Board, much can be done by scientific research and extension work, and much can be done by the farmer himself, once he can be certain of the way in which to proceed.

All of us hope that the Farm Board will ameliorate conditions created by surplus crops. All of us hope that the pending tariff legislation will primarily be based on the tariff needs of the farmer, and give to the American farmer the home market to the full extent of his ability to supply it.

The American farmers' income can be increased approximately a billion dollars a year by his possession of the home market. This increased sum will come to him directly by the sale of products that now are imported from foreign countries.

For example, there is the home market for flax. We annually import 22,000,000 bushels of flax. On this item of flax alone we have a direct addition to the American farmers' income of \$45,000,000.

But this direct addition to the American farmers' income is by no means the only benefit that would come to him. By growing 22,000,000 bushels of flax the American farmer would cease to grow 38,000,000 bushels of wheat. The exportable surplus of wheat would be reduced by 38,000,000 bushels. Our average exportable surplus of wheat is 175,000,000 bushels. If this should be reduced by 38,000,000 bushels, we would be much nearer to a solution of the surplus-wheat problem.

In a varying degree that which is said for flax can be said for wool, sugar beets, sweet clover, and all the other commodities of which we now have an underproduction. A proper tariff on all these items not only would bring the American farmer large additions to his declining

income but at the same time would have probably a far more beneficent and far-reaching effect by removing the problem of surplus crops.

Direct additions to the American farmer's income by proper tariff legislation can be made in the items of casein, starch, certified sweet potatoes, dried and frozen eggs, sago, and tapioca, in the various dairy schedules and the schedules that deal with vegetable fats and oils.

We import over \$150,000,000 a year in vegetable fats and oils for the benefit of industry. One hundred and fifty million dollars a year goes out of the pockets of American industry to foreign countries. If these millions were paid to the American farmer it would come directly to American industry in the purchases made by the American farmer in the American market.

The fulfillment of the home market pledge, therefore, means more than giving to the American farmer millions of dollars' worth of business. It also means a long step toward the elimination of the surplus problem.

If we keep whittling away at the surplus of such farm products as wheat, lard, and cotton, a time must come when these commodities, now on an export basis, will be on a domestic basis and thus able to profit by a protective tariff in a sound and economic way.

The *Tribune* has always been a believer in the theory of protection. Its faith in this principle, however, is qualified by times and circumstances. Economic history shows that there are times and circumstances under which the Nation can profit most by free trade. There are other times when circumstances justify a high protective tariff. The principle of free trade was economically sound for England at the same time that a high protective tariff was economically sound for the United States.

In every line of industry there are marginal and submarginal producers. There are the victims of inefficiency, overproduction, poor financing, and poor management. I do not believe in the high protective tariff as a compensation for inefficiency. I do not believe in a tariff that will add extravagantly to the profits of one entire industry for the sake of those units in that industry that are inefficient. A case in point is the large profits made in the brick industry, although there are isolated instances where brick manufacturers, for one reason or another, have made small profits or even have suffered losses.

How much the American farmer could save by a tariff law which took this point into strict consideration is conjectural.

Any serious study of the agricultural situation in the United States must inevitably lead to the conclusion that our food production has nearly reached its economic limit. If in giving to the American farmer the home market we adjust the items of our food production to our own consumption, we are still faced with the fact that one-fourth of our population lives on or by the farm.

We are faced by the fact that our population is reaching the point of stabilization; that the per capita consumption of food is declining as a result of machinery that reduces bodily toil. Food fads and diet fads, while individually a matter for jesting, have, when they are considered on a national scale, serious economic effects.

The farm therefore can no longer confine itself to the production of foods. The displacement of the horse by the automobile and the tractor has greatly curtailed the demand for food from the farm and has had its effect on our surplus production.

The American farmer in the future must not only feed the operator of the machine but he must feed the machine as well; he must not only produce food but he must produce raw materials for industry.

Your inquiry related itself rather specifically to the tariff, but I assume that it was more broadly aimed at that field of legislative activity which might further aid in remedying the present shortage of agriculture's purchasing power.

I believe that Congress could well afford to increase the appropriations now being made for research.

The American consumptive demand for food is limited by 120,000,000 consumers.

None the less in industry there may be 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 potential consumers. In other words, industry's machines represent potential stomachs.

Scientists believe that many of agriculture's waste products might be converted into raw materials which would feed industry.

An example may be found in the uses of skimmed milk which, converted into casein, enters into the manufacture of coated paper, glue, artificial cork, leather, rubber, jade, pencils, cigarette holders, knives, forks, combs, cigarette cases, coffee percolators, buttons, buckles, novelties, toys, poker chips, manicure sets, braceletes, hair-brush backs, teething rings, eyeglass frames, and fountain pens.

These commercial uses of one of agriculture's wastes were unknown until recently. They were made possible by research.

The citrus producers of California were enabled to produce citric acid and lemon oil from cull fruits of overproduction. Here research was responsible for stabilizing the industry.

Another example in the manufacture of wrapping paper from wheat straw. Another may be found in the manufacture of wall board from the stalks of sugar cane. Still another may be found in the manufacture of insulation materials from flax straw.

From 1 ton of straw, regarded as an irredeemable waste, a small Minnesota manufacturing company is now obtaining 12,600 cubic feet of gas, 640 pounds of carbon, 15 gallons of phenol oil, and 400 pounds of pitch element.

Literally hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of valuable products are produced on American farms each year in straw.

Here is a field susceptible of unlimited development. At present, because of insufficient funds, research work is not going ahead. Industry, it is estimated, is spending about \$200,000,000 annually on research, while agriculture is spending only about one-tenth of that amount.

The time must come when the farmer will produce two crops. The first crop will be food for human and animal consumption. The second will be raw materials for industrial consumption.

"The farmer of the future," said Glenn Frank, president of the University of Wisconsin, not so long ago, "will raise lacquer as well as Lima beans, rubber as well as rutabagas, and motion-picture films as well as melons."

While the human being's food demands are limited, the factory consumptive demands are potentially infinite.

Not much expansion is now possible for the farmer's crop of edible products, but indefinite and unbounded expansion is possible in the market for his extra-edible products.

What agriculture needs more than anything else right now is not increased productive capacity but increased consumptive demand.

The key to increased consumptive demand lies in research.

The problem for legislators is to speed the day when American machines will be feeding on the products of the American farm.

Whatever money industry pays out for raw material purchased from the farms will come back to industry in increased sales to farmer buyers.

Industry can not use the farm as the source of raw materials without at the same time building up the purchasing power of the farmer.

Therefore a dollar invested in research is equally a dollar invested on behalf of industry and a dollar invested on behalf of labor.

What better turn could the American Congress do than to help the farm enrich the factory and the factory enrich the farm?

All the industrial miracles were made possible by somebody not afraid to invest in research.

Research may double or triple America's consumption demands for agricultural products without reference to population.

Through research new billions may be uncovered for agriculture.

For that reason I would urge upon Congress the necessity for devoting more thought and more money to research.

Inefficiencies of production at present play an important part in holding agriculture's purchasing power down.

America's dairy cow production could be maintained at its current level by three-fourths of our number of cows.

If 6,000,000 of our 22,000,000 cows were eliminated and the efficiency of the remaining 16,000,000 brought up to a parity with the cow-testing-association animals, agriculture would effect a saving of \$750,000,000.

Michigan is a leader in making a few high-producing cows efficiently do the work formerly done by many low-producing cows. Michigan's plan of a single management for all State institution herds furnished both Iowa and Wisconsin with a model.

You may ask what a legislator might do in aiding agriculture to eliminate this.

The answer lies in increased Federal appropriations for extension work, with specific provision for funds to support cow-testing associations.

It is the extension workers who, in the main, foster cow-testing associations, and who disseminate the information concerning the proper care and scientific feeding which is indispensable to high butterfat production.

Our corps of extension workers is markedly undermanned. Hundreds of counties have no county agent or extension workers whatsoever. Capable extension workers furnish us our most practical and effective means of attacking the losses referred to. An enlarged corps of extension workers would represent a group engaged specifically upon the job of increasing agriculture's purchasing power.

In the foregoing we have kept clear of any suggestion which would tend to increase production in commodities now overproduced.

Were research to enlarge the country's consumptive capacity sufficiently to eliminate all surplus, it would be in order to suggest the correction of many other wastes and inefficiencies which would save billions for agriculture. But that is a step ahead and space does not permit.

Such figures as I have used are, of necessity, crude and approximate.

None the less, I believe they point to the sources from which the billions agriculture is now short may be recovered.

These billions will not be taken from industry or from labor or from the urban classes, but instead will circulate among them all, and contribute to their enrichment.

I know that legislation alone can not create these missing billions, but it can play an important rôle in furnishing the enlightened leadership

indispensable to a rehabilitated and reorganized and prosperous agriculture—a goal, Senator, which I believe is as dear to your heart as it is to mine.

F. E. MURPHY,
Publisher Minneapolis Tribune.

DISTRICT OFFICE OF BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE
AT JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from Dr. Julius Klein, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, relative to the district office of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, at Jacksonville, in my State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, December 3, 1929.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Remembering the interest you took in the establishment of a district office of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce at Jacksonville, you will, I am sure, be glad to have some details as to the actual dollars-and-cents results achieved by that office.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1929, 15 firms reported voluntarily that they had secured new business or had benefited by preventive services to the extent of \$2,207,691 through the efforts of the Jacksonville office. The preventive services were in the form of sayings through negative information leading to the curtailment of certain unwise export plans, the discouragement of expenditures in exploiting dubious markets, etc. This office is serving some 116 Florida firms, so that the total results of the trade-promotive efforts of the office are probably many times the figure mentioned, many firms reporting that it was impossible to estimate the "dollars-and-cents" results, but paying high tribute to the service by the Jacksonville branch.

I am sure you will agree that in view of the modest budget of that office, which is less than \$15,000, the above figure represents a decidedly substantial "dividend" for the taxpayer.

For all of the 29 offices throughout the country there were voluntary reports during the fiscal year 1928-29 from 1,021 firms (out of about 22,000 currently using the bureau's services) showing results achieved for them which totaled \$42,651,854. Since this represents about one-twentieth of the bureau's regular clientele, it would seem that the total value of the efforts of the organization in behalf of American business is many times this amount.

In addition to being a "service station" on export trade the Jacksonville office has endeavored to serve as a clearing house for firms seeking information on domestic marketing. While this phase of the work has been limited, due to the small available personnel, the office has been able to serve some firms by giving exact information concerning our domestic markets and the various practices in marketing.

I am sure you will understand my mentioning these details to you as being not in any sense a "glorification" of the bureau, but simply as part of a businesslike accounting to Congress of the stewardship of our staff and its obligations under the appropriations voted by Congress for the last year.

Cordially yours,

JULIUS KLEIN.

REPORT OF YORKTOWN SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. FESS. From the Committee on the Library, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate concurrent resolution 21; and I call the attention of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] to it.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, it is important that this concurrent resolution should pass at once. It simply extends from December 15 to February 1 the time within which the commission for the Yorktown sesquicentennial celebration shall make its report. The concurrent resolution is unanimously reported by the Committee on the Library; and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) submitted by Mr. SWANSON on the 10th instant was read, considered by the Senate, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 6 of the House concurrent resolution establishing the United States Yorktown Sesquicentennial Commission as amended be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. That the commission shall, on or before the 1st day of February, 1930, make a report to the Congress in order that enabling legislation may be enacted."

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. RANSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the speeches of our colleagues, Senator T. J. WALSH, of Montana, and Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND, of New York, before the Twenty-fifth Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, at Washington, December 11, 1929, on the subject of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The addresses are as follows:

THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—A MAJOR IMPENDING PROJECT

(Address by Senator T. J. WALSH)

I feel entitled to assume that the members of this association are familiar in a general way with the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project, and from the purposes to promote which it exists regard with favor any feasible plan to afford to the millions marketing their products at ports on the Great Lakes or routing them through such to their ultimate destination the advantage of water communication from such ports without breaking cargo to the sea. The chain of lakes has been likened in its economic value to the Mediterranean, each affording ingress by water to the very heart of a great continent, the full serviceability of the former, however, awaiting the further improvement for navigation for the passage of the larger cargo carriers of the approaching and connecting waters.

The desirability of thus improving this natural outlet to the sea, if it can be accomplished at reasonable cost, few, if any, will undertake to controvert. That it can be has twice been attested within the past seven years, by international commissions, aided by the best engineering talent at the command of the Governments of the two countries concerned, the United States and Canada. The American section of the commission last studying the problem, of which the President of the United States, then Secretary of Commerce, was the chairman, reporting in 1926 summarized its conclusions in the following paragraph:

"The conclusions of this commission are therefore:

"First. The construction of the shipway from the Great Lakes to the sea is imperative both for the relief and for the future development of a vast area in the interior of the continent.

"Second. The shipway should be constructed on the St. Lawrence route, provided suitable agreement can be made for its joint undertaking with the Dominion of Canada.

"Third. That the development of the power resources of the St. Lawrence should be undertaken by appropriate agencies.

"Fourth. That negotiations should be entered into with Canada in an endeavor to arrive at agreement upon all these subjects. In such negotiations the United States should recognize the proper relations of New York to the power development in the international section."

In the conclusion that the project is feasible from an engineering standpoint and economically practicable the Canadian National Advisory Council concurs.

The principal obstacles to be overcome are the rapids of the St. Lawrence River, now passed through lateral canals, admitting vessels of light draft, requiring water of no greater depth than 14 feet. The Welland Canal now affording passage from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario is limited in its capacity in like manner, but that conduit is now, by the Canadian Government, being enlarged so as to admit the passage of ships drawing 25 feet. Approximately \$90,000,000 have already been spent on this unit of the through waterway. Its completion during the ensuing year at a total cost of \$116,000,000 is anticipated. The project contemplates the submerging of the rapids in the river by artificial lakes created by dams across it, the step down or up to be accomplished by a limited number of locks adequate in size to accommodate any craft of the heavier draft indicated, the water above the dam to be maintained at a conformable depth.

The works so to be constructed with some minor improvements in the channels connecting the Lakes and compensating structures to maintain the lake levels, despite diversions at Chicago and elsewhere, will make possible continuous passage of 90 per cent of the shipping of the world, all, indeed, except the leviathan ocean liners, from all ports on the Lakes to the seven seas and the shores thereof. The lighter bottoms that may now make the passage can not be employed economically in the overseas trade and, accordingly, the vast region drained by the St. Lawrence west of Montreal and the adjacent territory with its teeming millions and highly industrial centers is denied access by this natural water route to the sea. American statesmanship is confronted with no more imperative task than speedily to make it available. Some idea of its vast economic consequence may be gathered from the testimony of experts long engaged in the export grain trade given before the International Joint Commission investigating the project under orders of the Congress and the Parliament of the Dominion, and reporting in 1922 that the cost of transporting grain from Duluth or Chicago to Liverpool or Hamburg would be reduced from 8 to 10 cents per bushel could it go, as it would, by the route proposed without transshipment. No plan or project for farm relief, so far as the Middle West or Northwest is

concerned, offers ground for anything like the hope held out by this improved waterway. Though the region whose products now pass through the lake ports would be most directly and perhaps highly benefited, every section of our common country would profit by the enterprise, New England and the Pacific Coast States notably. The opportunity that would be afforded those States to get their products by water instead of by the long rail haul into the lake region is so keenly appreciated in that quarter that the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Oregon, South Carolina, Washington, and California, 20 in number, have associated themselves, by formal acts of their legislatures, with three others (Kentucky, West Virginia, and Utah), joining by Executive order, to forward the project.

Farseeing and keen-minded men of Boston have written exhaustively and persuasively on it; a recent publication by Mr. Henry I. Harriman, president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, canvassing the subject in a particularly thorough manner from the New England viewpoint.

The two commissions by which the project has been studied within the past 10 years explored the entire field of inquiry, its feasibility from the economic as well as the engineering standpoint, careful attention being paid to alternative routes, all of which were definitely rejected.

A book by Doctor Moulton, of the George Washington University, lately issued, questions the conclusions arrived at by the official representatives of the two Governments concerned as to the economic value of the waterway. He concludes that the traffic likely to be offered will not be of such magnitude as to justify the expenditure necessary. By a like course of reasoning the conclusion would have been inevitable that the Panama Canal, speaking as of the time that great work was undertaken, never would have returned sufficient revenue to meet the cost of operating it. Scarcely an enterprise promoted by this organization or now sponsored or proposed by it has failed to encounter criticism of like character.

This discordant note comes somewhat belatedly. The two Governments are already so far committed to the project that ours has asked for a conference for the negotiation of a treaty looking to the prosecution of the work, to which request our neighbor has signified a purpose to comply as soon as some complications in which it is involved, not extending to the substantial merits, are adjusted. Indeed, it has progressed so far as that its assent to any reasonable proposal on our part can scarcely be withheld. Its vast expenditure in enlarging the Welland Canal will have been without purpose, or, at least, will be without very substantial returns, unless the larger ships it will accommodate can pass down the St. Lawrence or ascend to utilize that passage. But the power potentialities of the river, the development of which incidental to its improvement for navigation is planned, are such as to insure at no distant day the further progress of the work. It will be remembered that the river from the outlet of Lake Ontario to a point near St. Regis, N. Y., a distance of 113 miles, forms the boundary line between New York and Canada, and that for the remainder of the distance to Montreal, the present head of navigation, 70 miles, it is entirely within Canadian territory.

In these two sections of the river electrical energy to the amount of 5,000,000 horsepower may be generated, approximately 2,250,000 horsepower in the international section. In view of the ever-increasing demand for power in the highly industrialized region within transmission distance, it is inconceivable that this tremendous source of energy will long remain dormant. In fact the Canadians have already taken steps to make available a large share of that capable of development in the section of the river over which they exercise exclusive jurisdiction. The Province of Quebec recently, in a spirited contest between the Beauharnois Power Co. and a rival institution, awarded to that organization a concession to develop the power possibilities of the St. Lawrence between Lake St. Francis and Lake St. Louis, stretches of the widened river in which the water is so still as to offer no substantial impediment to navigation, which concession was subsequently approved by the Dominion Government. It obligates the company to prosecute the development work in conformity with the plans prepared by the engineers associated with the international commissions referred to and approved by them, the pertinent paragraph of the concession being as follows:

"(b) The capital amount properly chargeable to navigation in this connection as calculated by the International Joint Board of Engineers will be approximately \$16,000,000 and will be paid by the company. The company will also install such remedial works as may be necessary to avoid injury to existing power developments and will maintain the level of Lake St. Francis at such elevation as may be required for navigation."

The transaction amounts, in effect, to an agreement that in consideration of its enjoying the power developed, the company undertakes the improvement for navigation of the river in the section referred to in accordance with the plans of the joint board, and further

to pay a rental of \$50,000 annually, save for the first five years, when the charge is to be \$20,000. Of the total cost, \$16,000,000 is to be regarded as the sum spent for navigation, which amount is to be added to the \$116,000,000, the cost of the new Welland Canal, to arrive at the expenditure already made or contracted for by the Canadian Government toward the ocean waterway to the heart of the continent. It is so far committed that it is inconceivable that it should not go forward despite the hesitancy that has been exhibited in respect to the necessary treaty touching the improvement of the international section.

In a letter from the Canadian minister of date January 31, 1928, expressing at some length the views of his Government, among the reasons assigned for hesitancy on its part in respect to an immediate agreement looking to the inauguration of the work of improvement, two of major consequence were referred to, first, the financial burden that would be imposed upon Canada, not to be considered lightly in view of the heavy obligations incurred by it to prosecute the war; and, second, the pendency of a difference of opinion of much moment as to whether the power to be developed would fall under the control of the Dominion or of the Province in which it should be developed. Both of these difficulties have passed or largely passed from the field of action in consequence of the grant of the Beauharnois concession. By it both the Province of Quebec and the Dominion are relieved from the obligation to incur any expense whatever for the improvement of that part of the river affected by it. Provision must be made for overcoming the obstacle of the Lachine Rapids, the only other major obstruction in the Canadian section of the river, and no reason is apparent why a similar agreement can not be entered into by which that part of the work can be accomplished without any outlay by the Government. Indeed, proposals looking to such an agreement are, I am reliably informed, now in progress.

Furthermore, the vexed question of ownership of the power to be generated as between the Dominion and the provincial government, upon which the supreme court of the Dominion declined to commit itself, was in principle at least adjusted by the action taken, to which reference has been made.

The Beauharnois concession extended by the Province of Quebec which, by its terms, gets the royalty therein stipulated to be paid by the concessionaire, was made subject to the approval of the Dominion Government, which was in due course accorded. Quebec having thus secured the returns from the development of power incident to the improvement of the river for navigation within her borders, the right of Ontario to that to be developed within hers can scarcely longer be questioned.

Obviously the Dominion Government, primarily concerned, as is the United States, in the utilization of the river for navigation, waives whatever demands it might legitimately assert as a matter of strict legal right. Statesmanship solved the problem where resort to the courts proved ineffective. A conference of the premiers of the two Provinces involved and Dominion officials, called for the purpose of arriving at an agreement on the subject of interest here, which should not be difficult in view of the precedent mentioned, has been postponed from time to time, but which it is now expected will assemble early in January, in season to permit the submission of any conclusions that may be reached to the Dominion Parliament, to sit shortly thereafter.

The work, it is contemplated in the diplomatic changes and in the conferences between the national sections of the commissions, shall be prosecuted by the United States, the Government of Canada to attend, as it is doing, to that part of it to be prosecuted wholly within the territory of that country. On the completion of the entire project an adjustment is to be arrived at between the two countries, taking into consideration all expenditures made by either in works constituting a part of the general improvement for navigation, including the cost of the locks at the Sault Ste. Marie, the greater portion of which has been incurred by the United States.

Our Government may now enter into an agreement quite like that negotiated with the Beauharnois company, by which the work devolving upon it in the international section can be carried out without the expenditure of a penny. A responsible company stands ready to enter into an agreement to prosecute the work of improvement strictly in conformity with the plans of the joint board of engineers, to deliver to the Dominion Government or that of the Province of Ontario, as may be agreed, the one half of the power developed in consideration of its being allowed to dispose of the other half.

In the present temper of the public mind it is quite unlikely that either the National Government or that of the State of New York will consent to transfer to private interests a source of electrical energy in excess of a million horsepower. Reference is made to the opportunity only to indicate that actual net cost of the waterway that promises so much is insignificant.

In the report of the Hoover commission the total cost allocatable to navigation is fixed at \$125,000,000, not reckoning any saving that might be effected by contemporaneously carrying in the Canadian section the works necessary to navigation, and to the development of power, the one-half of which would be chargeable against the

United States. The power that would be developed would, it was estimated by the engineers of the commission last reporting, produce revenue sufficient to meet the remainder of the total cost, figured at \$423,000,000, including all necessary generating machinery. The power interests have long looked with envious eyes on this tremendous source of electrical energy. Years ago riparian rights were secured by a group of capitalists, including Andrew W. Mellon, looking to the development of the power possibilities of the international section. The transfer of their interests within recent months to the Morgan allies, understood to be for the Electric Bond & Share Co., aroused nation-wide concern. For almost 20 years the proper attitude of the State of New York toward this great resource has been a matter of discussion in that State, whether it ought to be developed directly by the Commonwealth or by private interests under a concession from the State if, indeed, the riparian proprietors required any governmental sanction. Fierce contests have been waged before the legislature over the question and political campaigns have been carried on in which it featured. The enormous value of the right to utilize the flow of the stream for the generation of power has been universally recognized. The demand for the energy has been constantly mounting and the desire to see the development go forward becomes more and more insistent.

As far back as 1921, before either commission had reported on the feasibility of the project which is the subject of these remarks, and rejected an alternative route proposed by him, the Hon. Nathan L. Miller, then Governor of the State of New York, in the course of an address in which he assailed the proposal afterwards so enthusiastically indorsed by the commissions referred to said: "As a water-power project it undoubtedly is economically sound, and I hope the time is not far distant when that tremendous power in the St. Lawrence as well as more power in the Niagara shall be harnessed for the benefit, not of some power company, but of the people who own that water power." More recently former Gov. Alfred E. Smith and Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt have both made the development of the power potentialities of the State, including those of the St. Lawrence, first in importance by the public rather than by private interests outstanding policies of their respective administrations, and have both sought legislative action for such policy.

The discussion has gone on strangely enough as though the question were one for resolution exclusively by the people of New York. The interest of Canada has been ignored, or all but ignored, and the idea of the Government of the United States having any say at all in the matter has been tartly denied. Proceedings were at one time instituted in the Supreme Court of the United States intended to foreclose any claim of right in the premises by the Federal Government and to establish the unrestricted right of the State of New York to the power that might have its origin in the flow of the St. Lawrence, but the suit was subsequently withdrawn, upon the advice of counsel that it was, at least, premature. It is needless to enter upon any inquiry as to the soundness of the position thus taken. The question is altogether academic. It engaged the attention of Congress for many years prior to the passage of the water power act of 1920. Reams and reams of legal opinions were submitted to the various committees having the subject under consideration and learned lawyers in both branches of Congress expatiated on the question and dreadingly quoted from opinions of judges and writers on the law.

All the learning on the subject fell, however, before the very practical view that as no one may construct a dam across a navigable stream without the consent of Congress, it may attach such conditions as it sees fit to the granting of such consent. Congress has gone even further and made it a penal offense to place any obstructions in a navigable stream, except structures serving as docks and the like, without its consent. It is difficult, accordingly, to conceive how anyone, even by authority of the State of New York, can construct the necessary diversion works in the St. Lawrence River for the development of power without congressional permission. Nor can one conceive that Canada will lamely submit, without her consent, to the erection of such structures or the diversion of the water from its natural channel.

The diversions at Niagara Falls are made pursuant to a treaty with the British Government before the change ensued, in consequence of which we now deal directly with the Government of Canada. Such a treaty must be negotiated by the national authority. The State of New York, as well as every other State of the Union, is forbidden by the express language of the Constitution from entering into a treaty with a foreign power, and another Federal statute makes it a penal offense for any citizen not authorized by the central authority to treat with a foreign government on behalf of ours. If, accordingly, the State of New York looks to the development of the power of the St. Lawrence as an asset of its people, it can make no substantial progress toward the realization of its hope in that regard except through a treaty between the United States and Canada. And that treaty, whenever it is entered into, to-day, to-morrow, or a hundred years from now, will provide for the improvement of the river at once for navigation and power.

The policy of Canada is clearly disclosed in her action with reference to the Beauharnois concession, heretofore referred to. The Provinces west of Quebec, all of which are deeply interested in the improvement

of the river for navigation, would block any effort to ignore that feature in a treaty dealing with the subject of power development. It is quite too much to expect of the great group of American States west of New York that look to the opening of their natural route to the sea, that they would not do likewise. Either the power possibilities of the St. Lawrence in the international section, as well as in the Canadian section, will lie dormant or they will be developed pursuant to a treaty that will make that river a commercial highway to and from the great Northwest.

The interests of the people of the State of New York and of those to whose future the improved waterway means so much, are in no wise in conflict if the former prize their asset in the power of the St. Lawrence above the export trade of the city of New York, originating in the lake country and the hinterland, that would be diverted to the cheaper route. If the more or less heated controversy that engaged attention in political circles, at least in that State, over the question of private or public development of its water-power resources, is not all shadow boxing, its Representatives in Congress will unite with those from the other Lake States and the Northwest in promoting the speedy negotiation of the necessary treaty with Canada. It is quite likely that the latter will waive any question of whether the State of New York does, as it asserts, or does not own the water of the St. Lawrence in the international section to the boundary line, and consequently whether it is or is not entitled to any power that may be developed from the flow of that water and accord to it the right to all such power, conditioned upon its bearing so much of the cost of the works as is properly allocatable to power development, a sum, upon the testimony of all the expert engineers, that is less than would be required if that development were prosecuted independently of the improvement of the river for navigation.

The representatives of that State have heretofore shown little disposition thus to unite. They have contented themselves with expatiating on objections, every one of which has been canvassed and exploded by both commissions, as that the cost would be prohibitive, that no west-bound freight of consequence can be expected, that fogs in the Gulf and the Strait of Belle Isle forbid exit to the sea, or make it unduly hazardous, that the waterway would be closed by ice half the year. An alternative route is proposed and urged with enthusiasm, called with a lame appeal to national sentiment, the all-American route by canal across the State of New York from Lake Erie to the Hudson, oblivious of the fact that all the rest of the way to Duluth or Lake Michigan ships would pass through international waters, and that by treaty that lake even is open unrestrictedly to Canadian vessels; oblivious of the fact that such a canal would be unavailable on account of ice for a like period and that west-bound freight by that route would be equally limited; oblivious of the fact that it was rejected by the international commissions, among other reasons because of the excessive cost both of construction and of operation, the vastly greater distance of restricted navigation and the innumerable bridges that must of necessity span the waterway, extensive enough in width and depth to permit the passage of ships drawing 25 feet. But even if the route were developed there would remain the problem of the utilization of the power of the St. Lawrence—the alternative route—costing some \$600,000,000 and providing no power, or only an inconsequential amount, to reduce the gross cost, or supply the imperative need for electric energy.

As indicated, the Dominion is committed to the project not only by reason of the enormous outlay it has already made, but by its express avowal of attachment in the diplomatic correspondence. Just why it defers entering negotiations to arrange the details is not clear. The very obscurity in respect to the reasons for delay on its part suggests opposition from the rail carriers so often present and so rarely openly manifested to projects sponsored by this association. Whatever may be the source of opposition on either side of the line, it will be overcome. The consummation may be delayed, it can not be defeated.

AN AMERICAN CANAL FROM THE GREAT LAKES TO THE SEA (Address by Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND)

From the earliest days of our history an interest has been taken in the waterways and the possibilities of navigable canals between the Great Lakes and the sea. During the past few years, particularly since the economic troubles of the wheat farmers of the West became so pronounced, there has been renewed discussion of this idea. There is much talk of building such a waterway in order that the Great Lakes may become a second Mediterranean. There are dreams that ocean-going vessels may proceed westward, to tie up at docks in Detroit, Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Chicago, and Duluth.

Regarding this project there are two schools of thought. The St. Lawrence route is held in high favor in the West. But many thinking Americans feel that if the money of the Nation is actually to be expended in canal building it should be spent wholly within the borders of our country. These are they who advocate what is known as the all-American route, a canal connecting the Great Lakes with the headwaters of the Hudson River.

The latter project would involve an initial expenditure of more money, but it would be hundreds of miles shorter, open for a slightly

longer season, and, for the purpose of the national defense, would be of greater service to the Nation. The all-American route coincides with the present lines of railroad travel and leads to the same terminals on the seacoast. Such a canal development, it is thought, would be less disturbing to commerce and trade during the part of the year when either water route would be closed by ice.

A great many surveys have been made by the Federal Government, the New York State authorities, the Canadian Government, and recently by an international joint commission. The result of these surveys is that we have at our command a mass of scientific and statistical material.

With this before him it is possible for any citizen to master the problems involved and to form for himself a conclusion as to which route is preferable. Both are considered feasible from an engineering standpoint. Each has its particular advantages. Each has its engineering and scientific backers. It may be said in all truth that a given citizen may form his own conclusions and, no matter what it may be, find himself in company with thousands of distinguished citizens who take a like view. Unfortunately, he will find himself in opposition to other thousands of equally distinguished citizens who are just as insistent that the other route is preferable.

Every citizen should give serious thought to these schemes of canal building. Either one will cost as much as three complete and equipped double-track freight railroads between Boston and Chicago. But assuming that a canal is actually built from the Great Lakes to the sea, which route should be selected?

It is my purpose to bring together in the briefest possible way the arguments pro and con. I shall attempt to marshal the facts and, frankly admitting the greater popularity of the St. Lawrence waterway, attempt to prove that if the Federal Government is to appropriate money for a Great Lakes to the sea ship canal, the all-American route is the one which should command the indorsement and financial support of the taxpayers of the country.

Unfortunately, whichever way is determined upon, the most we can expect of such a canal is that it shall be serviceable for not to exceed eight months of the year. In 50 years the latest the St. Lawrence was open for navigation was the 14th of December. Three times only was it open past the 8th of December. Usually it closes about the 20th of November.

During the same period the earliest date it ever opened was the 29th of March. One year it opened on the 3d of April. Usually it opens about the 20th of April, and occasionally as late as the 1st of May. One year it was the 7th of May. As a matter of fact, then, the St. Lawrence can be depended on for only a little more than seven months of the year.

No candid person conversant with the physical conditions of the lower St. Lawrence and of that route to the sea can fail to acknowledge that through a majority of the months of the year there is no uninterrupted passage between Montreal and the open ocean. I speak of this in no spirit of disparagement but simply to bring to mind the embarrassments and dangers of this particular route as compared with another one equally available which is not burdened by these objections.

COMPARATIVE DISTANCES AND SAILING TIMES

At this point I wish to bring out the marked difference in distances between Lake Ontario and the ocean by the two routes. By the St. Lawrence it is 166 miles to Cornwall, where the river leaves our boundary; 66 miles from there to Montreal; 1,003 miles to the ocean; a total of 1,185 miles. From Lake Ontario to Albany is 164 miles, and from Albany by the Hudson River to the ocean 150 miles, a total of 314 miles. From Lake Ontario to New York City by the St. Lawrence route is 1,500 miles. By the all-American route it is a trifle over 300 miles. Whether the cargo is to be taken to Portland, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore, of course, the distance is many hundreds of miles greater by way of the St. Lawrence.

The advocates of the Canadian route place great emphasis upon the fact that it is much nearer by way of the St. Lawrence from the Great Lakes to Liverpool, where the wheat would go, than it is by the all-American canal. It is stated, for instance, that the distance between Montreal and Liverpool is 2,760 miles. But this is through the Strait of Belle Isle which, as I have already indicated, can not be used during a considerable portion even of the open season. The distance from Montreal to Liverpool when the route taken is to the south of Newfoundland is 3,007 miles, practically the same as the distance between New York and Liverpool, a distance of 3,166 miles. By the St. Lawrence to Liverpool the distance from Lake Ontario is 3,239 miles. By the New York route it is 3,480 miles. To put it in a word, the route through foreign territory is 141 miles shorter than the all-American route. That is all.

Where the St. Lawrence route reaches the ocean is at a point more than a thousand miles east and 700 miles north of the confluence of Lake Ontario with the river. The Strait of Belle Isle is far removed from the United States and all our ports. There is no port and nothing to appeal to American commerce all the way from Lake Ontario to the shores of Europe.

Let me call attention to the fact, too, that the time consumed between Duluth and New York City by the St. Lawrence and the sea route would be 12 days, as contrasted with 7½ days over the all-American route. By way of the St. Lawrence Canal it would take four days longer for a cargo from Duluth to go to the Panama Canal, four days longer to Seattle, and practically the same time to Gibraltar.

EXPORT TRADE

The chief advocates of the St. Lawrence route are the grain producers and flour millers of the great Northwest. If the proposed canal were to be used exclusively for the exportation of wheat and flour, I should frankly admit that the St. Lawrence route is superior to the all-American.

If the waterway from the Great Lakes to the sea were to be used exclusively for the carriage to Liverpool in cargo lots of automobiles, furniture, or stoves from Detroit or other western ports, I should say that the St. Lawrence route is preferable. For any cargo that is to be taken in bulk from any one port on the Great Lakes directly to Liverpool, I should admit at once the superiority of the St. Lawrence route.

If there could be profitable operation of a one-way service between the Great Lakes and Liverpool, the St. Lawrence would hold first place. Unfortunately for the advocates of the St. Lawrence route, water traffic can not succeed on a one-way basis. Unfortunately for the St. Lawrence route, water traffic to and from the Great Lakes is not confined to bulk cargoes or to export trade. A very large percentage, probably in excess of 75 per cent of the traffic between the Great Lakes and tidewater, is sure to be of package freight for domestic distribution.

WHEAT EXPORTATION

A discussion of a waterway to the sea would amount to nothing unless its possible relationship to wheat exportation is given particular attention. This I shall attempt to show.

The American wheat farmer is confident that the St. Lawrence canal will benefit him materially. He has dreams of cheap freight rates and higher home prices in consequence.

It must be admitted that every dollar saved on freight charges is a dollar made for the farmer. He will benefit directly by economies of this sort. This is true of export trade as it is of domestic. This I shall concede, of course.

The exigencies of the World War created an unheard-of demand for American wheat. For the four or five years before the war the exports from the United States averaged about 100,000,000 annually. In 1915 there was a jump to 332,000,000.

The war interfered with European, particularly Russian, production, a condition continuing until the end of 1923. Since that time there has been gradual improvement in foreign wheat crops. In consequence, by 1926 our exports fell to 108,000,000 of bushels, including flour converted into terms of bushels of wheat. It was better than this in 1928.

But this does not tell the whole story. A study of Canadian wheat prospects is most illuminating.

In 1910 Canada planted 8,000,000 acres to wheat and exported 56,000,000 bushels. Last year she planted 25,000,000 acres and exported 324,000,000 bushels. The Dominion has 80,000,000 acres of the best wheat land on earth ready for wheat when there is a demand for it.

Contrast these figures with conditions in the United States. In 1910 we had 45,000,000 acres in wheat, jumped to 75,000,000 in the one year, 1919, and have settled back year by year until at present we have only about 50,000,000 in wheat acreage.

In short, our increase in wheat production is practically nil, while Canada has trebled her acreage and products in less than 20 years. That progressive nation will continue to increase her acreage and exports.

To me the logic of the situation is irresistible. Within a short time the United States will disappear as a wheat exporter. Because blood is thicker than water and because of materially lower prices of production Great Britain will prefer to import Canadian wheat, and eventually the Liverpool market will be lost to us.

COMPARATIVE FREIGHT RATES ON WHEAT

Comparison of the freight rates and facilities of the two countries is interesting. Duluth, in our country, and Fort William, in Canada, are the extreme western lake ports through which wheat is shipped for domestic consumption in the home country, or for export to Europe. The rates by water from these two cities to the Atlantic seaboard are approximately the same.

Whether a canal is built or not, then Americans and Canadians are on the same basis so far as water transportation is concerned. But they are not on the same competitive basis when we consider the rail rates from points of production to the lake head.

There is little difference between the rates from the Dakotas to Duluth, but Montana and other points farther west are at a considerable disadvantage. For instance, the rate from Butte, Mont., is 44½ cents per hundred, while it is only 26 cents from Alberta to Saskatchewan points. This gives the Canadian shipper an advantage of about 18 cents a bushel.

What do these figures prove? They show conclusively that the St. Lawrence waterway will not better the prospects of the American wheat farmer. He will continue to be on the present basis of competition

with his neighbors across the line. As they increase their acreage, the cheaper rail rates in Canada to a considerable extent and the sentimental tie between England and her colony to a greater extent will cause Canadian exports of wheat to increase while ours decline.

There is no hope as I see it that the digging of a canal to the sea will help the American farmer to dispose of his wheat. There is one advantage, however, although it must be shared with the Canadian wheat exporter. I refer to the possibility of loading a ship at the lake head and sending it directly to Liverpool. This will save the "fobbing" charges (elevator service, storage, brokerage, insurance, etc.) at Buffalo and New York or in Montreal, as the case may be. Perhaps a few cents a bushel might be saved in this way. This amount added to the service by water transportation over all rail or part rail to New York might amount to 7 or 8 cents a bushel. But I seriously doubt it because of my conviction that the St. Lawrence Canal would be so essentially a one-way route that the present ratio could not be materially reduced.

THE ST. LAWRENCE A ONE-WAY ROUTE

I view the St. Lawrence route as one bound to be limited in its uses almost exclusively to eastbound traffic. Its value to Americans is confined to the advantage it offers in the exportation of bulk cargoes from the Great Lakes. If there is enough wheat to fill a ship, or if one port should have enough automobiles or any other product, to complete a cargo for Liverpool, it would go somewhat quicker, if no more cheaply, than by the American route. But that is all that can be said for the St. Lawrence waterway. For the shipping of domestic freight from the West, the Canadian project has almost no value to America.

One has but to study the Montreal traffic situation to see how valuable the St. Lawrence is to the American merchant receiving goods from the East. In 1925, of the lake carriers arriving in Montreal with grain, coal, and flour, no less than 2,670 returned westward without cargoes. There was absolutely nothing for them to take west. These are the official figures obtained from the Lachine Canal office, Montreal, April, 1926. There need be no expectation of better conditions as a result of deepening and widening canals already in existence.

To my mind, it is absurd to think the St. Lawrence route would profit the Great Lakes ports, or the great western population of our country. A one-way water system could never pay, and this route could never be anything but a one-way system. What is produced in Europe that the Mid West wants in ship-cargo lots? Regardless of the doubtful advantages to the decreasing exportation of wheat, what else is there to expect from a through line to Europe, entering the sea a thousand miles from our own eastern and southern Atlantic seaboard?

THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT A WATER-POWER SCHEME

Both in the United States and in Canada there are powerful interests back of the St. Lawrence development. It is not alone the farmers of the West who are enthusiastic for the waterway because they honestly believe it will act in some mysterious way as a remedy for their economic ills. But there are other and secret influences at work to realize this project. These interests are selfish interests, interests devoted to the accretion of private wealth. They are not like the western advocates, striving for self-preservation. On the contrary, they are men who seek to corral the water-power resources of the country. They are determined that cheap electricity shall not compete with their wealth-producing properties and lessen their inflated dividends.

Frankly I regard the St. Lawrence waterway project as a water-power scheme. The navigation feature is merely incidental to hydroelectric development.

If water power is the end and aim of those who would utilize the St. Lawrence, they will do well to consider the plan of R. H. Bowen, an unselfish engineer, who would combine an all-American canal with St. Lawrence hydroelectric development. It would be less difficult to negotiate a treaty for this purpose than to find a solution for the puzzling complication of an international canalization scheme.

Canadian vessel owners, however, as well as the Great Lakes Harbor Association, are opposed to any method of development that does not recognize the superior rights of navigation. All vessel owners are afraid of canals that lead water to turbines. Currents of 2.5 feet per second and great masses of water moving at that speed are dreaded by all navigators.

Hydroelectric development and navigation are two separate and distinct things. They are almost as impossible to mix as are oil and water. In any event, the rights of the Province of Ontario and of the State of New York are at stake in this matter, and many State, Provincial, local, national, and international problems must be solved and kept in solution if the St. Lawrence scheme is to succeed.

PARALLEL THE RAILWAYS

The American railways carrying freight to and from tidewater are handling goods for domestic consumption. If I am correctly advised, 85 per cent of all the traffic is of this type.

If that is true, the only kind of a waterway which will benefit the great masses of American shippers is one which will cheapen or facilitate the carriage of freight for domestic consumption. There is but one route to serve this purpose. It is the one which coincides with present-day railway development.

There are several reasons for this statement. In the first place, any waterway from the Great Lakes to the sea will be open at best but eight months in the year. During the other four months, and usually nearly five months, the railways must be depended on as they are at present.

This being true, is it not wise to parallel the railway lines as nearly as possible? Then the same terminals at tidewater, the same brokers, the same bankers, the same offices can be used the year around. There can be no doubt, it seems to me, that satisfactory trade arrangements can best be made by such a plan if we are to engage in such an enterprise at all.

As a nation we have determined upon the Illinois-Ohio-Missouri-Mississippi waterway. With a policy of internal canals already established, it is illogical to go beyond our borders with another route to the sea.

THE ALL-AMERICAN CANAL PREFERABLE

The St. Lawrence waterway is out of the question, as I see it. It does not compare in value to the United States with the so-called all-American canal. The latter is capable of accomplishing for the Great Lakes and the West all that the St. Lawrence can give. With the one exception of a few hours saved on export wheat to Liverpool, the American route is superior to the Canadian.

It will run to an American port, carry domestic freight to and from the Atlantic seaboard, give the manufacturers and farmers of the West access to Central and South America, the Panama Canal, the West Coast of Africa, and the entrance to the Mediterranean. It has no dangerous fogs and deadly icebergs to contend with and is open a few more days in every year.

The all-American canal makes use of American bankers, brokers, insurance facilities, and terminals. It provides for transshipments in American ports. It leaves the money of our citizens in the pockets of Americans. It helps to develop our own United States.

There is no doubt the American canal will cost more in the beginning than the Canadian waterway. But the money for it will be spent in our own country and its control will be forever in our own hands.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WATSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business in open session.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

[Mr. PHIPPS and Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported sundry nominations, which were received and placed upon the Executive Calendar.]

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further reports of committees? If not, the calendar is in order.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Albert L. Watson to be United States district judge, middle district of Pennsylvania (additional position); and Richard J. Hopkins to be United States district judge, district of Kansas, in place of George T. McDermott, appointed circuit judge.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that these two judicial appointments may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be passed over.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT NOMINATIONS

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Chester W. Ziegler to be assayer of the mint, Philadelphia, Pa., in place of Jacob B. Eckfeldt, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Milton V. Veldee to be surgeon, Public Health Service, to rank as such from October 10, 1929.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

POST-OFFICE NOMINATIONS

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, with the exception of the postmasters in South Carolina, entered under date of November 20, I ask that the list of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I report the nomination which I send to the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama asks for the immediate consideration of a nomination, which will be stated by the clerk.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

James S. Henderson to be postmaster at Tuscumbia, Ala., in place of W. V. Walker, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

ARMY NOMINATIONS

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified.

NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS

Mr. HALE. I move that the nominations in the Navy and Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified.

POST-OFFICE NOMINATIONS

Mr. PHIPPS. I ask that the South Carolina post-office nominations be taken up for consideration at this time; and I send to the desk a letter from the Civil Service Commission, which I should like to have read. I think it will shorten the proceedings. It contains information that I think every Senator should have. It is not lengthy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., December 4, 1929.

Hon. LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,
Chairman Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR PHIPPS: The discussion in the Senate on November 20 in connection with the consideration of nominations for postmasterships is the basis for this communication. It is believed that it would be of service to the members of your committee, and, in fact, to the entire Senate body, to have a clear statement of the duties of the Civil Service Commission and of the limitations on the commission's authority and responsibility, in connection with examinations for postmasterships at first, second, and third class offices.

First, it should be understood that postmasterships at first, second, and third class offices are not classified under the civil service law, and, therefore, are not subject to the civil-service rules. Such postmasterships are by law filled through nomination by the President and confirmation by the Senate. The law prescribes a 4-year term. Such postmasterships can not be classified under the civil service law and made subject to the civil-service rules except by act of Congress.

Postmasters at fourth-class offices are classified under the civil-service act and rules. These minor postmasterships were brought within the classified service by reason of the fact that appointments to them are made by the Postmaster General without action of the President or the Senate.

It is understood that the President has the right to select nominees for postmasterships at first, second, and third class offices in any manner satisfactory to himself. The Senate has the prerogative of confirming or refusing to confirm a nomination.

The President has seen fit to call upon the Civil Service Commission to assist him by finding qualified persons for postmasterships at first, second, and third class offices. When a vacancy is to occur in one of the presidential postmasterships, it may be filled in any one of three ways under the terms of an Executive order, viz:

First, the President may nominate the incumbent for an additional term. In such case the Civil Service Commission has no part in the transaction.

Second, an employee in the classified service may be promoted to the postmastership. In such case the person selected for promotion must meet the minimum examination requirements.

Third, the Postmaster General may call upon the Civil Service Commission for an open competitive examination.

The Executive order provides that when an open competitive examination is held and the papers thereof have been rated, "the commission shall furnish a certificate of not less than three eligibles, if the same can be obtained, to the Postmaster General, who shall submit to the President the name of one of the highest three eligibles for appointment to fill such vacancy: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may reject the name of any person or persons so certified if he shall find that by reason of character or residence such person or persons shall have become disqualified after said examination, in which event he may request said commission to complete the certificate of three names."

When the commission makes its certification of eligibles to the Postmaster General, its duty ends under the terms of the Executive order. The commission has no control over or part in the method employed by

the Postmaster General in determining which of the certified eligibles he will submit to the President for nomination.

The Postmaster General may submit the name of any one of the three eligibles certified, if there be as many as three. It will be noted that the Executive order does not require the Civil Service Commission to certify three eligibles; three are to be certified "if the same can be obtained"; therefore the commission has no reason to rate an applicant higher than he logically should be rated simply to make up a certificate of three eligibles.

Sometimes there are no eligibles. In such a case a new examination is necessary. Sometimes only one or two eligibles result. The commission makes its certification to the Post Office Department whether there be one, two, or three eligibles. If the eligibles number less than three, however, the Post Office Department has the right to ask for a new examination to provide a full certification of three.

The commission does not hold a new examination when as many as three eligibles are available from the original examination.

The commission is in no way interested in the politics of candidates for postmasterships. Nothing is permitted to appear in a report on which ratings are based which might even suggest the political affiliation of any candidate. The examinations are, of course, held impartially, just as all examinations conducted by the commission are held.

For third-class offices the examination includes written scholastic tests, as well as a rating on education and experience, for the reason that at the smaller offices postmasters are required to do considerable clerical work, including the keeping of their own books.

For first and second class offices, however, the ratings are based upon education, training, and business experience and fitness. The information upon which the ratings are made is obtained through confidential inquiry among representative business and professional men and women in the city in which the postmaster is to be appointed. For first-class offices the investigation is made by agents in person. For second-class offices the inquiry is conducted through correspondence, owing to lack of facilities for doing the work otherwise. The information upon which ratings are given on training and experience in examinations for third-class offices also is obtained through correspondence.

All investigations, whether made by agents in person or through correspondence, include inquiries as to character and standing in the community, as well as to business experience and general fitness.

The Executive order providing for examinations for postmasterships at first, second, and third class offices is supplemented by the following Executive order:

"While the appointment of presidential postmasters is not within the legal scope of the civil service law and, therefore, as a matter of law, no 'preference' is applicable thereto, yet, in order that those young men and women who served in the World War, having their scholastic and business experience intercepted and interrupted thereby, may not suffer any disadvantage in the competition for such postmasterships, I direct the Civil Service Commission, in rating the examination papers of such candidates, to add to their earned ratings five points and to make certification to the Postmaster General in accordance with their relative positions thus acquired.

"I further direct that the time such candidates were in the service during the World War may be reckoned by the commission in making up the required length of business experience, and all age limitations be waived."

The benefits of the above order have been extended to veterans of the Spanish-American War and of the Philippine insurrection.

The commission repeats that postmasterships at first, second, and third class offices are not subject to the civil service law and rules and can not be made so except by act of Congress.

The commission would be glad to have this letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the entire Congress.

By direction of the commission:

Very respectfully,

JOHN T. DOYLE, *Secretary.*

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I believe that letter answers any and all questions that may have been raised with relation to the appointment of James E. Minter as postmaster at Laurens, S. C.; Paul H. Norris, as postmaster at Parris Island, S. C.; and Wesley D. Banks as postmaster at St. Matthews, S. C. I therefore move the confirmation of those nominations.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, as is well known, the Republicans of my State have no representative on the floor of the House or the Senate of their political faith. Personally, I am not taking any part in the fight now going on in my State among some people who are really Republicans, and some who are claiming to be Republicans in order to get office, but who, of course, as everybody in South Carolina knows, are not and never will be Republicans.

I feel that it is my duty, however, as one of the representatives of all the people of that State, to lay before the Senate the facts in connection with these appointments, when so requested by either side.

Joseph W. Tolbert is the Republican national committeeman from the State of South Carolina. He is also the chairman of the Republican Party of South Carolina. Those whom he represents are opposed to the nominations made by the President in these cases.

I hold in my hand a letter written on the 5th day of December by Mr. Tolbert in which he makes the statement that he does not indorse either of the appointees for postmasters whose names are now before the Senate. I have a telegram from him dated September 26 in which he says that he has not indorsed anyone for any of the places mentioned.

In the Laurens post office case, the gentleman who is postmaster there has been postmaster for eight years. He is an ex-service man. His record at the post office shows that he has been perfect in the discharge of his duty for the eight years. He stood the examination when the time came, and received a higher mark than that of any other man who took the examination. His record as postmaster for eight years is without a blemish. He gave perfect satisfaction to the patrons, he made the highest mark in the examination for reappointment, and, as I have said, he is an ex-service man.

I have not a word to say against the gentleman who received the appointment. As I understand, he is a very fine gentleman. I have a letter from the postmaster, which I ask to have published in the RECORD, in order to save the Senate time, but I will read this from it:

In addition to this I had the indorsement of the Hambright committee. I do not know what this availed, but it leads to the fact that Mr. Dial went over the heads of everyone to get his man nominated.

He refers to former Senator Dial, who is a brother-in-law of the man who received the appointment.

I have also a telegram from Mr. Crews, the postmaster dated October 8, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

I also have a letter from Postmaster General Walter Brown to Mr. Crews, and an affidavit signed by Mr. Minter. I ask that all these be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Is there objection?

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

LAURENS, S. C., October 8, 1929.

HON. COLE L. BLEASE,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter. It is impossible for me to appear before the committee at this time. My only claim is that I am a veteran of the World War; received much the highest rating on the examination for appointment the first time and again for reappointment. I have given faithful, efficient, and conscientious service as postmaster, which my official record with department and patrons will prove. I do not wish reappointment on some one's demerits. I feel that my efforts as postmaster should be rewarded on the basis of them. I leave the matter to your regard for right, in which I have implicit confidence.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY W. CREWS, *Postmaster.*

UNITED STATES POST OFFICE,

Laurens, S. C., October 9, 1929.

HON. COLE L. BLEASE,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BLEASE: I thank you very kindly for your letter of the 7th instant. I wired you last night that it would be impossible for me to personally appear before the committee just at this time, but of course, if you think it essential in order to hold my position, why I will make arrangements to come.

There is nothing that I could tell the committee except what I stated in my wire. I had thought that I was safe, inasmuch as I received much the highest rating over the next man to me, and in addition had veteran preference. However, the nominee is Mr. N. B. Dial's brother-in-law, who has lived here for a little over the minimum time necessary for eligibility and I think Mr. Dial went over the head of the Postmaster General in order to assure Mr. Minter's nomination. I say this because I received a letter from General Brown to the effect that when the case came up for action my record and qualifications would be given every proper consideration, and I knew if he did this that I would get a reappointment for I have on file in my office reports of inspections by postoffice inspectors wherein I have been complimented on the conduct of the office. In addition to this I had the indorsement of the "Hambright committee." I do not know what this availed, but it leads to the fact that Mr. Dial went over the heads of everyone to get his man nominated.

My impression is that inasmuch as I was a veteran of the World War and received 91.40 on the examination, which attest to a good record in

office, I should have been given the preference of appointment. But, you know the situation and I do not and I assure you that I appreciate very, very much anything that you can do to see that I receive a fair deal.

With kindest, personal regards to you and Mrs. Blease, I beg to remain,
Very respectfully,

STANLEY W. CREWS.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, June 20, 1929.

STANLEY W. CREWS, Esq.,
Postmaster, Laurens, S. C.

DEAR SIR: I am pleased to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of June 19. In recommending to the President the appointment of a postmaster at Laurens every proper consideration will be given to your record and qualifications.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER F. BROWN.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

County of Laurens:

Personally appeared before me James E. Minter, who, being duly sworn, says that he has not violated the United States statutes by having paid or having promised to pay or contribute any part of his salary as postmaster at Laurens, S. C., to any person or persons in consideration of their help or influence in obtaining for him the appointment as postmaster at Laurens, S. C., and that he has not promised nor agreed to make any contributions to any political party or parties in consideration of such appointment as postmaster; that no such payments have heretofore been made by him and that he has not agreed to hereafter make any such payments.

JAMES E. MINTER.

Sworn to before me this 14th day of September, 1929.

[SEAL.]

O. L. LONG,

Notary Public for South Carolina.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I have a letter from the American Legion at Laurens, which I desire to read. It is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
LAKE GARRETT POST, No. 25,
Laurens, S. C., December 6, 1929.

HON. COLE L. BLEASE,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BLEASE: Our attention has been called to the remarks of several Senators in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 20 criticizing the action of the department heads of our Government in their failure to adhere to the law granting veterans of the World War preference in appointments to Government positions, especially where they receive the highest ratings on civil-service examinations.

As commander of the local post of the American Legion, I respectfully call to your attention the situation as pertains to the postmastership at Laurens.

In December, 1928, an examination was held to fill the vacancy of the incumbent postmaster, Mr. Stanley W. Crews, whose term had expired. The result of this examination, as certified to by the United States Civil Service Commission, was as follows:

1. Stanley W. Crews, 91.40 (with military preference).
2. James E. Minter, 79.2 (without military preference).
3. Mace F. Reid, 79 (with military preference).

It will be noted that the incumbent, Stanley W. Crews, and Mace F. Reid are veterans of the World War. James E. Minter received the nomination in spite of the fact that Mr. Crews was a veteran of the World War and received much the higher rating irrespective of his preference. The nominating officer passing over the name of Mr. Crews and then not giving preference to the third name on the list, who had military preference.

We wish to protest vigorously this apparent discrimination against veterans of the World War and to respectfully request you to use every power at your command to see that veterans of the World War are not discriminated in this manner, and that the fundamental principles of civil service are adhered to. We beg to remain,

Very respectfully yours,

D. ROY SIMPSON, Commander,
Lake Garrett Post, No. 25, Department of South Carolina,
American Legion, Laurens, S. C.

I also have some other correspondence in regard to the matter.

As I have stated, personally this is not my fight; but at the request of these gentlemen I have stated to the Senate just what the situation is, and I want to repeat for just a moment. Mr. Crews has been the postmaster for eight years. He is a Republican, appointed by a Republican administration. Mr. Minter, as I understand it, is not and never has been a Republican.

Mr. Crews is a World War veteran, and as I have already stated, made 91 per cent.

Mr. SMITH. Did that include his military preference?

Mr. BLEASE. No; that did not include his military preference, as I am told.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from South Carolina to say that the 91 per cent did not include the 5 per cent military preference?

Mr. BLEASE. That is my understanding.

Mr. PHIPPS. I think the Senator is mistaken. It is always figured in before the percentage is handed down. Deducting that 5 per cent from the 91 per cent would leave 86 per cent.

Mr. BLEASE. It is my understanding that the 91 per cent did not include it, but I will see if there is anything in my file on that point.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, even without that he still is ahead in points of the man who was given the appointment. Can the Senator from Colorado explain that?

Mr. PHIPPS. Under the practice of the department, it is not at all surprising that he should not have been the selection, although of course he was entitled to it as against the other man at 79 per cent. But this postmaster had worked in the office for eight years and had the experience. He has the knowledge and all the advantage of any outside applicant. But he has had the office for eight years.

Mr. NORRIS. If we are going on the theory that these positions are to be passed around to help fellows out, then the Senator is right. But if we are going on the theory that the office is for the benefit of the public and to give the public good service, then he is wrong.

Mr. PHIPPS. That is my opinion.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to ask the Senator a question or two if he will yield.

Mr. BLEASE. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand it the present postmaster had the highest rating on examination, there were no charges against him, and his work has been efficient.

Mr. BLEASE. He stands 100 per cent with the department.

Mr. NORRIS. He is an ex-service man and the other man is away below him in the examination and is not an ex-service man. I am at a loss to understand why the President selected that man in preference to the other one. Can the Senator give us any light?

Mr. BLEASE. I can not give anybody light on what Herbert Hoover does, or will do.

Mr. NORRIS. I suppose he acted through somebody down there who has been advising this way.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I ask my colleague if he has particular information as to whether the new so-called referee board down there indorsed Minter?

Mr. BLEASE. I do not know, but Mr. Crews writes that the Hambricht committee indorsed him.

Mr. SMITH. I have had no communication in reference to the point I am raising. I understood from the reading by my colleague of the communications he has in reference to the matter that the Hambricht committee, that is the new anti-Tolbert committee, had not indorsed Mr. Minter.

Mr. BLEASE. Here is a letter dated October 9, 1929, citing other things as to his standing, and so forth, and then stating:

In addition to this I have the indorsement of the Hambricht committee. I do not know what this availed, but it leads to the fact that Mr. Dial went over the head of everyone to get his man nominated.

Mr. SMITH. If I understand the situation in the Republican element in my State, after the trial or the hearing here on the Tolbert matter, there was a new deal, a new order of things inaugurated, so it was claimed, and Mr. Hambricht was made the referee in place of one J. W. Tolbert. It was a matter of news to me that the new Hambricht committee had indorsed Mr. Crews, who is the present incumbent and whose examination rating, even though we deduct 5 points from it, puts him 7 or 8 points ahead of either one of the other competitors. I have had some communications about the matter, but my colleague being on the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I have left these matters largely to him and to the Congressmen representing the particular districts from which the appointments come. But this is a matter that is rather interesting at least, in that an ex-service man, one whose rating in the post office is 100 per cent, who is indorsed by the present Republican régime or leaders down there, the referee, is turned down and another man appointed.

I want to take occasion right here, if my colleague will permit me, to say for the RECORD that during all of the Republican administrations since I have been a Member of the Senate, and I have been here now approximately 22 years, I have received such consideration at the hands of the Republican administration that I had no criticism whatever to make. Everybody recognizes that perhaps the most hopeless State in the Union, from

the standpoint of Republicanism, is South Carolina. That arises from certain historical facts that make it the pivotal State around which cluster certain sentiments and emotions so that it is almost impossible for her, in name at least, to become Republican.

But I have received consideration because, as Mr. Taft recognized and as Mr. Harding recognized and as Mr. Coolidge recognized, the State being almost homogeneously Democratic, the very best men to fill the positions would, of course, be Democratic. When I have made certain requests and gone before them and shown that men who were seeking offices were preeminently qualified, they have granted me consideration and in several instances made the appointments. But when under this administration, following the custom of 22 years, I have gone and made certain recommendations, I have been promptly ignored in every instance, from census enumerator up to postmaster. Some of the men I recommended were Republicans that I happen to know are worthy men. I have gone to recommend them, but they were turned down. The matter of census enumerators is a very important thing, where men of intelligence go around and take the census as to certain conditions and facts that ought to be known, and there everybody that I have recommended has been promptly ignored.

So I have about come to the conclusion that it is not an unmixed evil. I felt that the recommendations were due to the administration; that it was supposed that they would want the best men to represent them in a given place, if one of the other party was not available; but my recommendations have been ignored, and I have about come to the conclusion, as I said, that it is not an unmixed evil.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit, I should think he would about have reached the conclusion that they do not care about his recommendations.

Mr. SMITH. They do not. I have reached the conclusion that they do not care about my recommendations, and therefore it has relieved me of my responsibility and I am not making any more. This is a case in point. Certain facts have been developed that I was not aware of, that the Hambright committee had recommended this man, that he is an ex-service man and a Republican; but I just wanted to state the part I had had in it. I have received several letters in reference to it that were in such language that I did not think they would interest the committee, and therefore I did not present the letters to them.

Mr. BLEASE. I want to answer the question of the Senator from Nebraska by reading a letter from Mr. Arch Coleman, who signs himself "Acting Postmaster General." The letter reads:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., September 18, 1929.

Hon. COLB L. BLEASE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BLEASE: In the absence of the Postmaster General, I desire to acknowledge receipt of your letter of September 16 concerning the postmastership at Laurens, S. C.

In accordance with the regulations governing the appointment of presidential postmasters, any one of the highest three eligibles certified may be appointed as postmaster. The law requiring that preference be given to ex-service men in making appointments does not apply to the appointment of postmasters at presidential offices, who are not in the classified civil service.

However, in accordance with the Executive order of October 14, 1921, the Civil Service Commission is authorized to add five points to the earned ratings of ex-service men and women in examinations for postmasters at presidential offices, and give them their relative places on the eligible registers.

Very truly yours,

ARCH COLEMAN,
Acting Postmaster General.

It seems that this man's 5 per cent was not added. If it had been, he would have been almost as perfect in his rating as he has been in his eight years of service.

This is a Republican fight, and, personally, I have no interest in it; but I know this town of Laurens well. I know the people there, and I know this young man has given perfect satisfaction. I am satisfied that if the Senate or any Senator will make inquiry it will be found that there is not a man inside of the corporate limits of the town of Laurens, white or black, who will make one word of complaint against Mr. Crews and his administration of the office.

I lay the facts before the Senate, and, of course, the Senate can act on it as it may be advised. I only say in conclusion that neither one of the Senators from the State, neither one of the Congressmen from the State, nor the Democratic State chairman, the Democratic national committeeman, the Republican national committeeman, nor the Republican national chair-

man has indorsed the man who has been appointed. Somebody got this indorsement, I do not know who, but it certainly has come from some organization other than the Hambright committee, according to Mr. Crews's letter, and I am not fighting the Hambright committee and not asking them any favors; neither am I asking any favors of Mr. Hoover or any department of the Government heads serving under his orders; but I feel that as the Republicans have no representation from my State, some one should lay their claims before the Senate, and I am doing that. I do not want to be mixed up in their fight in South Carolina, and am not going to be. Let the Senate decide as between them.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, of course the nomination comes before us as sent here by the President and properly referred to the committee. On the request of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE] a subcommittee was appointed to inquire into the fitness of the nominee. We can not select. That is not our duty. It is only the duty of our committee to determine, if it can, whether or not the person nominated is qualified to fill the position which has been suggested. The subcommittee heard all of the evidence which was presented by the Senator from South Carolina. Not having served on the subcommittee myself, I do not know whether they inquired as to who recommended. That is not considered necessary. The subcommittee determined that the candidate was duly qualified to fill the office and had been appointed within the requirements of the presidential order. Therefore they have reported his name for confirmation. I renew my motion.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I would like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Colorado. In the first place, who passes on the applicants or on the candidates for postmasterships in South Carolina?

Mr. PHIPPS. Whenever an open examination is had anyone who desires may take the examination.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that. I know about that.

Mr. PHIPPS. The examinations are conducted by representatives of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes; I know about that, too.

Mr. PHIPPS. After the examination comes the question of rating, which takes a considerable length of time. The papers, as a rule, are rated by men who do not know the applicants.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has not understood my question. I do not care anything about that; we all know about that; the Senator is telling us nothing new. What I am trying to get at is, when the three men are selected by civil-service examination who in South Carolina picks out the one who is to be appointed from the three highest on the list of those who have been certified?

Mr. PHIPPS. Presumably the national committeeman of the Republican Party in that State. If he is not in touch with the situation, then perhaps selection is made by some one else; but it is the custom of the administration to take the recommendation of the one decided upon for that purpose in the State.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is assuming that I must have some wrongful motive in asking my question.

Mr. PHIPPS. Not at all.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not questioning motives; but I want to know what the facts are. Who is it that recommends the appointments?

Mr. PHIPPS. I do not know in this particular case in South Carolina, because I have not asked the department as to each State.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator does not know, he has answered my question as well as he can.

Mr. PHIPPS. I stated that I did not ask the Post Office Department, and I do not have any reason to think that the subcommittee which I had appointed asked the Post Office Department.

Mr. NORRIS. That is all immaterial. The Senator simply does not know and can not answer the question, and that is the end of it, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. PHIPPS. I frankly say that I do not know.

Mr. NORRIS. It would be interesting to know the fact. I am asking the question for information. I think the Senate in its official capacity in passing on nominations ought to know the fact, and the committee that has been investigating to see whether or not the nominee is a proper person for the office ought to find out who has recommended him. Whence did the recommendation come? What was the reason for it? It may be perfectly legitimate; I am not criticizing it in any way; but it seems that somebody has picked this man, who, so far as the record is concerned, is not entitled to the appointment. That seems to be perfectly plain. An examination is held: the man who stands the highest is rejected; the man who has had eight years' experience is rejected; the man who has been a soldier is

rejected in favor of a man who has seen no military service, contrary to the rules and regulations, and to the law in so far as there is a law applying to such cases. I asked the question, Who made the recommendation? I do not have the remotest idea that the President is to blame for it; he can not look into all these matters, but he has delegated somebody in South Carolina to tell him what to do. The chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads can not tell me who it is, because he does not know and he has not inquired and has not found out, and the Senate does not know.

Mr. President, it seems from the record that is before us an injustice is being done to a worthy official, to a soldier of the country, that the real intent of the law is being perverted, and we are not advised as to the reason why. According to the record as we have it before us, somebody evidently has done a wrong to the postmaster. If it be true that he has been wronged, and if the record before us is what it appears to be, somebody has been guilty of conduct that ought to be exposed, and the President of the United States ought to know of it; he ought to be informed, so that in the future the man who has misled him in this instance will not be able to mislead him again.

I am surprised that the committee does not know anything about it. The committee have proceeded on the theory—and they may perhaps be right in that respect—that here is a certain appointment, and the only thing they can do is to look—

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

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield in a moment. The only thing they can do is to look into the facts, to see whether or not—

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I will not yield to the Senator; he must wait until I get ready to yield.

Mr. PHIPPS. But when the Senator—

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield to the Senator when I get ready.

Mr. PHIPPS. The Senator should not—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I insist that the Senator remain quiet until I yield to him. I have not yielded to him as yet.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the subject matter before the Senate?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I object to the Senator being informed, because he has been sitting here in plain hearing all the time while I have been making the subject clear, and he does not know now what it is all about.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Frankly, the longer the Senator speaks the more confused I am.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, the Senator is due for a great deal more confusion, because I am not through as yet.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Not now. I want to say, Mr. President, that the committee has probably proceeded on the theory that when an appointment is made all they have to do is to see whether it is a fit appointment, and, if it is, to recommend confirmation, and, if not, then to recommend that the nomination be rejected. That may be right in a technical sense. If that be so, however, it does not enable the Senate to perform a duty it owes to the country and to the President in letting the facts be known as to how such nominations have been brought about.

The Post Office Department is the greatest business institution in the world. For years it has been the idea of progressive-thinking minds in Congress and out, of leaders along social and economic lines, and of those who desire to see sound principles applied to government that the Post Office Department should be taken out of politics. I have been one of the humble Members, both of the House and of the Senate, who have advocated that idea for a great many years. Both political parties have promised to the country that if they were successful they would apply civil-service rules to the appointment of postmasters and eliminate politics from such appointments.

It is my judgment, without knowing the facts—and so I may be wrong about it; but I have seen the same thing occur so often that I think the statement is correct—that if the curtain were drawn aside and the truth disclosed to the public it would be found in this post-office case that the nomination has been made because of politics, and nothing but politics, and perhaps dirty politics, such politics as have to do with dealing out offices to the partisan faithful, with candidates coming to the political pie counter and getting the reward for political service. I know that nine times out of ten that is the case where unseemly things occur. As I have said, that may not be so in this instance; but if it be so, then we owe it to the President of the United States, who, we assume, is trying to carry out the real spirit of the rule he has promulgated to put post offices under

civil service, to let him know how he has been deceived by some crooked politician who has disregarded the good record made by an efficient postmaster, a soldier of his country, and put him out in favor of somebody else. If some political reason has actuated the appointment, it means the detriment of the service, and, after all, in the end the object we all want to attain is good service in the Post Office Department. Take the post office out of politics; do not give postmasterships as a reward for partisan political dirt or for partisan political service in political campaigns. Every high-minded man and woman in the country knows that when we follow along pie-counter lines we degrade the Post Office Department; we take away its efficiency and make it more expensive to the taxpayers. I should like to find out what the truth is. I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I shall take the floor in my own time.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator. I will be very glad to have him do so, and I hope when the Senator takes the floor he will give us some information. I now yield the floor.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I have endeavored to make the situation plain by having read into the RECORD the rules under which postmasters are selected and by stating the manner in which nominations are handled by the Post Office Committee. I am always willing to benefit by experience and to take the advice of other Senators who, even if they are not my elders in point of years, may be my elders in length of service. Naturally, however, I would rise to my feet to protest when any Senator undertook to criticize what has been done by the committee which I have the honor to head at the present time. I do not think it lies in the mouth of the Senator, without good and sufficient reason, to criticize the work of a committee any more than to criticize an individual Senator. I took the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska—I may have been overzealous—as leading in that direction, and it was natural that I should resent them.

Mr. President, it may be—

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. PHIPPS. Certainly; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say that the Senator is entirely mistaken about my motive. It never occurred to me that I was being discourteous to the Senator from Colorado; I would not think of doing such a thing.

Mr. PHIPPS. Not to me personally perhaps, but to the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Neither to the Senator personally nor to the committee, but I do not have to agree with what has been reported by the committee.

Mr. PHIPPS. I did not want to interrupt the Senator's political speech—and if I had known he was making a political speech at the time, I would have waited a few minutes—but I did not realize that that was what he was doing. I thought that it was proper for me to ask him to yield so that I might object to the character of remarks which he was making at the time.

Mr. President, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads by its subcommittee has followed the usual procedure in this case. I understand that neither Senator from South Carolina has any personal objection to the nominee for the post office at Laurens, S. C.; but I am willing to separate my motion and ask first for the confirmation of Mr. Paul H. Norris at Parris Island, and then of Mr. Wesley D. Banks at St. Matthews, regarding whom I understand there is no real objection.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, there is objection to the nominee for the St. Matthews office. I have several affidavits here from which it looks as if there was dirty work in that case.

Mr. PHIPPS. May I inquire of the Senator from South Carolina if the affidavits were submitted to the subcommittee which reported the nomination favorably?

Mr. BLEASE. I understand they were, although I do not know whether the subcommittee read them.

Mr. PHIPPS. I think I can answer for the subcommittee. I am confident they would not have such affidavits in their possession and not read them. I believe the minutes of the meeting, however, will show as to that.

Mr. BLEASE. If the statements in the affidavits are true, then this is an instance of a political trade, one man being traded out and another man traded in. Here are the affidavits [exhibiting]. There is no objection, however, so far as I know, to the confirmation of the nominee for Parris Island.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I suggest, in justice to the committee, that I have not heard a word of criticism as to the fitness of Mr. Minter, or as to his character and his general standing.

Mr. BLEASE. Nobody is questioning that.

Mr. SMITH. And I can understand how the committee investigating Mr. Minter's fitness after he had been recommended, would feel that his nomination should be reported to the Senate for confirmation, in view of the fact that I have not heard a word of criticism as to Mr. Minter's character or qualifications, despite the fact that he was somewhat lower on the examination rating than the other candidates. Personally I have heard nothing that should cause Mr. Minter's nomination to be rejected, other than the fact of Mr. Crews being an ex-service man with a fine record. However, if the appointing power saw fit to appoint Mr. Minter, under the rules and regulations, they had the right to do that, and there is nothing against Mr. Minter, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, that is quite true; and I do not know that it makes any difference as to whose recommendation they took when they determined as between Mr. Minter and Mr. Crews. Under existing law the full right and authority is in the department to make the nomination, and if the President approves it he sends up the name. There are no charges against any one of these three men whose names have been submitted. The subcommittee has found them all qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask for individual votes?

Mr. PHIPPS. I should like to accommodate the junior Senator from South Carolina as far as possible.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I ask that the affidavits which I send to the desk be read as to the trade at St. Matthews.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the affidavits will be read.

The legislative clerk read the affidavits of J. B. Taylor, R. E. McLaughlin, C. E. Clay, and C. P. Zeigler, all dated October 15, 1929.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from South Carolina whether these affidavits were submitted to the committee or to the department?

Mr. BLEASE. I do not think they were submitted to the department. I think they were submitted to the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. I will ask the Senator from Colorado whether he has ever seen them before.

Mr. PHIPPS. I will state that I did not serve on this particular subcommittee. We divide up the work. As I recall, the minutes of the meeting of that subcommittee indicate that these affidavits were submitted. They were submitted, not by the Senator from South Carolina, but by his clerk, who brought them there. The Senator had been notified, and was to be present at the meeting, but he was represented by his clerk instead.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, assuming this record to be true—I have no personal knowledge about it; I have no interest whatever in this matter, except that I should like to see the Post Office Department operated on efficient lines—it seems to me that the contract was carried out, as these affidavits say it was carried out, by which a man really bought the recommendation of the man whose recommendation was necessary and sufficient. He bought it by agreeing with him that when he got into the office he would discharge a certain employee, an assistant postmaster, and employ another certain-named individual as assistant postmaster.

Mr. President, if a Member of the Senate were running for reelection, and made that kind of a deal with a postmaster or with any other public official, and were elected after making that kind of a deal, that contract would disqualify him from taking the office. If properly shown up here, it would cause his rejection by a committee of this body. It is a violation of law; it is a violation of honor; and any man who makes such a contract to get an office has violated the law, the civil-service rules, and common decency as well.

It appears that that contract was made here by the man, I take it, who has been nominated. Is that right?

Mr. BLEASE. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. And he stated—so it is sworn to by several witnesses—that he wanted to keep this assistant postmaster, but that he had to agree to discharge him; he had to agree to employ a certain other person named, in order to get the office himself. Has this other fellow been appointed, or has not the postmaster gone in yet?

Mr. BLEASE. The man who is to make the appointment, if he is confirmed, is to turn out the man who has been there, and put in the other man.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly. That ought to be sufficient to cause his rejection.

Mr. BLEASE. The man about whom the trade was made is acting postmaster now. He has been assistant postmaster there for many years, and he is now acting as postmaster. This man Banks said he wanted to keep him, but the referee told

him that he would not recommend Banks for appointment unless he agreed to turn out Taylor and put in Albergotti.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly.

I can not conceive that the President of the United States would appoint a man if he knew that he had made a contract of this kind.

I do not believe the Postmaster General would recommend him; and under the ordinary rules of civil service, if that were disclosed at the examination, it would cause his rejection instantaneously.

I do not think we ought to confirm this nomination. We ought to send it back to the committee. Perhaps these things are not true. They are ex parte, it is true; and I should like to give the person against whom this charge is made an opportunity to meet it. I do not want to try him in his absence; but the committee ought to take up this matter with the department again and lay these charges before them and let the man who has been appointed have an opportunity to meet them. Maybe he will make a clear showing that will dissipate them all, but with that kind of a contract facing us I do not see how we can confirm this appointee.

I move, therefore, that the nomination be referred back to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads for further investigation and recommendation.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. PHIPPS. May I have the attention of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE]? I should like to inquire of the Senator from South Carolina if he would like to have further inquiry made regarding the nominees for Laurens and St. Matthews, if he desires to have them referred back to the committee for further inquiry, and if he is willing to have the other nominee confirmed?

Mr. BLEASE. I am perfectly willing; but I want to state once more that I want it distinctly understood that this is no fight of mine. I do not want to be mixed up in this thing.

Mr. PHIPPS. The Senator is so deeply involved that I do not see how he can escape; but we will try to fix things for him in South Carolina, and another year we will see that we have Republicans possibly in the Senate, but at least in the House, so that they may be consulted.

Mr. BLEASE. I will say to my friend that he might get one vote in the House; but with me up for reelection, he has not any chance to get one on this side of the Capitol.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to proceed a little further now. I have the floor, as I understand.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one moment further?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. PHIPPS. I was going to suggest that if the Senator will add to his motion that this other one be returned to the committee, I shall be glad to take it up. We are willing to take back the St. Matthews and Laurens nominees and find out who made this suggestion if the Senator desires.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is a fair proposition; and I will include the other, too.

Mr. PHIPPS. The other one, and confirm the other regarding which there is no objection.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. Is there going to be any objection to that?

Mr. SMITH. No, Mr. President; but in justice to Mr. Banks—who has not appeared and who has not taken any part in this matter so far as I know—I think it ought to be said that these affidavits or their equivalent were sent to me, and I have not heard a word from Mr. Banks, who is the postmaster. This is a charge against him that he accepted the office, according to these affidavits, under a trade such as is indicated. In justice to Mr. Banks, I think he ought to be given an opportunity to state before the committee whether or not he was a party to any such trade.

Mr. NORRIS. That is right. That is my object in making the motion to refer the nomination back to the committee.

Mr. SMITH. I think it ought to be referred to the committee, so that they may communicate with Mr. Banks.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, Mr. President, just one other word.

The Senator from Colorado apparently was offended at what I said, and because I refused to yield at a particular moment. A Senator having the floor is supreme, and ought to be, whether he yields or not. I do not want to yield always in the midst of a paragraph or something of that kind. I did yield finally; I had no other intention than to yield. I was not trying to be offensive to the Senator from Colorado, and I hope was not. I exercised a right which I claim to have, and which I will assert whenever I think I ought to assert it, to make inquiry as to the

business that is before the Senate; and that is what I shall proceed to do whenever I desire to do so. I thought that the committee should have made some further investigation. The Senator apparently agrees with me now, since he is willing to take it back to the committee.

I do not know any of these people, and I was not trying to make a political speech. I am not trying to embarrass anybody. I am trying to do what I believe to be my duty as a part of the appointive power in the case of post offices, which ought not to come to us at all, in my judgment. If I had my way, they would not be here. We ought to have nothing to do with them. It seemed to me that there was disclosed here a fact about which the administration, assuming it to be fair, which I do, and wanting to enforce the law fairly, would want to know. If they do not want to be fair, then I want to know about it.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator now.

Mr. PHIPPS. I do not object to being lectured by other Senators, but I submit that if I had stood in my place and charged the Committee on the Judiciary with failing to perform its duty, the Senator from Nebraska on the floor would promptly have asked me to yield in the middle of a sentence.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; I would not.

Mr. PHIPPS. Then that is a question on which the Senator and I differ.

Mr. NORRIS. If I did undertake to do so and the Senator declined, I would not be offended. I have asked hundreds of Senators to yield to me, and when they have said, "No; I decline to yield," I did not keep on talking, as the Senator from Colorado did, and say, "I am going to have you yield right now. You have made a charge against me." I did not make any charge at which any man has a right to be offended.

The Senator has referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. He has been before that committee. He came before the committee once in a matter in which he took a very deep interest, and he was not in good health at the time. Does the Senator remember how that case dragged along? Will the Senator say now that he was not treated with the utmost courtesy and his rights preserved by myself, even when he was not present, as against his own colleague? Will the Senator admit now, as he has already admitted to me in thanks which he returned to me, I think in writing, for the way I took care of his rights, that I preserved his rights in a courteous way?

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. PHIPPS. I was glad to say to the Senator in person—I did not write—that I appreciated the courtesies extended to me by his committee and by himself.

Mr. NORRIS. Then the Senator has had experience with the Judiciary Committee, and he knows how it gets along.

Mr. PHIPPS. Had I taken the other tack and criticized the action of the committee, of course, the situation would have been entirely different.

Mr. NORRIS. It would have been different, Mr. President, but the Senator would not have heard the chairman of the Judiciary Committee objecting to the criticism. I have been criticized from the time I got out of the cradle, and if the criticism is honest and constructive, I invite it, I welcome it, it is a benefit to me, as well as to the man who makes it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will allow me, I want to make one suggestion. In view of the affidavits which have been read, which will go into the Record unless otherwise ordered by the Senate—and they are of such a nature as to reflect on Mr. Banks, the nominee for postmaster at St. Matthews—I request that the record as disclosed here this afternoon in reference to Mr. Banks be withheld from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until such time as Mr. Banks's statement can be given, so that that record and his statement will go in together, if they go in at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and that part of the Record will be deleted.

The question now is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to recommit.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, let us have the motion definitely stated so that there will be no misunderstanding. Is it modified to include Laurens and St. Matthews? Is that correct?

Mr. BLEASE. Yes.

Mr. PHIPPS. Does the Senator from South Carolina want to have the two nominations go back?

Mr. NORRIS. I made the motion with reference to one, but the Senator suggested that the other ought to go back, too; and, of course, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to recommit to the Committee on

Post Offices and Post Roads the name of James E. Minter to be postmaster at Laurens, S. C., and the name of Wesley D. Banks to be postmaster at St. Matthews, S. C.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PHIPPS. I move that the nomination of Paul H. Norris to be postmaster at Parris Island, S. C., be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, would it be proper to exclude from the Record the entire reference to the Laurens case and the St. Matthews case?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reference to those cases could be excluded unless there were objection.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, unless we are going to eliminate the entire proceedings I do not see where we can draw the line. The papers were submitted in the case as to Laurens, and unless they go into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Post Office Department will not see what was said about the matter.

Mr. BLEASE. I have no objection; I was just trying to protect some one else.

Mr. PHIPPS. I think it would be better to have the Record stand with regard to that.

Mr. BLEASE. Anything I do or say I want anybody interested to know.

AMBASSADOR TO JAPAN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this morning the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] reported favorably from the Committee on Foreign Relations, by unanimous vote of that committee, the nomination of Mr. William R. Castle, jr., to be ambassador to Japan. Ordinarily, such a nomination would go to the calendar and it would not make any difference, but the Japanese delegates to the London conference are expected to be in Washington within a few days, and it is not likely that another executive session will be held in time to enable Mr. Castle to be commissioned before their arrival if the nomination is not confirmed to-day. Therefore, I ask consent that the nomination may now be confirmed. It is on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

MEDICAL CORPS, UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. REED. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report favorably, by unanimous vote of the committee, the nominations of a number of captains in the Medical Corps to be majors. These officers have been held up since last April because of an uncertainty in the mind of the Judge Advocate General of the Army, I understand, as to the meaning of the law. Some of the officers have had to be demoted, although they were serving as majors, due to the fact that the names were not sent to the Senate and that they were not confirmed.

Inasmuch as the Committee on Military Affairs is unanimously in favor of the promotions, and as they are all routine nominations, and as none of them involves a rank higher than that of major, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations may be considered and confirmed en bloc at this time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, were the nominations unanimously reported?

Mr. REED. Yes; the committee was unanimous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified.

RECESS

Mr. WATSON. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess, the recess being until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), under the order previously entered, took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, December 12, 1929, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 11 (legislative day of December 4), 1929

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

William R. Castle, jr., to Japan.

ASSAYER OF THE MINT

Chester W. Ziegler.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Milton V. Veldee to be surgeon.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be first lieutenants

Joseph Julius Hornisher.
 Roland Keith, Charles, jr.
 Harold James Collins.
 Frederick Cantwell Kelly.
 William Henry Powell, jr.
 Paul Nixon to be second lieutenant, Medical Administrative Corps.

DENTAL CORPS

Grant Arthur Selby to be first lieutenant.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY

Robert Scurlark Moore to be first lieutenant, to Finance Department.
 Joseph Harris to be first lieutenant, to Finance Department.
 Clyde Vincent Simpson to be major, to Signal Corps.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

Gordon Johnston to be colonel, Cavalry.
 James Josephus Loving to be lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers.
 Frederick Blundon Downing to be lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers.
 Edmund Leo Daley to be lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers.
 Henry Abercrombie Finch to be lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers.
 Berthold Vogel to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Harry Howell Dunn to be major, Cavalry.
 Renn Lawrence to be major, Cavalry.
 John Richard Hermann to be major, Infantry.
 William Allen Austin to be colonel, Cavalry.
 Rudolph Ethelbert Smyser to be colonel, Quartermaster Corps.
 Edward Dahl Ardery to be lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers.
 Richard Coke Bursleson to be lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery.
 Lloyd Patzlaff Horsfall to be lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Charles Gearhart Mettler to be lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department.
 Morgan Lewis Brett to be lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department.
 Ralph Arthur William Pearson to be major, Infantry.
 Raymond Holmes Bishop to be major, Infantry.
 James A. Summersett, jr., to be major, Infantry.
 Hugh Coskery Gilchrist to be major, Infantry.
 Joseph A. Sheridan to be major, Field Artillery.
 Clyde Wakefield Scogin to be major, Dental Corps.
 James Lawrence Olsen to be major, Dental Corps.
 John Ezra Hemphill to be colonel, Signal Corps.
 Otto William Rethorst to be colonel, Cavalry.
 Robert Sterrett to be colonel, Quartermaster Corps.
 Forrest Estey Williford to be lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Earl McFarland to be lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department.
 Joseph Andrew Green to be lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.
 Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright to be lieutenant colonel, Cavalry.
 Walter Stephen Sturgill to be lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery.
 Thomas Godfrey Bond to be major, Infantry.
 John Lenhart Rice to be major, Cavalry.
 Nelson Mark Imboden to be major, Cavalry.
 Willis Henry Hale to be major, Air Corps.
 Walter Ray Mann to be major, Infantry.
 Charles Arthur Shamotulski to be major, Infantry.
 William Powell Scobey to be major, Infantry.
 Burton Alpheus Seeley to be lieutenant colonel, Veterinary Corps.
 Orville Earl Fisher to be major, chaplain.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

William Cotman Whitmore.	Henry Edgar Keely.
Edward Lane Moore.	Ralph Hayward Simmons.
Charles Augustus Pfeffer.	James Brent Anderson.
Francis Elwood Weatherby.	Jarrett Matthew Huddleston.
Robert Lancelot Tebbitt.	Albert Bowen.
Richard Henry Eanes.	Louis Archie Milne.
Andrew William Smith.	John Pierce Beeson.
James Wesley Duckworth.	Howard Tilghman Wickert.

Harold Paine Sawyer.	Victor Newcomb Meddis.
Frederic Hamilton Thorne.	Verner Trenary Scott.
James Roy Hudnall.	Edwin Raymond Strong.
George Joseph Schirch.	Leroy Dilmore Soper.
Reeve Turner.	Thomas Morris Chaney.
Reginald Ducat.	Cleve Carrington Odom.
Fred Earl Hickson.	William Alexander Smith.
John Andrews Rogers.	George Earl Hesner.
Alexander Mileau, jr.	William Humes Houston.
Guy Blair Denit.	Edwin Leland Brackney.
Charles Rice Lanahan.	Frank Paul Strome.
Read Benedict Harding.	Edward Jones Strickler.
Lowyd Whitcombe Ballantyne.	Frank William Pinger.
William John Miede.	Aubrey Kenna Brown.
Thomas Grant Tousey.	Daniel Currie Campbell.
Edwin Forrest Shaffer.	John Leonard Meddaugh.
Harrison Horton Fisher.	Kirk Patrick Mason.
Joseph Richards Shelton.	Neely Cornelius Mashburn.
Charles August Stammel.	Charles Booth Spruit.
Stanley Gibson Odom.	John Shackelford Gibson.
John Marion Stanley.	John Dawson Roswell Woodworth.
Robert Keith Simpson.	Lucius Featherstone Wright.
Don Guernsey Hilldrup.	Percy Daniel Moulton.
Paul Henry Streit.	Henry Samuel Cole.
Earle Douglass Quinell.	Fred Oscar Stone.
Frank McAlpin Moose.	Herbert Hall Price.
Emory Howard Gist.	William Elijah Moore Devers.
Arthur Raymond Gaines.	William Munroe White.
Lewis Edwin Joel Browne.	Jose Canellas Carballeira.
Charles Earle Brenn.	Samuel Elkan Brown.
Frederick Arthur Blesse.	Ralph Duffy.
Henry Earl Fraser.	John Calvin Dye.
Douglas Hamilton Mebane.	Clyde Clifford Johnston.
James Archibald Orbison.	Ernest Farris Harrison.
James Claude Kimbrough.	Albert Julius Treichler.
John Jay Moore.	Gaston Wilder Rogers.
Harold Dana Rogers.	William Daniel Mueller.
Carl William Shaffer.	Harry Ainsworth Clark.
Alfred Robert Thomas, jr.	Julius Girard Newgord.
Logan Mitchel Weaver.	Royal Shepherd Loving.
Charles Edward Sima.	Malcolm Cummings Grow.
Lyle Charles White.	Charles Henry Haberer.
Frank Walker Young.	James Gustin Hall.
Roy Farrington Brown.	Henry Wells Stanley Hayes.
Richard Turberville Arnest.	Henry Mitchell Van Hook.
Charles Levi Maxwell.	Bartlett Lockwood Shellhorn.
William Love Starnes.	Silas Walter Williams.
Orlando Jefferson Posey.	Frank Noble Stiles.
Levy Steven Johnson.	Ross Bradley Bretz.
Daniel Franklin.	Everard Blackshear.
Clive Paul Mueller.	John Rutherford Herrick.
Edwin Howerton Roberts.	Clarence Clinton Harvey.
Arthur Howard Nylan.	Shores Erastus Clinard.
William Walker McCaw.	Robert Cornelius Murphy.
Allan Wilson Dawson.	Clyde Danford Oatman.
Anthony Joseph Vadala.	James Russell Bibighaus.
William Archdall Boyle.	Claude Vernon Gautier.
Paul Maxwell Neuman Kyle.	Ralph Emerson Henry.
Myron Parkhill Rudolph.	Carroll Porteous Price.
Patrick Sarsfield Madigan.	Henry Charles Johannes.
William Cramer Pollock.	Earl Hunter Perry.
Louis Martin Field.	Donald Ion Stanton.
Ottis Lee Graham.	Charles Beresford Callard.
William Scott Dow.	James Sutton Brummette.
John Glenwood Knauer.	Pernier Albert Mix.
Montreville Alfred St. Peter.	Joseph Hall Whiteley.
Fabian Lee Pratt.	Oscar Amadeus Hansen.
Harry Baldwin Gantt.	James Harvey Ashcraft.
Daniel Bascom Faust.	Clyde McKay Beck.
Wilmer Clayton Dreifelbies.	William Bartle Kenworthy.
William John Burdell.	Lawrence Bell Pilsbury.
Maxwell Gordon Keeler.	William Clare Porter.
Harold Vincent Raycroft.	David Ap Myers.
Hugh William Mahon.	James Bliss Owen.
Wayne Roscoe Beardsley.	Frank Cady Venn.
William Eli McCormack.	Milo Benjamin Dunning.
Thomas Harold Reagan.	Joseph Sherman Craig.
Sam Hardeman.	Richmond Favour, jr.
Morgan Clint Berry.	Guy David Griggs.
Eli Edwin Brown.	Dennis William Sullivan.
Ralph Elmer Curti.	Walter Midkiff Crandall.
Marvin Chester Pentz.	James Edward Gramond.
John Ignatius Meagher.	Adolph Thomas Gilhus.
Eugen Gottfried Reinartz.	Samuel L. Thorpe.
Shirley Quincy Elmore.	John Michael Weiss.
Albert Glenn Kinberger.	
Wilbur Gibson Jenkins.	

Frank William Romaine.
Charles Arthur Bell.
Lincoln Frank Putnam.
Rufus Leroy Holt.
John DuBose Barnwell.
Everett LeCompte Cook.
Ralph Leslie Cudlipp.
Virgil Heath Cornell.
Gordon Adams Clapp.
Joe Harold St. John.
Theodore Wallace O'Brien.
William Charles Munly.

Ebner Holmes Inmon.
George William Rice.
Robert James Platt.
William Ralph Campbell.
James Neal Williams.
Ernest Jackson Steves.
Rollo Preston Bourbon.
John Christopher Woodland.
Brooks Collins Grant.
Elmer Seth Tenney.
William Bell Foster, jr.
Chauncey Elmo Dovell.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Frederick C. Sherman to be commander.
Edward B. Arroyo to be lieutenant.
James M. Lane to be lieutenant (junior grade).
Jared A. Mason to be lieutenant (junior grade).
Benjamin F. Tompkins to be lieutenant (junior grade).

MARINE CORPS

James T. Buttrick to be colonel.
Frederick A. Gardner to be lieutenant colonel.
Tom D. Barber to be lieutenant colonel.
William J. Livingston to be captain.
Carl F. Merz to be captain.
William W. Conway to be first lieutenant.
Arthur G. Bliesener to be first lieutenant.
Gerald H. Steenberg to be first lieutenant.
George H. Bellinger to be first lieutenant.
Gouverneur H. Parrish to be chief pay clerk.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

James S. Henderson, Tusculumbia.

ARIZONA

Lucye L. Horan, Inspiration.
Gwendolyn A. McNary, McNary.

ARKANSAS

J. Ernest Simpson, Berryville.

COLORADO

Zetah C. Straub, Flagler.

GEORGIA

Annie R. Humphreys, East Point.

HAWAII

Shinichi Okamura, Hanapepe.

IDAHO

Ray W. Sheesley, Hansen.
Ida M. Helton, Homedale.

INDIANA

Maurice J. Sterner, Chalmers.

KENTUCKY

Rufus J. Bruner, East Bernstadt.
John B. Lafferty, Wheelwright.

MAINE

Earl J. Gilpatrick, Danforth.

MASSACHUSETTS

Hattie A. Grant, Bryantville.
Mildred D. Linnell, Hyannis Port.

MICHIGAN

Reva Runnels, Eau Claire.

MISSOURI

Paul M. Essig, Clifton Hill.
Bert G. Ozenbaugh, Watson.

NEBRASKA

Ralph B. Demel, Central City.
Victor F. Palmateer, Creston.

NEW JERSEY

Herbert E. Morton, Ashland.
Fred C. Blossfeld, Montvale.
Fanny Jenner, New Market.

NEW YORK

Bartlett M. Ide, Corinth.
Eugene C. Morley, Sodus Point.

NORTH CAROLINA

Una C. Edwards, Cliffside.

NORTH DAKOTA

Jesse J. Taylor, Oriska.

OKLAHOMA

Maude D. Eaton, Waynoka.

PENNSYLVANIA

Vincent P. Lyman, Cranesville.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Paul H. Norris, Parris Island.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Mangus B. Eastwold, Fedora.
Myrtle K. Norbeck, Platte.

TENNESSEE

Hattie M. Johnson, Henning.

TEXAS

Andrew S. Broaddus, Caldwell.
Stanley F. N. Dolch, Eagle Pass.
Ada E. Harris, League City.
John Mahurin, Point Isabel.
Byron R. Hughes, Roxton.
James W. Foster, Woodson.

UTAH

Oscar W. Evans, Castlegate.

VERMONT

Edward E. Whitcomb, Ely.

WASHINGTON

Clarence E. Sears, Chewelah.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, December 11, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Hon. CARL E. MAPES, of Michigan, Speaker pro tempore. The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Draw near to every one of us, dear Father in Heaven. May the blessing of this day take our thoughts to Thy mercy seat; in humble and perfect confidence we would submit ourselves to Thee and conform our wills in the spirit of gratitude and obedience. We call upon Thee in the wonder, mystery, and conflict of life. O God save us from ourselves; keep our hands clean and our hearts pure. Separate us from every carnal and compromising motive, and all that we are and have may they be consecrated to the law and will of God. O awaken in us the old love, the old trust, and the old memories of home and childhood, and bless and inspire us with their sweet and heavenly benedictions. Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 679. An act granting the consent of Congress to Knox County, Tenn., and Anderson County, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Clinch River at or near Solway, in Knox County, Tenn.;

S. 680. An act granting the consent of Congress to Knox County, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Holston River at or near McBees Ferry in Knox County, Tenn.;

S. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution for the emergency relief of flood sufferers in the area overflowed by the Rio Grande River in the State of New Mexico; and

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution for adjournment of Congress from December 21, 1929, to January 6, 1930.

CLOSING THE CIRCLE OF WATERWAYS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, by inserting an address delivered by my colleague, Hon. CHARLES G. EDWARDS, of Georgia, before the Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington, D. C., on December 10, 1929.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech by his colleague [Mr. EDWARDS]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, the keynote of the program of this convention has been given in the splendid addresses already made, but it will bear repeating. It is the advocacy by the President of the United States of a great connected national system of waterways. I have been asked to speak to the subject of "Completing the circle," which would indicate we are about to complete something in waterway development.

Our water resources have always been here. They are the same old rivers, harbors, lakes, and waterways, except very few artificial canals. The possibilities of these great resources have been here since time began, and why we have not long before this harnessed them into useful production through power and navigation, where possible, I am unable to understand.

When I came to Congress back in 1907 it was my pleasure to meet men who were then active for waterway development, like the Hon. J. Hampton Moore, Hon. John H. Small, the late Hon. Theodore Burton, and many others, who were then, over 20 years ago, appealing for "a policy and not a project," and the people were being told of the possibilities of our waterways and urged to hasten development of them that the commerce and industry of the country might grow. True, much has been accomplished in that time, but it seems so little as compared to what we feel should have been accomplished. When we contemplate the vastness of our rivers, lakes, harbors, and waterways, coupled with the proposed canal systems, we must confess with frankness, despite all that has been done and expended on our waterways, that "water is to-day our greatest undeveloped resource," offering a possible total of fifty-five or sixty million horsepower, of which only about 12,000,000 has been developed; and of approximately 25,000 miles of possible inland waterways, we are told that less than 7,000 miles have been developed and much of these 7,000 miles remain unconnected. The great American who said: "Water is to-day our greatest undeveloped resource," also said:

"True conservation of water is not the prevention of use. Every drop of water that runs to the sea without yielding its full commercial returns to the Nation is an economic loss, and that loss in all its economic implications can be computed in billions."

It would take more than billions to compute what has run to waste during the history of this country both with respect to power and navigation. The fact that this waste has been permitted is no excuse that it should continue. Those "demagogues" who, in days gone by, raised the hue and cry of "pork barrel" against river and harbor appropriations have cost this Republic vastly more in waste of power and navigation than the Government has yet spent on her waterways because they retarded the work of farsighted patriots who sought earnestly to comprehensively develop our water resources to make them respond in all their fullness to our needs for power and transportation. The crime against progress of those self-serving demagogues who made waterway development unpopular, for a time, because of their "pork barrel" propaganda in the history of our waterway developments cries out to-day in loud condemnation of the many "slow ups" the cause has had in the misnomer of "economy." It has cost us vastly more not to go forward and complete our national systems than it would have to have completed the whole program years ago. We can not even dream of what the results would have been on our industries and commerce if we had driven straight to completion the things we contemplate to-day as worthy of development but which remain yet unfinished. When will the work be done? When are we to harness this national system to producing power and carrying commerce which is the wisest way in which they can be conserved—their conservation lies in their utilization for the benefit of the people.

Much has been completed. We have much to be thankful for. I recall when the Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which I was then a member, put the Ohio River on the road to completion. Some were then skeptical and said it would cost too much and could hardly ever be completed. That great completed system is a realization and an eternal monument to those of us who helped it on its way, with faith in it and with faith in the great section and people effected by it. It is one of many projects that went on the books, were approved, in the years gone by, that have gone to completion and justified the expenditures in making them possible and serviceable to the commerce of the Nation and the world. As fast as we have moved, we have not moved fast enough in this important work.

In fact, in the natural order of things, the waterways should have been developed ahead of our rail transportation, ahead of highway transportation, and much ahead of air transportation in this country, because water transportation was our natural gift and from the earliest days of our history should have been utilized more than it was. Farsighted men of all periods of our country's history have appealed for waterway development. Such men as Washington, Jefferson, and Hamilton were waterway advocates, and in all periods of our history our ablest men have urged water as a means for cheaply carrying commerce, yet for one reason and another we have gone at it spasmodically and by "starts and fits," and then slow down, with the result that

while we have done much there is still a great deal more to do to make really effective and really worth while, to this and future generations, in all the richness with which we should truly be blessed, in the usefulness and helpfulness of a comprehensive and completed national system of waterways.

You see on this printed program "Linking the Lakes with the Ocean"; the "St. Lawrence Route" and the "New York Route"; the "Lakes to the Gulf Waterway," the "Atlantic Inland Waterway," and the "Intracoastal Canal." If you will study this, you will find why the subject "Completing the Circle" is on the program. You will recall years ago the late L. M. Cooley, an eminent hydraulic engineer of Chicago, spoke of what he called "The great circle waterway," which, as you readily understand, was composed of the Great Lakes and a connection therefrom to the Atlantic coast, the Atlantic coast inland waterway, the intracoastal canal along the Gulf coast, the Lakes to the Gulf waterway, and, finally, a waterway across northern Florida and southern Georgia which would tie it all together in the completed circle. So really my subject is as to the uncompleted Atlantic inland waterway and the proposed canal across Georgia and Florida to make the completed circle. There are yet some parts of the Atlantic inland waterway that have not been started, leaving segments uncompleted, while other segments have been completed.

I think, too, that I am right in the assertion that some segments are of one depth and some still of other depths and widths. The Atlantic inland waterway, to be fully effective, ought to be of a uniform depth and width, and it ought to be connected up and completed from Boston to Key West, and then to complete this important circle, that will take in and serve the eastern half of the United States, the proposed canal across Georgia and Florida should be completed. The canal in question would serve the dual purpose of serving navigation and of helping in our problems of drainage in Georgia and Florida.

With the circle completed water-borne commerce might be interchanged between any point on the Great Lakes, any point on the Atlantic coast from Boston south, any point on all the navigable rivers, and those that can be made navigable, flowing eastward to the Atlantic, any point on the Gulf coast all the way down to Mexico, and any point on the rivers flowing to the Gulf, including the Mississippi and all its tributaries, which waterway circle and navigable waterways connected with or flowing into it would cover the entire eastern half of the United States. Is this impossible? Is it a dream? Was the great Chicago hydraulic engineer seeing visions when he spoke of this waterway circle? Is this to be desired? Is it worth while? Is it to be done, and if so, when?

It is no dream. It is possible. It is highly desirable, the great hydraulic engineer referred to had a practical vision, the project is richly worth while in what it would mean in increased commerce and reduced freight rates in the eastern half of the United States, and let us hope it will be undertaken and completed at no distant date.

That waterway developments favorably affect and reduce freight rates, and that water transportation is the cheapest known, there is no longer any dispute and about which there are no arguments.

The President in his recent message to Congress said: "Expansion of our intracoastal waterways to effective barge depths is well warranted" to which I wish he had added an appeal for their rapid development and completion. I do not like the idea of limiting waterway developments to fifty or fifty-five million dollars per annum. We have agreed pretty generally on a policy, and we are pretty generally agreed that the job should be done, and that all worthy rivers, harbors, and waterways should be developed, then in the interest of what I believe would be economy and of wonderful progress, let us agree upon a program of saying this thing shall be completed within a certain period of 5, 7, or 10 years, and then move forward with that program as rapidly as money will carry it, regardless of the cost, for the completed system will be worth tenfold more than it will cost and will return its cost a thousand times over in increased commerce and benefits to the people it will serve.

The circle of which I have spoken should be completed at once, and the entire national system of waterways should be pushed as rapidly as it can be that we may utilize as far as possible the great resources that are wrapped up in a comprehensive waterway system of the entire country.

PROTECTION OF WHALES IN ALASKAN WATERS

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Delegate from Alaska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, the destruction of whales which goes on apace in Alaskan Territorial waters, to be manufactured into oil and fertilizer, is surely leading to a complete extermination of that sea animal. This ruthless commercial exploitation of whales in other sections of the world has reached a stage where it is considered of such importance as to warrant

serious discussion by the League of Nations, with a view to international action for the protection of this sea mammal.

On January 29, 1926, at Geneva, the committee of experts for the progressive codification of international law submitted a report to the League of Nations on exploitation of the products of the sea. This report was prepared by Signor Jose Leon Suarez, of Argentine. I herewith submit extracts from the Spanish translation as published by the League of Nations in the hope that it may call attention to the necessity for action by Congress to protect the few whales now remaining in Alaskan waters:

The wealth constituted by the creatures of the deep is not fixed in the sense of being confined to one region or latitude, but varies from year to year according to the biological, physical, and chemical circumstances affecting the plankton among which they live. The majority of aquatic animals are essentially migratory, and it is this characteristic which creates the biologic-geographical solidarity of species, which should find its counterpart in a legal solidarity in the sphere of international law in which we are working.

This urgent necessity for international regulation of the exploitation of the biological wealth of the sea is a new phenomenon to jurists but is familiar to all those who are brought into contact with the creatures of the deep, either in the pursuit of gain or in the interests of science. The marine species of use to man will become extinct unless their exploitation is subjected to international regulation. It is this situation, gentlemen, which must be considered, and not the existing treaties, which in their time were a palliative but never a cure and which to-day are no longer sufficient and even constitute a danger, either because the species in question migrate for natural reasons from places where they are protected to places where they are uneconomically exploited or because, when they are hunted to excess in certain areas, they take refuge in other waters where they are less molested, thus constituting, in practice, a monopoly in favor of certain countries.

The human race is already beginning to experience a shortage in food, and this shortage is likely to be accentuated, owing not only to the increase of population but to the growth of the average consumption of each individual. As the democratic organization of society improves, so man increases his consumption, particularly of meat and corn. This is due not only to a physiological but to a psychological necessity—the craving to make up for past deprivation of meat, which has generally been regarded as a food reserved for the rich. Coming, as I do, from a country whose main export is meat and corn, I am not influenced by any immediate apprehensions or by my own material interests, for it is clear from the present tendency of the world meat market that the Republics of the Plata enjoy great natural advantages, and that, as the cattle-rearing industry exhausts the reserves of production, the greater the demand the greater will be the value of the supply.

I am not considering, however, the interests of the moment or of any particular country, but the general interest of mankind, which before long will have to draw upon the reserves of the sea to make good the inadequacy of the food production of the land. It is our business to see that this step is not taken too late.

The exploitation of the products of the sea requires regulation, the most urgently in the waters nearest the coasts, because it is in these regions, and particularly on the shoals, that the species most useful to man have their habitat. In the open sea away from the continental shelf, where the depth exceeds 200 meters, only a few species useful to man are to be found in the upper levels of the sea. Apart from the waters in the immediate vicinity of the beach, it may be said to be a natural law that the intensity and variety of marine life is inversely proportional to the depth of the water.

In proposal (j) as it stood were limited to existing treaties, it would not cover the modern whaling industry, which is rapidly exterminating the whale. To-day it is carried out with the help of a perfected form of weapon and special craft; but the great increase in its scope is due to the manner in which the animal is treated once it has been killed. The extraction of the oil, which previously had to be done ashore, is now done in floating factories, which accelerates the process ten or twenty fold and renders national control impossible, since no action can be taken in the open sea, and the whalers have no need to touch land to extract the principal product from their quarry. This process is carried out principally in the southern waters of South America. Here the whales, pursued and almost exterminated in the north polar regions, have taken refuge, driven by the instinct of self-preservation and a certain degree of rudimentary intelligence which they possess. To such a pitch of perfection have the Norwegian whalers brought their trade that one of the conditions imposed by the majority of insurance policies for this class of craft is that the harpooner and some of the crew should be Norwegian.

M. Valette, to whom I had occasion to refer above, has described this process of extracting oil from whales, and it really seems impossible that the governments interested in preserving so important a source of wealth should do nothing to prevent its extinction, which will be complete in 5 to 10 years at the most. "This class of fishing," he says,

"has reached such a point as to be a veritable butchery, which is the more deplorable when one considers the uniparous character of whales and the length of their period of gestation."

Doctor Charcot, an eyewitness of these practices in the Antarctic seas in the vicinity of the Argentine, was so impressed that he addressed a communication to the French Colonial Ministry drawing attention to the rapidity with which whales would disappear if they went on being exterminated in a manner which he qualified as barbarous. Even 15 years ago, Doctor Charcot emphasized the urgent necessity of an international agreement settling such important matters as the protection of young whales, the creation of reserves for adults, and the full industrial utilization of all the parts of the captured whale. The Paris Academy of Science also unanimously recommended that an international committee should meet to settle the problems of fishing in the open sea, such as more thorough exploitation and the preservation of species.

These examples, only two among hundreds which might be quoted, fully demonstrate that the crying need for general international legislation has not been met by existing treaties on maritime hunting and fishing.

The absence of such legislation accelerates the disappearance of these species year by year, not so much because they are decreasing of themselves as because their destruction is becoming more intensive. The products of the fisheries are not fully utilized, and it would appear that, although all those who carry on this trade realize the harm they are doing, each is unwilling to restrict his activities for the benefit of the others, and they endeavor to kill as many whales as they can, realizing that the total extinction of the species is approaching and that they must avail themselves of such opportunities as still remain.

At the British Imperial Conference in 1923, one of the speakers, alluding to this wanton destruction, proposed that the British Empire should adopt regulations. This, however, is not possible, as the fisheries are carried on in the open sea, and the Argentine and Chile, as owners of the neighboring coasts and islands, could claim rights at least equal to those of Great Britain, while other countries which engage in whaling in the Antarctic, such as the United States, the three Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, Russia, and various others, could easily put forward claims as well, since, with the modern system of floating tanks and rafts, there is no need of terra firma for the necessary operations, quite apart from the fact that on those uninhabited islands and coasts such operations could easily be carried out openly or secretly. The present system of control (of very doubtful legality) is quite inadequate; indeed, it defeats its own ends from the point of view of preservation of the species, the only one which in this report we need consider. It takes the form of a tax imposed by the Governor of the Falkland Islands, which belong to Great Britain, at the rate of 5s. per barrel of whale oil, of approximately 170 kilograms. This fiscal system runs counter to the economizing of wealth and promotes its more rapid destruction.

The riches of the sea, and especially the immense wealth of the Antarctic region, are the patrimony of the whole human race, and our committee is the body best qualified to suggest to the governments what steps should be taken before it is too late.

To save this wealth, which, being to-day the uncontrolled property of all, belongs to nobody, the only thing to be done is to discard the obsolete rules of the existing treaties, which were drawn up with other objects, to take a wider view, and to base a new jurisprudence, not on the defective legislation which has failed to see justice done, but on the scientific and economic considerations which, after all the necessary data has been collected, may be put forward, compared, and discussed at a technical conference by the countries concerned. In this way a new jurisprudence will be created of which to-day we have no inkling, owing to the fact that the necessity which now arouses our legitimate apprehensions was never contemplated.

With the help and guidance of M. Valette, I have sketched a map which is attached to and forms an integral part of the present report, the geographical distribution of some of the most economically important species which should be preserved for the use of humanity. I have done this merely by way of illustration and as impartial evidence to convince my colleagues that we must accept the idea of holding a technical conference to draw up international regulations for the exploitation of certain species. I make no attempt to mention the cases of definite species but merely quote certain examples; there are many others which it would be tedious and unnecessary to enumerate here. The source of wealth which is most immediately threatened with total extinction is the whale, because its bulk prevents concealment, because its slowness of reproduction makes the replacement of casualties impossible, and because the species, being concentrated in the South Polar region after having been exterminated in the North, is attacked in these waters by fishers from every part of the world and is being exterminated with alarming rapidity.

The average number of whales killed in the Antarctic every year is not less than 1,500 and sometimes as many as 2,000. No other method than international regulation can be conceived to prevent the annihilation of whales, the total remaining number of which may tentatively be put at 10,000 or 12,000 at the most. What should be the main

points of such regulation? Without any more claim to be exhaustive than in my enumeration of species, I would suggest the following: Establishment (in the open sea) of reserve zones on the basis of what is known already or may be discovered with regard to the habitat and migrations of whales; exploitation of each zone in turn and for a limited period; uniformity of methods (without going into details of a nature to hamper industrial freedom), in order to insure the full utilization of the products of the chase, which to-day are squandered owing to the thirst for immediate gain at all costs; adoption of general rules regarding the ages at which whales and seals should not be killed even when found in zones and during periods not subject to prohibition.

In conjunction with the facts I have adduced, particularly with regard to the South Polar region, should be taken others concerning quite different areas, which show that isolated measures of protection or measures taken by a single country are useless, and that they must as a rule be general and international in character. Most of the whales are in the south, as they are ruthlessly hunted in the north; but as their hunters have followed them they are now tending to return to the north or to disperse all over the world in search of the peace they will never find.

A report of the Tronsberg Whaling Co., which operates in the South American latitudes of the Pacific mentions in a memorandum for 1924 that it made a net profit of 2,958,120 crowns; it paid its shareholders 50 per cent on their capital, and the balance of 1,038,120 crowns went to the reserve. This net profit at present (December, 1925) represents some 14,000,000 French francs—an enormous sum if we take into account the amount of capital invested. There is also an Argentine company which, I believe, makes similar profits, although I have not been able to obtain details.

Encouraged by these results and knowing that the sooner it kills the whales the more it will prevent from falling into the hands of others, as they constitute a form of wealth which will soon be exhausted, the Tronsberg Whaling Co. ordered the construction of four additional whalers for the 1925-26 season.

I have said enough with regard to the hunting of whales and seals, but it is worth mentioning that the Swiss zoologist, Paul Sarazin, stated before the International Commission for the Protection of Wild Life which met at Berne in 1913 that, with the invention of floating grease and oil factories which are becoming more and more numerous on the high seas and are stimulated by investments of capital seeking a higher return than can be obtained in any other industry, the most important source of marine wealth would mathematically be exhausted within a short period.

THE FLEXIBLE TARIFF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] for 30 minutes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, my discussion this morning will be on the flexible tariff, which in view of the attitude of the Senate is sure to come before this House for discussion and consideration, and doubtless a separate vote before the tariff bill is sent to the President.

It is quite common for Members of the House on both sides of the aisle in discussing some proposition before the House to say that they consider all legislative propositions before Congress from a nonpolitical standpoint, except the tariff.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield? I want to ask him a question before he leaves that proposition, that the House will consider the flexible tariff. Does the gentleman mean to convey to the membership of the House the idea that the House will consider the so-called Simmons-Norris amendment in the House?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I will discuss the Senate proposal in a moment. The flexible tariff will come before the House—

Mr. GARNER. Will it be discussed, and the House be given an opportunity to vote upon it?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I do not see how a conference report can be agreed on without a separate vote on the flexible provision, in view of the rather pronounced attitude of the Senate on that issue.

Mr. GARNER. Will we have an opportunity to discuss the Simmons-Norris amendment and vote on it in the House?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am unable to say. My view is that it will be impossible to get a conference agreement without such a vote. Whenever Members say that they consider all legislative propositions from a nonpolitical standpoint, except the tariff, I wonder why they except the tariff. The tariff in its nature is an economic problem and not a political problem, and I think the sooner we consider tariff matters, both rates and administrative provisions, from that standpoint the better it will be for the business of the country and for the welfare of the people.

I do not know how many share my views in this position, but, whether many or few, I always get a good deal of comfort

from the support of the wise, the noble, and the great in days gone by.

I have before me a copy of a letter by Mr. Lincoln, which can not be found among his published writings, and the first time it was published was last Sunday a week ago. A friend of his wrote asking Mr. Lincoln to express his views in a letter for publication on the tariff. For political reasons Mr. Lincoln did not think it was expedient at that time to do so, but he did state in this letter that he had been an old Henry Clay tariff Whig and that he had not changed his views on the tariff. There appears this sentence in the letter:

I believe yet if we could have a moderate, carefully adjusted protective tariff, so far acquiesced in as to not be a perpetual subject of political strife, squabbles, changes, and uncertainties, it would be better for us.

I trust the Members of the House get the full force and meaning of this statement. Whatever justification there may be for party differences on rates, there is none for party differences on administrative provisions in the tariff laws. Take the flexible tariff. There is nothing in the party traditions or in the party platforms which justify a party difference. Personally, I favor the flexible tariff and indorse in the main the flexible provision in the House bill.

In what I have to say this morning I have no intent whatever to reflect on anyone or criticize anyone for the position he now holds on the flexible tariff. It is not my purpose to make an appeal for votes for the position that I have maintained and still maintain. The purpose of my address this morning is, in so far as within me lies, to direct the thinking of Members of Congress into channels that are both logical and practical.

There are three phases of the flexible tariff that I wish to discuss at this time:

First. The Senate proposal.

Second. The personnel and operation of the Tariff Commission.

Third. The opposition based on constitutional grounds.

First. The idea or meaning of a flexible tariff is to place into effect speedily, through some kind of a governmental agency acting under a rule laid down by Congress, changes in customs duties after the investigation of the Tariff Commission has been completed. Prompt action after the completion of the investigation is the gist of a flexible tariff. The three ways that have been discussed to make the tariff flexible are:

First. Let the Tariff Commission investigate and empower the President to proclaim the changes in duties upon the findings of the Tariff Commission. That is the present law.

Second. Give the Tariff Commission the power both to investigate and to proclaim changes in duties based upon its own findings. Some who oppose the existing law favor this proposal.

Third. Let the Tariff Commission after investigation report its findings and recommendations to the President and to Congress, and the changes in duties based on such recommendations to be made effective only by congressional action. This is what is known to the country as the Senate proposal.

The Senate proposal is as flexible and no more flexible than the Congress or either House thereof is flexible. A change in duties under this proposal recommended by the commission would follow with characteristic congressional speed. You can not hurry up either House by passing a law that its action shall be expedited.

The provision of the Senate proposal that only germane amendments shall be considered by either House to a bill to carry out the recommendations of the Tariff Commission for changes in the duties will prove wholly ineffective either to expedite or to limit congressional action. If this provision were enacted into law it would constitute a joint rule of the two Houses to be construed by each House and could be changed or annulled at will by either House without the consent of the other. This provision is in the nature of a proposed agreement to do that which the House always has done and the Senate never has done, and in my opinion can never force itself to do, however noble its present intentions. Ex-President Coolidge in discussing the Senate procedure in a recent magazine article said:

At first I intended to become a student of Senate rules and I did learn much about them, but I soon found that the Senate had but one rule, subject to exceptions, of course, which was to the effect that the Senate would do anything it wanted to do whenever it wanted to do it.

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

Mr. RAMSEYER. I wish the gentleman would wait until I get through with the phase I am now discussing. I am not criticizing the Senate or the Senate rules. I am simply calling attention to an evident situation. If you are opposed to giving the President or the Tariff Commission the power to proclaim

changes in duties based on a rule prescribed by Congress, then you are against a flexible tariff. The proposition to leave it to Congress to act on and make effective the recommendations of the Tariff Commission has not one whit of flexibility about it. If you favor the Senate proposal, then quit talking about a flexible tariff, take away from the President his present power to proclaim changes in duties, and proceed to do business at the old stand in the usual way. It is certainly no answer to or compliance with the demands of the farm organizations and other organizations which want the flexible tariff retained to say that you favor the Senate proposal, which does not contain a single element of flexibility.

Second. The debates in Congress emphasize two objections to the flexible provision of the tariff law of 1922. The first goes to the personnel and the operation of the Tariff Commission itself. As with other commissions, the President nominates the members thereof and the Senate advises and consents. Whatever is wrong with the members of the Tariff Commission, the Senate is equally responsible with the President. The remedy lies in the appointment of better qualified members of the Tariff Commission and not in depriving the commission or the President of otherwise useful and desirable functions.

It is true the Tariff Commission operates slowly. That is largely due to the difficulties encountered under the rule prescribed by Congress to find the differences in costs of production here and abroad of the commodity or commodities under investigation. Impressed with the difficulties and delays in obtaining the facts under the rule of the present law, the House bill substituted for the present rule, the differences in costs of production here and abroad, a new rule providing for the finding of the differences in competitive conditions here and abroad. In the opinion of the majority Members of the House, this new rule will expedite the findings and reports of the Tariff Commission.

To guide the President and the Tariff Commission in adjusting the customs duties, the House bill undertakes to substitute for the present yardstick "differences in cost of production" a new yardstick "differences in competitive conditions." The Progressive Party seems to have been the first political organization in this country to recognize the difficulties in finding the differences in cost of production here and abroad and making that the yardstick for adjusting tariff duties.

Mr. GARNER rose.

Mr. RAMSEYER. First, let me read this quotation from the Progressive Party platform.

The platform adopted by the Progressive Party at its convention held in August, 1912, declared:

We believe in a protective tariff which shall equalize conditions of competition between the United States and foreign countries, both for the farmer and the manufacturer, and which shall maintain for labor an adequate standard of living.

Now, has the gentleman a question on this point?

Mr. GARNER. I just wanted to know what constitutes the Progressive Party at this time.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am referring to the Progressive Party platform plank of 1912.

Mr. GARNER. Is there any Progressive Party at the present time?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am not discussing that subject, and I hope the gentleman will not divert me from what I am attempting to discuss.

It should be noted that the phrase "equalize conditions of competition" was substituted in the tariff plank of the Progressive Party for the phrase "equalize differences in cost of production," employed at times by both Republican and Democratic Parties prior to 1912.

These declarations by the several political parties indicate, as Dr. Thomas Walker Page says in his book entitled "Making the Tariff in the United States":

* * * There is one purpose underlying all others upon which there seems to be fairly widespread agreement. It is that the tariff should maintain for foreign and domestic producers equality of opportunity in their competition to supply the American market (p. 66).

The tariff policy—

Says Doctor Page—

that finds the widest public advocacy in the United States aims to maintain equal opportunity in the American market for domestic and foreign producers (p. 66).

After noting that there appears to be a general accord among the major political parties as to equalization of cost of competitive differences, Doctor Page proceeds to point out that—the difference in costs of production is unfit for general application as a measure of duties (p. 74).

The application of the difference between costs as a measure of duties is usually impossible—

Says Doctor Page—

owing to the difficulty of finding what the difference amounts to (p. 83). There are almost as many different costs as there are producers. * * * (p. 92).

The difficulties in obtaining and verifying costs of production are infinitely greater in foreign countries than they are in the United States. With rare exceptions, the ascertainment of such costs with any degree of accuracy is wholly impossible by an agency of the American Government. It must depend upon published materials, the general observations of its agents, and such information as foreign producers may be willing to give. It is quite inconceivable that the manufacturers of any country would tolerate a detailed investigation of their business (p. 95).

Summing up the matter, Doctor Page says:

In the first place, costs of production are only one of the factors in competition. Transportation facilities, prestige, business connections, marketing organization, and many other things have to be considered in determining duties for the regulation of trade with a view either to revenue or to protection. It is equality in competition and not in costs upon which the calculation of duties for any purpose must rest.

Since the present flexible provision went into operation in 1922, out of 33 increases in customs duties 13 have been on farm products, 12 on chemicals, 4 on earthenware and glass, and the rest were scattered. Wheat, flour, butter, cheese, cherries, onions, peanuts, eggs, flaxseed, milk, and cream are among the agricultural products upon which the customs duties have been increased. It is generally conceded that the increases on butter, cheese, milk, and cream were very helpful to the dairy industry and possibly saved it from disaster.

Every farm organization that has expressed itself on this subject has gone on record in favor of the flexible-tariff provision. Farm organizations generally, and quite unanimously, demand the retention of the flexible-tariff provision giving authority to the President, upon recommendation of the Tariff Commission, to raise or lower customs duties within prescribed limits.

Now, I come to the third part of my discussion, and will take up the objection urged against the flexible provision, based on constitutional grounds, and I hope I may have your very close attention.

Third. The second objection, and the one most strenuously urged against the flexible tariff, is based on constitutional grounds. The speeches against the flexible tariff are based on the supposition that the existing law constitutes a surrender of the taxing power of Congress to the President. The opponents, in their earnestness and zeal, have consumed days protesting against a surrender of the taxing power of Congress. Furthermore, they still contend that the flexible provision is unconstitutional, notwithstanding the fact that the Supreme Court, in the Hampton case, held unanimously that the flexible provision of the present tariff law is constitutional.

My opinion for a number of years has been, and still is, that customs duties to protect products of agriculture and of manufactures are imposed by Congress in the exercise of the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and not in the exercise of the power to lay imposts. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution recites the powers of Congress. Clause 1 of that article and section reads: "To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises." Clause 3 of the same article and section reads: "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes." The purpose of a customs duty for protection is not revenue but is to give producers of products in the United States certain advantages over producers of like products in foreign nations. [Applause.]

It is rather singular that in all the speeches in Congress against the flexible provision, to which my attention has been called, it does not appear that any thought whatever has been given to the view that the readjustment of customs duties under the flexible provision of the tariff is an exercise of the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and not an exercise of the power to lay and collect imposts.

The constitutionality of the protective tariff as well as the flexible provision of the tariff law of 1922 was an issue in the case of Hampton v. United States (276 U. S. 394). It was contended by the plaintiff that the only power of Congress in levying customs duties is to create revenue and that it is unconstitutional to frame the customs duties with any other view than that of revenue raising. In the last paragraph of its opinion, the court said:

So long as the motive of Congress and the effect of its legislative action are to secure revenue for the benefit of the General Government, the existence of other motives in the selection of the subjects of taxes can not invalidate congressional action.

I selected this quotation to show the reason for the conclusion of the court on one phase of the case, although I regard it as an inaccurate and rather confused statement. "The motive of Congress" in imposing customs duties for protection is not to secure revenue. "The effect of its legislative action" in imposing customs duties for protection may lessen the revenue or destroy it altogether. In fact that is the effect of some of the rates in the existing law and in other tariff laws.

The Supreme Court in holding the protective tariff and the flexible provision constitutional did not in its opinion anywhere discuss or refer to the power of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations. I have not had time to examine the briefs of attorneys in the Hampton case, and, therefore, can not say whether the validity of the flexible provision on the ground of the power of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations was presented to the Supreme Court or not. If it was presented, the court in arriving at its conclusion ignored it. However, the court at one place in its opinion calls attention to the similarity between the power of the President under the flexible provision and the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission in regulating interstate commerce, as follows:

The same principle that permits Congress to exercise its rate-making power in interstate commerce by declaring the rule which shall prevail in the legislative fixing of rates, and enable it to remit to a rate-making body created in accordance with its provisions the fixing of such rates, justifies a similar provision for the fixing of customs duties on imported merchandise.

Rate making in interstate commerce is a legislative function. Congress has power to regulate commerce among the several States. Congress also has power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. A customs duty imposed to protect American products is not for the purpose of revenue. As I have already stated, a customs duty so imposed may lessen the revenue or destroy it altogether. The object of a protective customs duty is not revenue. The object of a protective customs duty is to regulate commerce with foreign nations in order to give to the producers of products in the United States certain advantages over producers of like products in other countries.

Even though the Supreme Court in Hampton against United States in holding the flexible provision constitutional ignored or overlooked the issue of the power of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations, that court in a former decision recognized a customs duty as a regulation of commerce. The case I now refer to is *Russell v. Williams* (106 U. S. 623), and was decided in October, 1882. A brief review of that case will be instructive and helpful.

The act of March 3, 1865, provided that there should be collected and paid on all goods, wares, and merchandise, with certain exceptions, of the growth or produce of countries east of the Cape of Good Hope when imported from places west of the Cape of Good Hope a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem in addition to the duties imposed on such articles when imported directly from the place or places of their growth or production.

The act of July 14, 1870, imposed a duty on tea of 15 cents per pound. Williams, importer of tea, protested the duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on the basis that the act of 1870 superseded the act of 1865. The court held that the act of 1865, imposing an additional duty of 10 per cent ad valorem, was a general commercial regulation for the encouragement of direct trade with the countries east of the Cape of Good Hope as well as for the benefit of American shipping, that the additional duty was not intended as an increase of duties for purposes of revenue, and that the act of 1870 did not repeal this provision in the act of 1865. Such goods imported from countries east of the Cape of Good Hope usually came in American vessels, while such goods produced east of the Cape of Good Hope and shipped into the United States from places west of the Cape of Good Hope came in foreign vessels. This 10 per cent ad valorem duty was imposed as a commercial regulation and to encourage shipments in American vessels. The object of the act of 1870 was to readjust the regular schedule of duties and not to interfere with the cape rule as a regulation of commerce. That is the holding of *Russell against Williams*.

In the past there has been considerable debate in and out of Congress on the constitutionality of the protective tariff. No one seriously questioned the constitutionality of the protective tariff prior to 1820. For a decade or more following 1820 the debate on this issue became spirited, and both sides of the controversy became radical in opinion and strenuous and excited in upholding each his own view. Henry Clay was then the foremost advocate of the American system of protection. I quote from *American Tariff Controversies in the Nineteenth*

Century, by Edward Stanwood, volume 1, pages 294 and 295, discussing Mr. Clay's contribution to the debate in 1824:

It was at that time that Mr. Clay startled the opponents of protection, and possibly its advocates quite as much, by announcing that he relied for the constitutional sanction of the American system upon the clause giving Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations" rather than upon the power to levy imposts.

I want you to note especially that Mr. Clay defended his position upon the clause of the Constitution giving Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and not upon the clause of the Constitution giving Congress the power to levy imposts.

Going back to the foundation of the Republic, I find that the framers of the Constitution held the same view in regard to the power of Congress to aid manufactures that I am now presenting to you. That is, that the power of Congress to aid manufactures is under the clause to regulate commerce with foreign nations and not under the clause to levy imposts. When the debate back in the 1820's was intense and bitter over the constitutionality of protective tariffs, James Madison, one of the framers of the Constitution and one of its ablest expounders, a Member of the First Congress under the Constitution, and later President of the United States for two terms, came to the defense of the constitutionality of import duties for the encouragement of manufactures. Mr. Madison, in one of his ablest letters, addressed to Joseph C. Cabell, September 18, 1828, based his argument for the constitutionality of protective duties on the commerce clause and not on the taxing clause of the Constitution. The letter to which I refer is found in the *Writings of James Madison*, volume 9, page 316. He opens his letter as follows:

DEAR SIR: Your late letter reminds me of our conversation on the constitutionality of the power in Congress to impose a tariff for the encouragement of manufactures.

On pages 324, 325, and 326, in this same letter, he says:

In this view of the subject, it was quite natural, however certainly the general power to regulate trade might include a power to impose duties on it, not to omit it in a clause enumerating the several modes of revenue authorized by the Constitution.

Again on page 330:

But ample evidence may be found elsewhere that regulations of trade for the encouragement of manufactures were considered as within the power to be granted to the new Congress, as well as within the scope of the national policy.

Now, I want you to note carefully what he has to say in this letter, on page 332:

That the encouragement of manufactures was an object of the power to regulate trade is proved by the use made of the power for that object in the first session of the First Congress under the Constitution; when among the Members present were so many who had been members of the Federal convention which framed the Constitution, and of the State conventions which ratified it; each of these classes consisting also of members who had opposed and who had espoused the Constitution in its actual form. It does not appear from the printed proceedings of Congress on that occasion that the power was denied by any of them.

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

Mr. CRISP. How much additional time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Ten minutes.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is requested for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. RAYSEMER. I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] and the Members of the House for the extension of time.

You will see that Mr. Madison places the power to levy duties for the encouragement of manufactures squarely upon the clause to regulate trade. He also calls attention to the fact that in the first Congress there were many Members who had been members of the Federal convention which framed the Constitution and of the State conventions which ratified the Constitution, Members who were both for and against the adoption of the Constitution, and that no such Member of Congress questioned the power of Congress to levy duties for the encouragement of manufactures under the clause of the Constitution to regulate trade.

Quoting again from this same letter, on page 333:

A further evidence in support of the constitutional power to protect and foster manufactures by regulations of trade, an evidence that ought of itself to settle the question, is the uniform and practical sanction given to the power, by the General Government for nearly 40 years with a concurrence or acquiescence of every State government throughout the same period; and it may be added through all the vicissitudes of party, which marked the period.

I want you to pay especial attention to the closing paragraph of this letter, which reads as follows:

You will observe that I have confined myself in what has been said to the constitutionality and expediency of the power in Congress to encourage domestic products by regulations of commerce. In the exercise of the power they are responsible to their constituents, whose right and duty it is in that, as in all other cases, to bring their measures to the test of justice and of the general good.

Based upon my own interpretation of the Constitution, based on the decisions of the Supreme Court, and based upon the construction of the commerce clause by the framers of the Constitution, I conclude that the powers exercised by the President and the Tariff Commission are a regulation of commerce with foreign nations under a rule prescribed by Congress, the same as the powers exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission are a regulation of commerce among the several States under a rule prescribed by Congress. To give the President and the Tariff Commission the power to raise or lower duties within certain limits under a rule prescribed by Congress is in no wise a surrender of the taxing power of Congress. Whatever surrender of power there is, is a surrender of the power to regulate foreign commerce. Congress can to-day or to-morrow, under its power to regulate commerce among the several States, fix interstate freight and passenger rates. Congress can abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission and itself do by law what the Interstate Commerce Commission has been doing by regulations under a rule prescribed by Congress. Likewise the Congress has the power now to abolish the Tariff Commission and do in the future what the President, with the Tariff Commission, under the flexible provision of the tariff law, has done since 1922. Whether to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Tariff Commission, or both, or to enlarge or curtail the duties or powers of either or both of those commissions is a question of policy for Congress in its wisdom to determine.

My view is that from the standpoint of the Constitution and of public policy there is no more objection to conferring regulatory powers over foreign commerce with the President and the Tariff Commission under a rule prescribed by Congress than there is to conferring regulatory powers over commerce among the several States with the Interstate Commerce Commission under a rule prescribed by Congress.

If you want to repeal the flexible provision of the tariff, that is within your power. If you desire to do that, then be logical and base your action on the ground that you are opposed to conferring upon the President and the Tariff Commission regulatory powers over foreign commerce. Do not ground your opposition on the illogical and false premise that you are opposed to conferring upon the President and the Tariff Commission power to tax.

Mr. Madison defended the constitutionality of customs duties for the encouragement of manufactures under the power of Congress to regulate trade with foreign nations. Mr. Madison and the other framers of the Constitution certainly were as competent to interpret the meaning and the purpose of the powers conferred on Congress as anyone who has appeared in the Halls of Congress since their day. With due regard and highest esteem for the ability, intelligence, and learning of those who oppose the flexible provision of the tariff law on the ground that it is a surrender of the taxing power of Congress, I commend to them a careful study and thorough understanding of Mr. Madison's interpretation and construction of the power of Congress under the commerce clause and his defense of the constitutionality of customs duties for the encouragement of manufactures under the power of Congress to regulate commerce. [Applause.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I gladly yield for a question on what I have been discussing.

Mr. HASTINGS. Following the gentleman's argument, in which it seems the gentleman contends that the flexible provisions of the tariff bill are to be construed in the light of that provision of the Constitution giving to Congress the right to regulate commerce rather than the power to raise revenue, does the gentleman think that the flexible provisions of the tariff are really a part of tariff legislation, and does he think it should

come from the Committee on Ways and Means, or that it should go, rather, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for consideration?

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman's question is not relevant or germane to anything that I have discussed. Most tariff laws, and possibly all tariff laws, have duties whose primary purpose is revenue, and other duties whose primary purpose is protection for the products of agriculture and industry. That is, in the same law there are duties for revenue and other duties for protection—duties imposed under the power to levy imposts and duties imposed under the power to regulate trade. I have discussed constitutional issues, not issues of parliamentary law of this House. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH].

Mr. HOCH. I have been very much interested in the gentleman's contention that the protective tariff rests upon the commerce clause of the Constitution rather than upon the power to levy imposts, and impressed with his argument. Objection has been made to the yardstick, both in the present law and in the proposal of the House bill, in that it is indefinite and constitutes a delegation of legislative power rather than simply giving to the commission the performance of an administrative act. I think it might be well in that connection to call attention to the fact that in setting up the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out, as an agency of Congress, the fixing of railroad rates, which is purely a legislative function, they have been given a yardstick which perhaps is not as definite as the one in the tariff law. The direction they have had has been the traditional rule that rates should be just and reasonable. If it can be contended that the tariff law constitutes a delegation of legislative power, it could certainly be contended that by permitting the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix rates, under the rule simply that the rates shall be just and reasonable, we have delegated legislative power to them. But, of course, the interstate commerce act has long been upheld as providing administrative functions and not a delegation of legislative power.

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

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The two objections raised in the Hampton case to the constitutionality of the flexible provision were, first, that it is a delegation of legislative power; and second, that its main object is not revenue but protection to industry. I have discussed the second objection raised. The statement made by the gentleman from Kansas goes to the first objection—that is, that it is a delegation of legislative power—which I did not undertake to discuss. I think, however, that the gentleman from Kansas in his inquiry or statement is absolutely correct; that is, that the yardstick that is now in the tariff law to equalize the differences in the cost of production here and abroad—and what I say is also true of the yardstick in the House tariff bill—is more definite and more certain than the yardstick given to the Interstate Commerce Commission to adjust freight and passenger rates in interstate commerce. [Applause.]

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

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing the whole of Mr. Lincoln's letter from which I read one sentence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lincoln's letter can not be found in any publication containing the writings of Mr. Lincoln. The letter was first published Sunday, December 1, 1929, in one of the Washington papers. I submit herewith this letter for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to wit:

OFFICE OF THE CIRCUIT CLERK AND RECORDER,

DE WITT COUNTY, ILL.,

Clinton, October 11, 1859.

DR. EDWARD WALLACE:

MY DEAR SIR: I am here, just now, attending court. Yesterday, before I left Springfield, your brother, Dr. William S. Wallace, showed me a letter of yours, in which you kindly mention my name, inquire for my tariff views, and suggest the propriety of my writing a letter upon the subject. I was an old Henry Clay tariff Whig. In old times I made more speeches on that subject than on any other. I have not since changed my views. I believe yet, if we could have a moderate, carefully adjusted, protective tariff, so far acquiesced in as to not be

a perpetual subject of political strife, squabbles, changes, and uncertainties, it would be better for us. Still, it is my opinion that, just now, the revival of that question will not advance the cause itself or the man who revives it. I have not thought much upon the subject recently, but my general impression is that the necessity for a protective tariff will, ere long, force its old opponents to take it up, and then its old friends can join in and establish it on a more firm and durable basis. We, the old Whigs, have been entirely beaten out on the tariff question, and we shall not be able to reestablish the policy until the absence of it shall have demonstrated the necessity for it in the minds of men heretofore opposed to it. With this view, I should prefer to not now write a public letter upon the subject. I therefore wish this to be considered confidential. I shall be very glad to receive a letter from you.

Yours truly,

A. LINCOLN.

THE FRENCH DEBT

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted a report (Rept. No. 26) on the bill (H. R. 6585) to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the French Republic to the United States of America, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill will come up to-morrow, and in the morning there will be in every Member's mail a copy of the hearings.

FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York to address the House for 15 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a proposed Federal department of education with a secretary of education in the President's Cabinet has been provided for in several bills introduced this session and at previous sessions of Congress. The right of the Federal Government to establish a department of education or to recognize or to render any service whatever to the cause of public education through such a department has been challenged by those opposed to it as an improper function of government. This objection, if sustained in this case and followed as a precedent with reference to others, will destroy every educational activity of the Federal Government.

A review of public education as encouraged and supported by our Federal Government will demonstrate quite conclusively, I feel sure, that the great majority of the people of this country are not ready to surrender the benefits now enjoyed and likely to accrue under our present system of education. Such a review will do more than that. It will show quite as conclusively the present and future need for the service which a Federal department can render to the cause of education.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the public-school system of this country stands as a monument to the genius, the vision, and the toil of the men and women who from the first saw clearly the importance and the relationship of public education to the general welfare of our Republic. These pioneer advocates of public education were not fanatics; they were solid, substantial citizens, undaunted by criticism, determined to carry out the counsels of Washington and Jefferson and to make effective the mandate in the ordinance of 1787 that "schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

The public school is now recognized by the majority of the people as the chief agency for fostering and perpetuating democratic ideals and for laying a solid foundation for the economic development of our country.

Strange as it may seem to us, it required a bitter fight, extending over a period of more than half a century, to establish a public-school system in the United States freed from the pauper-school taint, open to every boy and girl as an American birthright.

The next important step in the educational progress and economic development of the United States was taken when the land-grant colleges were established. These were authorized under the provisions of the Morrill Act of 1862.

It was but natural that the political party favoring the protection of American industries should be the first to promote the research and education upon which these industries depend. The tariff act of 1861 was drawn by the same hand that drafted the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862 for the benefit of industrial education. This act, which was vetoed by President Buchanan, was signed three years later by Abraham Lincoln. It provided that each State should receive 30,000 acres of public land for each Senator and Representative in Congress to endow a college for the teaching of agriculture, mechanic arts, and military tactics. A total of about 10,400,000 acres of the public domain

was given to the States for this purpose. Congress from time to time had added money to provide for an experimental and research station in connection with each. The land-grant colleges and experiment stations now number 69, for there is one or more in every State.

Our economic stability as a Nation in the world to-day is due in large measure to the pioneer work of these land-grant colleges in the field of research. Yet, had it not been for the establishment throughout the country of the free public schools to prepare the youth for higher technical education, this important step in our economic life would have been long delayed. Year after year since 1862 the boys and girls from our public schools have entered our State colleges, later to emerge equipped to assume leadership in almost every professional, industrial, and business endeavor. Our progress as a Nation and the increase of our national wealth can be measured with comparative accuracy by the advancement made in education. The total wealth of the United States has increased from \$7,135,780,000 in 1850 to \$320,803,800,000 in 1922. The per capita wealth during the same period increased from \$307.69 to \$2,918. The source of this rapid increase in our national wealth and much of our Federal revenue recalls to mind the answer made by Michael Faraday, the great scientist, when asked by a statesman, "Of what use is your discovery?" To which Faraday replied, "Some day it may be developed so that you can tax it."

Important discoveries and their development, adding so much to the happiness and comfort of mankind as well as to the taxable wealth of nations, have come largely as a result of the work done by leaders trained in the respective fields of science. For the past three quarters of a century our public schools, land-grant colleges, and universities have prepared an ever-increasing number of men and women for this important and constructive wealth-producing service. As legislators, therefore, we should remember that general education far more than natural resources has made for our national wealth and progress. This doctrine holds true throughout the world to-day.

This second step, the establishment of the land-grant colleges, so essential to the general welfare of our country, was opposed within and without the Halls of Congress with the same arguments which public education has had to meet and combat in every attempt that has been made to raise its standard and to extend its service.

Why was the land grant college act, known as the Morrill Act, of such far-reaching importance to the United States? In reply, let me call your attention to the words of Dexter S. Kimball, dean of the Cornell College of Engineering:

Our civilization differs from those that have gone before, and from some that exist even to-day, only in one important particular. Our philosophy and our religions are built up for the most part of beliefs inherited from our forefathers, but our power to produce the necessities of life, to feed, clothe, and house the multitude, stands out as a thing apart and unlike anything that has yet appeared on earth so far as we have record. This power has come to us through the use of what we are pleased to call the "scientific method," by which we aim finally to replace the words "I think" with the words "I know" in all our mundane activities.

This new scientific method that was to usher in a new era of science, agriculture, and industry required the utilization of another great potential power—technically trained men. There was not an engineering school in the United States until our Military Academy was founded in 1802. It was over 30 years before a nonmilitary engineering school was established. There were less than 300 graduates from engineering schools, exclusive of West Point, when the Morrill Act was signed in 1862. As a result of this timely legislation, 64 technical colleges were established, 1 in each State and Territory, in 50 of which instruction in engineering was given. Had it not been for the impetus given to the technical training of engineers by our State colleges, the development of our great and varied natural resources would have been delayed for half a century.

There are parts of this country, abundantly endowed with natural resources, where the lack of educational advantages has pauperized what should have been a land of plenty. Generations of boys and girls who have been the innocent victims of these conditions have had their mental and spiritual lives starved and stunted. The real loss to the Nation, therefore, is not alone one of material wealth. The real tragedy is in the useless sacrifice of a social and spiritual force, the potential possibilities of which the Nation has no moral or political right to stunt or repress, and one which it can ill afford to lose.

If Congress had had the vision to establish a department of education when it was first suggested by patriotic and far-seeing men and women, educational opportunities would have been, ere this, more nearly equalized and much of the neglected and un-

utilized latent power would have been made available to the several States and to the country at large. Tragic and suicidal as our policy may have been in the past in this respect, to neglect now to establish a clearing house of educational data, as we enter upon the greatest period of world-wide competition in trade and commerce in history, would be even more shortsighted and deplorable. It would indicate a lack of discernment, for which it seems to me, the great mass of our people is not and should not be held responsible.

Pasteur, whose remarkable discoveries saved France a sum estimated in excess of the indemnity paid to Germany at the close of the Franco-Prussian war, said:

In our century science is the soul of the prosperity of nations and the living source of all progress. Undoubtedly the tiring daily discussions of politics seem to be our guide—empty appearances. What really leads us forward is a few scientific discoveries and their application.

The educational requirements of our country are multiplied each year as science opens new fields of endeavor. Never in our history has there been a greater need for the Federal Government to recognize the importance of public education, the problems confronting it, and to supply a service which it alone can render, that will make public education more effective. Our Presidents in their messages have stressed the necessity for a Federal department of education, patriotic organizations having an aggregate membership of almost a quarter of the population of the United States have petitioned for it, yet in spite of this urgent, insistent country-wide demand for such a department the Representatives in Congress, a majority of whom have expressed themselves in favor of legislation to create it, have never had an opportunity to vote for the bill.

Much foreign opposition to this legislation has developed and through political channels it has thus far been highly effective in preventing consideration of the bill.

This is not strange, in view of recent disclosures showing the active opposition of certain European governments to our naturalization laws and our Americanization program. It is a startling revelation to find foreign governments, supposedly friendly, establishing here in America social, political, fraternal, and educational agencies, the chief and avowed object of which is to thwart our efforts at Americanization. Peaceful measures failing to achieve their purpose they have resorted to violence and other methods of intimidation. American citizenship obtained by naturalization is neither recognized nor respected by these governments; insult and indignity has been the lot of those who have sought protection under it while traveling in the land of their birth.

Our public-school system thus far has been the most effective means of instructing the youth of the Nation in the principles of republican government and in creating in their hearts a feeling of devotion to country. This very fact has made our public-school system or any agency likely to increase its efficiency the chief target of attack by those countries that demand allegiance from naturalized American citizens. Therefore, any proposed legislation that aims to equalize educational opportunities, seeks to bring about a higher average level of education in the United States, or endeavors to stimulate loyal devotion to country is challenged and bitterly opposed by certain foreign organizations. Were it not for this opposition, directed and inspired from without and conducted from within the United States, we could speak of Americanization in the past tense and feel that the problem was well on its way to successful solution. As it is, however, it is neither wise nor courageous statesmanship to remain passive in the face of aggressive opposition directed at the very foundation of sound Americanism.

Manifestly our indifference to this foreign challenge or what appears to some to be an abject surrender to it is not very reassuring to our naturalized citizens who desire to remain steadfast in their allegiance to the United States.

Continued threats of political reprisal by those opposed to legislation for a department of education may temporarily retard congressional action on the measure, but the steadily rising tide of public opinion in favor of this service to the cause of public education will eventually secure favorable legislative action.

In the face of these disclosures it is not a sufficient answer by those who are opposed to any effort on the part of the Federal Government to promote public education to question the motive and the patriotism of those who aim to make public education more effective by extending its benefits to all, even to the humblest boy and girl in the remotest part of the land. And at this point, Mr. Speaker, may I insert a list of the national organizations that have gone on record in favor of a Federal department of education:

National Education Association, 200,000 members.
American Federation of Teachers, 10,000 members.
American Federation of Labor, 3,321,526 members.

National Committee for a Department of Education, 100 members.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 1,134,714 members.
General Federation of Women's Clubs, over 2,000,000 members.
National League of Women Voters, 44 State organizations, 1 district organization, 1 Territorial organization.
Supreme Council, Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, 300,000 members.
International Council of Religious Education.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 600,000 members.
American Association of University Women, 33,513 members.
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, 55,000 members.
General Grand Chapter, Order of the Eastern Star, 2,000,000 members.
National Women's Trade Union League.
National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations, 600,000 members.
National Federation of Music Clubs.
American Library Association, 10,056 members.
American Vocational Association, 3,000 members.
Woman's Relief Corps, 222,000 members.
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
National Kindergarten Association, 3,000 members.
American Home Economics Association, 9,000 members.
American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, 17,000 members.
American Nurses' Association, 75,000 members.
Osteopathic Women's National Association, 1,000 members.
National Council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, 342,000 members.
Service Star Legion (Inc.).
Educational Press Association of America, 55 members.
Woman's Missionary Council, Methodist Episcopal Church South, 350,000 members.
Women's Homeopathic Medical Fraternity.
National Association of Colored Women.

This list of organizations represents a total of some 29,000,000 people who have, through their official representatives, given their support and indorsement to the movement looking toward the creation of a department of education in the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

It is of the utmost importance that any and all information helpful to the cause of education should be accessible to every educational agency in every part of the country. It is not sufficient to our national needs that the latest educational data and scientific facts should be available only to those who have access to highly endowed universities, or in the case of those who must turn to a less expensive and exclusive source for such information to have it bestowed as a dole by some private foundation.

What part is education going to play in our future development as a Nation? The experience of other countries may not be amiss in answering those who challenge the right of the Federal Government to manifest any interest in public education. Great Britain in 1870 did one-quarter of the world's business. She had the ships, the seaboard, and the markets of the world. Was she secure in her industrial and commercial supremacy? In just one generation she found herself third in the race and her chief rival, Germany, first. Germany increased her foreign trade in five years over Great Britain by \$170,000,000. England now admits that she was outdistanced in the industrial and commercial race by Germany and by the United States because she neglected the technical education of her people and in so doing failed to train her industrial army.

The recent trip of the steamship *Bremen*, the spectacular arrival of the *Graf Zeppelin*, the leviathan of the air, and its circumnavigation of the earth are illustrations of the rebound of a nation so recently in a state of industrial and financial collapse when it can turn to educated, vocationally trained workers and scientific leaders for rehabilitation.

While much of our prosperity since 1862 has come from opening our western lands to cultivation, developing our mines, constructing railroads, building large cities, expanding our industries, it required not only pioneer settlers to do this, but also technically trained men. As we all know, much of this program has been completed. This being true, our large production in agriculture and industry calls for foreign markets if we would continue to prosper as an agricultural and industrial nation. Hereafter, we must meet our chief competitors, not as heretofore, largely in our own "protected market," but in the markets of the world. How shall we gain and maintain our supremacy in these markets?

The country that suffered the greatest loss in trade prior to the war because of her indifference and lack of vision with reference to the importance of education, now frankly asserts that the nation that most carefully trains its industrial army will by

so doing gain and maintain its manufacturing and commercial position.

Great Britain, France, Japan, and Germany are fully aware of the transcendent importance of public education and technical training in meeting competition in the markets of the world. Justice, therefore, to our agricultural and our industrial States, which will prosper only in so far as they successfully meet this competition, requires that the Federal Government shall make available to our schools any and all information that will make more effective the instruction of our youth in every useful and practical field of endeavor.

Fairness to the taxpayer requires such a service to make his dollar contribute its full part to education. Every parent has a right to expect his child to have the benefit of the best teaching methods and the most effective facilities in preparing his child for its life work.

It does not require a prophet to foresee that young men and women of each generation will be confronted with world-wide social and economic problems, the correct solution of which may prove quite as important to the nation as it will to them. Therefore, every child of this generation has the right to benefit by every new fact and every reasonable resource that will prepare him to meet effectively the problems of a new and complex civilization.

The bill which I have introduced provides, among other things, for research in the ever-expanding field of education. Why? Because research in the educational field is just as important, if not more so, than it is in the domain of business, agriculture, and industry. The discovery of a fact that will prepare a boy or a girl for success, measured in terms of usefulness to society, is more important by far than the discovery of a fact that will improve livestock, and I do not wish to minimize or belittle the importance of the latter.

It is quite as important to the taxpayer to receive accurate information with reference to heat, light, ventilation, sanitation, architectural designs, materials, and equipment for a school as it is to obtain reliable facts with reference to the construction of a cow stable or a hen house. I am in favor of the Agricultural Department with its research facilities, but I feel that research in the field of education is equally, if not more, important. The progress of education is a condition precedent to success in agriculture, and in all the arts and sciences. The taxpayers of the country have an investment in public school buildings and school equipment estimated at \$4,676,603,539. Recent inquiry as to the annual expenditure in the United States for school buildings and sites alone amounts to over \$400,000,000. The people of the United States through State and local taxation spend for public education the sum of \$2,500,000,000 annually. Even so, the opportunity for the exercise of wisdom and economy on the one hand, or reckless extravagance on the other, in the expenditure of these sums should challenge the serious attention of the best business minds in the country. Is there anywhere in this country a central clearing house to which the 100,000 school boards can turn for accurate information touching school construction and equipment? The saving of 2 per cent of this vast sum of \$400,000,000 would relieve the taxpayers to the extent of \$8,000,000. Every trained business man knows that such a service could place before the public facts that would save far more than \$8,000,000 in such a building program. This is only one of the innumerable ways in which such a department would effect large savings.

Without unduly stressing the importance of research over the many other services the Federal Government could render to the pupils, the teachers, the parents, and the taxpayers of this country, let me ask what it would mean if such a service could do for them in education what research has done for almost every successful enterprise in the United States and throughout the world. Within the period of a year research saved one company alone \$500,000,000. The public-school system of this country has an invested capital so large, material with such potential power, viz, 30,000,000 school children, with so many employees, with a responsibility so great, that it can not hope to achieve its best results without a coordinating, unifying clearing house to collect and disseminate facts relating to every phase of its activity. This great reservoir of information would be available to every school, college, and university, both public and private. Every institution would be entirely free to accept or to reject the investigation of any subject by the Government as an aid to its work, each according to its own decision as to the merits.

Much has been said by those opposed to such a service, that it might investigate educational systems in foreign countries; that imported educational facts might prove dangerous. Investigation of foreign educational systems, practices, and philosophy is not a source of danger; the real danger is far more likely to be our failure to have authentic information as to

the aim and purpose of the educational systems of other countries. Complete and reliable world-wide information is just as essential in the field of education as it is in the domain of science and business.

Fairness requires that we should acknowledge our indebtedness to other countries for the noteworthy contributions they have made to our educational progress.

Mr. Speaker, I would not for the world minimize the benefits which our Nation has derived from foreign educational and humanitarian practices, to a few of which I respectfully refer.

The American high school, first established in Boston in 1821, was an adaptation of English antecedents. It was the idea of the German-Swiss, Pestalozzi, who laid the foundation of our modern, secular, elementary school. The kindergarten, an institution that has profoundly influenced the educational methods of every enlightened country in the world, was an idea for which we are indebted to Froebel, a German. The first kindergarten in America was established in Wisconsin. We are indebted to the Swedes and the Finns for the manual-arts high school and the manual-training activities. The leading nations of Europe had been engaged in the development of systems of vocational education for more than 50 years before its importance was generally recognized in this country.

Finally a presidential commission reported in 1914 that—

There were in this country 25,000,000 workers, 18 years of age or over, engaged in farming, mining, mechanical pursuits, and trade and industry not 10 per cent of whom had had any vocational training for their work.

The commission estimated that if vocational education were to increase their earning power only 25 cents a day it would mean \$6,250,000 a day and \$1,875,000,000 a year added wages for the Nation. Based upon the investigation and the commission's recommendation, Congress enacted in 1917 the Smith-Hughes Vocational Act. Research, whether conducted here or abroad to ascertain real facts, whether they relate to education, agriculture, industry, or the relief of suffering humanity, is none the less valuable.

It was not until 1810 that the real foundation of the education of the deaf in the United States was begun. Yet schools for the deaf had been established many years prior to this time in England, Scotland, France, Italy, Switzerland, Spain, and Holland. The first school for the blind was established in France in 1784. Schools for the blind were well organized throughout Europe before America gave serious consideration to the question.

The first school in the world for the education of crippled children was established in 1832 in the city of Munich, Bavaria. It was not until 1890 that the United States fully appreciated the importance of this humanitarian and constructive work. While it would be highly pleasing to many of us if we could claim America as the birthplace of these fine, humanitarian, and educational ideas, nevertheless we must admit their value to our Nation and to humanity even though they had their origin outside our own country.

Opposition to a Federal department of education for the alleged reason that foreign ideas in conflict with our form and philosophy of government might be imported and then disseminated through such an agency is too far-fetched to ring true. Surely, if those who advocate a Federal department of education were to make the same assertion with reference to a system of education national in scope but private in character, those who maintain the system would deeply resent and vigorously deny the charge. The same holds true with reference to the alleged danger of standardization and centralization.

Such a challenge unsupported by evidence will never halt the onward march of education, whether it be private or public in character. We know that our obligation to civilization will not be discharged by maintaining a stationary place in the field of education at a time when the world is advancing in every field of scientific endeavor. The position to which the United States has advanced throughout the world in the fields of commerce, industry, and science can be maintained only by constantly striving to raise the level of education. This requires that accurate information touching every phase of education at home and abroad should be secured, if possible, and made available to the States and local communities, to be used only if local interest so determines.

Take from the social, civic, and industrial life the benefits derived from the public schools, the land-grant colleges, and the trained leadership supplied by these institutions in the field of natural science, economics, and general research work, and more than half of our national wealth would disappear.

We may well reflect on the importance of the words of President Hoover in his inaugural address, delivered March 4, 1929:

Although education is primarily a responsibility of the States and local communities, and rightly so, yet the Nation as a whole is vitally concerned in its development everywhere to the highest standards and to complete universality. Self-government can succeed only through an instructed electorate. Our objective is not simply to overcome illiteracy. The Nation has marched far beyond that. The more complex the problems of the Nation becomes, the greater is the need for more and more advanced instruction. Moreover, as our numbers increase and as our life expands with science and invention, we must discover more and more leaders for every walk of life. We can not hope to succeed in directing this increasingly complex civilization unless we can draw all the talent of leadership from the whole people.

One civilization after another has been wrecked upon the attempt to secure sufficient leadership from a single group or class. If we would prevent the growth of class distinctions and would constantly refresh our leadership with the ideals of our people, we must draw constantly from the general mass. The full opportunity for every boy and girl to rise through the selective processes of education can alone secure to us this leadership.

The very aim and purpose of education, so clearly and forcefully expressed by President Hoover, can never be fully achieved unless future generations can have the full benefit of all contributions made to our educational practices, methods, and administration by leaders trained in every walk of life. The viewpoint from each group should become the common property through a common clearing house of information.

Ira C. Baker, professor of civil engineering, University of Illinois, has stressed the importance of free education as a factor in the prosperity of our country:

One of the main reasons why the United States has been so prosperous in the past is that education has been free, and consequently the higher ranks have been continually recruited from the lower. The way should be open that the humblest may rise from the lowest to the very highest rank. Education should not be bestowed as a charity, nor as a means for helping the recipient to earn a livelihood, but because the proper education of the people is the only basis for social security, economic prosperity, and the highest national development.

Education is not free when the latest educational data to which the Government has access is not obtained and made available to every teacher and every school board throughout the United States. There can be no equality of educational opportunity unless the Federal Government meets this responsibility, which it alone can and should meet.

The future prosperity of our vast population, the perpetuity of our form of government, our national character, and our place among the nations of the earth will be determined by the broad vision with which our schools, colleges, and universities impart to each generation a thorough education, a sympathetic understanding of our social and political institutions, and the spirit and ideals of our national life. [Applause.]

DIVERSION OF WATER AT CHICAGO

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object to this request, but I give notice now that if the chairman in charge of the bill does not object I will object to any future requests. I do not object to this request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, I refer to the subject that was discussed before the House yesterday, the Chicago diversion of water from Lake Michigan. I do not care to take the time of the House now because I know you want to get to your other work. I refer you to a speech I made in the House on May 27, 1926, on the diversion of water at Chicago, page 10221 of the RECORD of the Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, and also to a speech that I made in the House on January 13, 1927, page 1614 of the RECORD of the Sixty-ninth Congress, second session. This was a speech I delivered before a protest meeting of the Great Lakes Harbor Association of the United States and Canada at Buffalo, N. Y., November 16, 1926.

Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I simply wish to extend my remarks, in accordance with the permission granted me, by inserting a letter which I wrote to the Hon. Newton D. Baker, former Secretary of War, and the answer to the same from the attorney general of the State of Wisconsin.

The letters referred to follow:

DECEMBER 6, 1929.

Hon. NEWTON T. BAKER,
Cleveland, Ohio.

MY DEAR MR. BAKER: I think the representatives of the Great Lakes States should take some concerted action to protect our interests in

the renewal of the Sanitary District's license to divert water from Lake Michigan. As you know, the 5-year present permit to withdraw 8,500 second-feet of water expires the 31st of this month.

I read in the newspapers that some Senators and Representatives are calling at the White House, upon the Secretary of War, and the Chief of Engineers, and are making an effort to secure a renewal of the present diversion. I feel that we should demand a reduction and at the same time the Secretary of War should notify the sanitary district authorities that a most substantial cut in the withdrawal of our water should be insisted upon at an early date.

I am taking the liberty of mailing a copy of this letter to some of the Senators and Representatives from the Great Lakes section.

I would be pleased to hear from you at your convenience.

Very sincerely yours,

W. W. CHALMERS.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Cleveland, Ohio, December 9, 1929.

Hon. W. W. CHALMERS,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Your letter of December 6, addressed to Mr. Baker, has arrived during his absence in California. It will come to his attention upon his return, but in the meantime I am taking the liberty of writing you with respect to the question discussed in your letter.

I have recently written to Attorney General Bettman, of Ohio, and Attorney General Brucker, of Michigan, with reference to the efforts of Chicago to procure a renewal or extension of the present permit. The supreme court entered a decree in which it was determined that the diversion at Chicago was illegal and that it should be ended as speedily as possible, without undue hazard to the health of the people of Chicago. The case was referred back to Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, as special master, to determine (1) what works should be constructed to provide for the disposition of the sewage of the Sanitary District of Chicago by means other than lake diversion; (2) what period of time would be required for the completion of such structures; (3) after the completion of such structures required for the treatment of all of the sewage, what diversion, if any, would be required to maintain navigation on the Chicago River as part of the port of Chicago (not through navigation to the Mississippi, which has never been authorized); (4) what reduction in the diversion can be made immediately or at the date entering the decree, and from time to time thereafter during the construction of the structures involved in the sewage-disposal program.

It is thus obvious that the Supreme Court contemplated the entry of a decree which should provide for such immediate reduction as should be found to be practicable upon the evidence submitted on the reference, for such further progressive reduction as should be found practicable from time to time as additional sewage-disposal works came into operation during the course of the completion of the program, and upon completion of the program for the termination of all diversion beyond the amount, if any, which should be found necessary to maintain navigation on the Chicago River as part of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system.

It is obvious that if the Secretary of War were to issue a new permit defining the immediate reduction which would be practicable and possible defining further progressive reductions during the construction of the sewage-disposal program, one of two difficulties would be thrust into the Lakes level litigation. First, it might necessitate the litigation of the validity of this subsequent action by the Secretary of War; second, if no question of the validity of such subsequent action by the Secretary of War so far as affecting the terms of the decree to be entered by the Supreme Court should be considered to be involved, the Supreme Court would be embarrassed by the fact that the Secretary of War had undertaken to determine and adjudicate the very issue which the Supreme Court will be called upon to determine upon the filing of the report of the special master on reference. Such action by the Secretary of War involves the assumption by him of the right to determine the very issues which the Supreme Court has before it for adjudication.

For the foregoing reasons I feel that we should not ask the Secretary of War to issue any kind of a permit, but should take the position that he has no power to issue a permit, and that any permit in form which he might issue would be void and ineffective. If, notwithstanding that objection, the Secretary of War should be determined to act, I feel that our position should be successively as follows:

First. That if the Secretary were determined to act notwithstanding such objection, he should merely extend the present permit until the decision is made by the Supreme Court subject to all orders which may be made by that court in the interim or on the entry of the final decree.

Second. If the Secretary were to refuse to follow that position and be determined to assume greater jurisdiction in the controversy, notwithstanding the assumption of jurisdiction by the Supreme Court, then I think we should press for an order requiring the largest possible immediate reduction in the diversion and the largest possible progressive reductions with the speediest possible termination of the diversion.

I noted in the Chicago newspapers they suggest that the Secretary of War was indicating a probable reduction of 1,000 second-feet. This

is wholly unsatisfactory, as I think the evidence conclusively shows that 2,000 second-feet reduction may be had immediately with liberal consideration for Chicago. Moreover, the form of the present permit is erroneous in principle in that it fixes no definite limit of the diversion, but merely limits one factor while permitting Chicago to extend the other factor as much as it wishes, the only limitation being its voluntary moderation, which is illusory, or its unwillingness to pump water.

Very truly yours,

R. T. JACKSON.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6564) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

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. 6564, the Interior Department appropriation bill, with Mr. CHINDELOM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue reading the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses of special investigations pertaining to the Bureau of Pensions, including traveling expenses of persons detailed from that bureau for such purpose, purchase of supplies and equipment for field use, copies of records and documents, and reimbursements of cooperating governmental agencies for expenses necessarily incurred in connection with such investigations; also including not to exceed \$1,500 for necessary traveling and other expenses of the commissioner or employees of the bureau assigned, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to official duty in connection with the annual conventions of organized war veterans or meetings of medical organizations, \$150,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Yesterday, in the consideration of the Indian Bureau portion of the bill, an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] with reference to the Concho school. In connection with that, I asked the gentleman a question, and a colloquy resulted. There are several questions and replies. Reading the RECORD, and on consultation with the manuscript, I find that under leave to revise and extend the gentleman has materially altered and added to his replies to my questions as well as in other portions of the colloquy. The result is that some statements are made that I appear to have assented to to which I would not have assented if made in my presence.

Of course, there is a parliamentary way to have the RECORD corrected. I do not care enough about it to follow that procedure. I want the statement in the RECORD that the statements that appear to have been made at that time I did not assent to because they were not made at that time.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Examinations and inspection of projects: For examination of accounts and inspection of the works of various projects and divisions of projects operated and maintained by irrigation districts or water users' associations, and bookkeeping, accounting, clerical, legal, and other expenses incurred in accordance with contract provisions for the repayment of such expenses by the districts or associations, the unexpended balances of the appropriations for this purpose for the fiscal years 1929 and 1930 are continued available for the same purpose for the fiscal year 1931.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

For the purpose of calling it to the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, I would like to turn back for a moment to page 61, where we find various items of appropriation for Indians in the State of Washington.

I have no desire to ask that the committee return to that page for the purpose of considering an amendment. I desire to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the members for the increased appropriations for the Quinaliet Indians, which include sums for construction of equipment for water supply and for the installation of electric-light plant at the Indian village of Taholah. It has taken some time to get this matter in shape, and the money, although appropriated by Congress, comes from the tribal funds of these Indians, and the appropriation is reimbursable.

This tribe has a considerable sum of money in the fund now held by the Government to be expended for the Indians when needed. But that tribal fund is subject to all of the rules and

regulations of the Budget system. To me that is the least bit strange. Indian money—their money—becomes part and parcel of Uncle Sam's total, and it is quite a task to get it, or any part of it, out for actual and necessary use.

An effort was made to provide about \$3,000 additional for improving the streets of the village by providing a surface something like macadam. Taholah is a wet country, and the streets are almost impassable at times. It was thought that at the time the water mains are laid, it would be well to provide for the improvement of the surface of the streets, fixing them so that wagons and automobiles could go over them. The agent in charge was not able for want of time to make sufficient showing for the item to be included last summer in the Budget, and I have not been able to get the necessary statements in order to make the necessary showing before the committee. For that reason I have not particularly pressed the matter; but I hope that I will soon have sufficient information to show that it will be an economy to put rock on the roads and fill up the mudholes at the time the water mains are laid. We have asked for \$3,000, but I am inclined to think that probably \$2,000 will be all that will now be needed, and I am making this statement now so that the chairman and the members of the subcommittee may be informed. Before the bill is enacted into law I hope it will be shown that economy in the handling of the Indians' own money will warrant doing the two jobs at the same time at the additional cost of \$2,000 or \$3,000.

While I have the floor I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] for his splendid statement the other day with regard to Indians generally. I know that all Members, and citizens, too, who live in western communities where there are numerous Indian tribes who have not had exactly the best of it all the time are greatly appreciative of the fact that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] is showing such a keen insight into their necessities. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Milk River project, Montana: For operation and maintenance, Chinook division, \$8,000; continuation of construction, \$23,000; in all, \$31,000.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would greatly appreciate a statement from the chairman as to why the Glasgow and Malta divisions of the Milk River project are not provided for in this bill as to operation and maintenance?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the situation as to the Glasgow and Malta River, Milk River purchase is this: An understanding was arrived at a few years ago between the Reclamation Service and these divisions under which these divisions were each year themselves to advance and provide an increased amount for operation and maintenance. If I remember, the first year it was a third, and so on up, until the fiscal year ending 1931, they were to take care of 100 per cent, and that is the reason why the bureau did not ask for any money.

Mr. LEAVITT. And that is an agreement to which the people of the project assented?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Vale project, Oregon: For operation and maintenance, \$15,000; for continuation of construction, \$530,000; in all, \$545,000.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman in regard to the reappropriation of unexpended balances and unexpended appropriations. I notice that, for instance, this Baker project, I think this is the third or fourth reappropriation made and nothing done on the work. Will the gentleman explain?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the reason for all of these reappropriations is that conditions have come up which hindered progress being made as rapidly as expected.

In the Baker project other elements entered into it, but the thing has finally worked out, and the Commissioner of Reclamation states that they expect to go ahead with certain construction work. They have made that assurance to us for 1931.

In that particular case the owner of the land that is to be used for the reservoir site is holding it at a price which the Reclamation Service considered prohibitive, and they have been hoping that they would get together on the price. At the price at which he is holding it there will be no construction. Whenever a reasonable price is available they are ready to go ahead and do the work. With this reappropriation and a reasonable price they would go to work with the construction as soon as the weather permits. Without such reasonable price they will

not proceed. That is the nature of the obstacles that require the reappropriation.

Mr. McFADDEN. I noticed the reappropriation each year and yet there was no work started.

Mr. CRAMTON. The reason we resort to reappropriations of unexpended balances in the appropriation bill is that if a million dollars is appropriated for a certain project and not expended and if instead of reappropriating for the next year we appropriated again a million dollars and so on it would look like a vast amount of money was being expended, whereas as a matter of fact none was expended. But by reappropriating the unexpended balance the statement of appropriations gives a true picture.

Mr. McFADDEN. None of these funds are diverted to any other project?

Mr. CRAMTON. They could not be.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I am doing this for the purpose of drawing to the attention of the House the needs of the Walker River Indian Reservation. I have tried a long time to have a first-aid room and equipment installed at the Walker River Reservation, and if possible a hospital for the care of these Indians. Under the provisions of this bill the Walker River Reservation is to obtain \$40,000 for a hospital and a first-aid room that is necessary will be installed at that place. I am very happy that this item is included.

The amount of money for an industrial school at Carson City, \$50,000, is following along the right line. In my talks with the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs I found his purpose is to bring about a divorcement, you might say, of the younger Indians from the Federal Government, as soon as possible, and this can be brought about only by training them to use their hands and brains along the lines of industry. I am very happy indeed that the bill to-day contains an item of \$50,000 for an industrial school at Carson City for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salt Lake Basin project, Utah, second division: For commencement of construction, \$300,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be available for construction work until a contract or contracts shall be made with an irrigation district or districts embracing said division, which, in addition to other conditions required by law, shall require payment of construction costs within a period not exceeding 20 years from the date water shall be available for delivery, as to lands now under production, tributary to canals and laterals already constructed, and for the irrigation of which a supplementary water supply is to be furnished.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Michigan a question. When we authorized the first division of this project the word "association" was used. In the second division I notice it is limited to "district or districts." I am not unmindful of the fact that in the act, commonly designated as the adjustment act, passed in 1926, I believe, we used the word "districts." Are we to be limited from now on to dealing with "districts"? The association that was formed under the first division of this project has been very successful. It has proven to be a very fine way of handling the matter. The Government is fully protected. The water rights are pledged as security, and work is going on splendidly. I notice the elimination of these words here. Is there any particular reason for it?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman first advise me as to how collections are made from that association? Is there an account with each water user or one with the association?

Mr. COLTON. One with the association by the Government.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am probably not fully advised as to the differences that would result from the use of one term or the other. This language was drawn up by the Reclamation Service at the request of the committee, and they have used that language. What technicalities might be involved I am not prepared to say.

Mr. COLTON. So far as this particular project is concerned, I think it will not make very much difference, but I wondered if there is any reason that the word "association" should be eliminated.

Mr. CRAMTON. I remember that when the first division was under consideration, and I think that at that time we did propose to use the word "district," and an appeal was made by the gentleman from Utah, I think, or some one else, that we should use the word "association," the Reclamation Service at that time advised us that that would be satisfactory. But in this case they have suggested this language upon our request for a provision of this kind.

Mr. COLTON. I am very glad to know that there is no particular objection to the word "association." In this case there may be no objection, but there are cases, peculiar, perhaps, to the State of Utah, where the "association" makes it much easier to handle the project than a district.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I rise to call attention to the fact that the great "Bambino," "Babe" Ruth, "Sultan of Swat," and his associates, are now duck hunting down in my home town. The following appears in the press dispatches:

BAMBINO IN SOUTHLAND ON DUCK-HUNTING TRIP

NEW BERN, N. C., December 7.—Babe Ruth, "Sultan of Swat," and Frank Stevens, a New York friend, to-day were in this section for their third duck hunt of the year.

Ruth and Stevens have established camp at Camp Bryan, near here, and from there they expect to make daily excursions for the next week into the marshes of the vicinity in quest of duck.

Numerous special hunts for the home-run king have been arranged by George A. Nicoll, assistant State game warden, and other friends.

This is a great hunting section, and a great many people are taking advantage of it. I invite the membership of this House to come down and hunt ducks and enjoy the hospitality of my district and my section of the country, particularly of my home town, New Bern, N. C.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, the invitation accepted, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Secondary projects: For cooperative and general investigations, \$75,000.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McFADDEN: Page 80, line 10, strike out lines 10 and 11.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a provision continuing appropriations for investigations. In the last session of Congress I called the attention of the committee to the subject of continuing investigations with an idea of taking on additional reclamation projects. This amendment is offered in line with my expressed thought at the time that under present existing conditions I do not believe we should continue appropriations for investigations on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation to dig up new projects. There has been no opposition to a continuance and completion of the present projects, but I believe there is a general feeling throughout the country that this department should not continue to investigate for the purpose of carrying on the development of additional irrigation projects.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Let me first say that under our present financial condition of the reclamation fund, there can be no large increase at this time in new projects, as I pointed out in my introductory statement. This fund is proposed in order that funds may be available for cooperation with State irrigation districts, and for them to continue these cooperative investigations and examination of irrigation opportunities throughout the West. The director has his program of investigations. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN] has his theory as to the way to protect agriculture. In his idea the way to make farmers rich in Pennsylvania is to entirely stop irrigation in the West. Whether this item of \$75,000 is in or is not, there will be the same acreage irrigated in the West this year and next year, and probably for the next 20 years.

If the gentleman wanted to stop the increase of the acreage he should move to strike out all of these different construction items that we have gone over.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to decrease the production in the West so that the proportion of voting strength in Pennsylvania might be greater?

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman knows I am not in politics.

Mr. GARNER. I wanted to know whether the theory of the gentleman from Pennsylvania should be carried out in this ap-

propriation bill so that Pennsylvania should have a greater representation in Congress.

Mr. CRAMTON. As I understand, the voting strength in Texas seems to be pretty safe.

I hope the House will not interfere lightly with the construction work, the groundwork.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Is it not a fact that a part of this fund is used in collecting information concerning water flow?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. McFADDEN. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan if any of this money is being used for the purpose of preparing new projects for development?

Mr. CRAMTON. Ultimately some new projects may develop from the use of some of this money. Studies are being made on water supply, and the studies are made by the cooperation of the States, and otherwise, and the information thus collected and piled up might some time result in the construction of new projects, I will say frankly to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. Does not this item provide for economic studies also?

Mr. CRAMTON. I think that is in another item.

Mr. McFADDEN. If the gentleman will permit me, I have another amendment to offer to strike out any paragraph providing for new construction.

Mr. CRAMTON. The effect of the gentleman's pending amendment would not stop new projects but would cripple the activities which are necessary in order to make them successful.

Mr. McFADDEN. They have great facilities for switching around and doing things that Congress does not intend to authorize them to do, and particularly in putting on new projects. I think Congress should check these investigations and studies looking to future large expenditures of money out of the Federal Treasury.

I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that this is not a Pennsylvania proposition. It is a proposition of national interest. Of course, Pennsylvania pays its part on this, and does it cheerfully. I do not think the voters of Pennsylvania have objected to the continuance of any of these present projects.

Mr. LEAVITT. How much of this does the State of Pennsylvania pay? This is paid out of the reclamation fund.

Mr. McFADDEN. That is true; but these appropriations are not always reimbursed.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate on the amendment is exhausted.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN] ought not to prevail. The reasons why it should not prevail have been fairly stated by the chairman of the committee [Mr. CRAMTON]. In addition to what the chairman said, may I add that the amount carried, \$75,000, is in part used for investigational work in connection with projects existing to-day touching features calculated to make them sounder economically and thus better from the standpoint of either the Government or the project. Again, the suggestion by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the investigation may lead to the adoption of programs for new projects, can hardly be correct because the very investigations made might lead to the defeat of proposed projects.

Suppose a Member of the House from some Western State should come to Congress with recommendations and petitions from local chambers of commerce and groups interested in the development of a project with the assurance that it would cost only \$100 an acre to reclaim a certain tract of land. The Reclamation Service not being in position to say whether the figures are correct or not, the House and Senate would be without adequate information as to what the cost would be. If investigations were made by responsible authorities of the Government, it might well appear that the particular project that it was thought could be reclaimed at an expense of \$100 an acre would really cost, perhaps, \$200 or more, and the Congress in the face of such a showing would not approve the project. In my judgment the Congress will gain far more by having official information concerning proposed projects that is unbiased than by refusing this information and relying alone upon the statements or estimates that are given by local groups as they attempt to put a project across.

Mr. LEAVITT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield a moment, I wish to ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto may close five minutes after the gentleman from Montana has concluded,

and that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] may have those five minutes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will state it.

Mr. KETCHAM. May I inquire on what form of motion the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] was speaking?

The CHAIRMAN. He moved to strike out the last two words.

Mr. KETCHAM. Do I understand the gentleman from Montana is to speak in opposition to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. KETCHAM. I wanted it understood that the gentleman from Montana is to speak in opposition to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Idaho. If I understand the parliamentary situation, he must proceed in direct opposition to the position taken by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I make this unanimous-consent request, that the debate be closed in 10 minutes, with the understanding that 5 minutes may be yielded to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, as I understood the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], it was that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] have his five minutes first, and I would prefer it that way if he wishes to be recognized.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, let us have the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Montana desire to proceed?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes. Mr. Chairman, this is perhaps the best opportunity to demagogue I have had before the House during this session, and that opportunity would be to take the position that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is an illustration of an attitude of enmity on the part of the eastern part of the country toward the development of the West. But I am not going to approach this matter from that standpoint. I believe there is a great deal of damage done to a constructive understanding between the different sections by the taking of that position under opportunities of this kind.

We have here the question of whether or not we are going to proceed with the matter of developing the reclamation projects in a constructive way, or whether we are going ahead without the information that is necessary to such constructive action. The House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation in 1926 reported to this House, this House passed, the Senate passed, and it became a law, a measure that requires that before appropriations shall be made for new reclamation projects there shall be certain financial and economic studies made under the instrumentality of the Reclamation Service, and that that information shall be presented to the Congress. We thus voluntarily brought about a restriction on the building of new reclamation projects in the western country. All this item does is to make that restriction effective by providing that the Reclamation Service shall have the funds necessary to carry it into effect.

That is all there is to this appropriation. There is, in addition to that, this further fact: That there are throughout the western country irrigation projects already in existence upon which certain studies are required to determine the proper steps to make their success more certain. There is provision in this item for the making of that kind of studies by those best fitted through experience and training to make them.

The only thing that could possibly result from striking this item out of the bill, since all of the other really large items leading up to it have already been favorably acted upon in the committee, would be to stop such studies and such constructive work, and allow things to go forward without adequate information. Let us therefore fully understand what it is proposed to do. We agree in the western country that it is possible to bring too much land into cultivation in the United States, but it is not in the western country on the present reclamation projects that that is a probability. It has often been shown in the House that what we produce on those projects are not the things which come into destructive competition with the products of the rest of the country. On the other hand, if these reclamation projects were not in existence, hundreds of thousands of acres of land now producing crops of which we have a shortage, like sugar and products of that kind, would be turned to the production of a further surplus of wheat and similar things, out of the surplus of which there grow many of the difficulties of agriculture under present existing conditions. Let us think at least once or twice before we take such

a step as is being proposed here. Let us not take out of the bill the one thing that puts the brakes on the bringing in of unsuitable areas. Let us have these studies made in advance. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] moves to strike out the last two words and is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I think we all understand, without extended explanation on the one hand or any dodging of the issue on the other, exactly what we are facing at this point in the pending bill. These are very fine gentlemen who come from the western section of the country and their appeals are almost irresistible. In attempting to do so there is nothing of the personal element, and I certainly disclaim any intention of saying anything that might approach the demagogic, but I do just want to lay this thought upon your mind: If you have taken the record of any representative farm organization in the last two or three years, where that organization covers the entire country, and noted its recommendations, I am sure you have found that one of the important recommendations made is that no reclamation projects be undertaken until at least agriculture has a chance to catch up. Of course, the argument is made that this activity of the bureau does not comprehend the bringing of any new lands into cultivation, but so many times we have found it to be true that after an investigation has been made, the report published, and the department itself comes before the committee and makes a recommendation that these projects be entered upon, then the work is begun. In a way the House of Representatives regards the proposition as started when a favorable report is made by the bureau. The best thing to do, in my judgment, is to face a situation before a bureau report really confronts us, and the time to do that is now.

I am not so particular whether the particular amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania with reference to the \$75,000 item be adopted and the item stricken out, but I certainly am very insistent that the following item, which has to do with new investigations, be stricken out or at least if it is voted by the committee, and the House follows the recommendations of the committee, that we do it with a full understanding of exactly what it means.

In response to the argument of the gentleman from Montana that the products raised in the western country do not displace those that are produced in other sections of the country, I do not need to go out of this building to indicate to him that his statement will not stand up. I go down and pick up the menu in the House Restaurant, and I find in certain seasons of the year Idaho potatoes. They are splendid potatoes, but not comparable at all with the potatoes raised in Michigan or the potatoes raised in Maine and other States.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does not my colleague know that they are actually Michigan potatoes that are sold under that alibi?

Mr. KETCHAM. By the taste, I would think so, but at any rate—

Mr. LEAVITT. How can the gentleman say that "if they do not compare"?

Mr. KETCHAM. I am sorry I can not yield. I knew I would get a rise out of the gentleman from Montana on that proposition.

I may say to the gentleman that his statement is absolutely indefensible and the gentleman must realize that if he gives it a moment's consideration.

Mr. LEAVITT. What about sugar?

Mr. KETCHAM. I am sorry I can not yield.

Wheat being brought into cultivation in these irrigated districts displaces the wheat produced in the other sections of the country, and I am sure we all know, as the Secretary of Agriculture stated, that 15,000,000 acres of developed farm lands east of the Mississippi River are not now in a state of cultivation, and when this is realized, certainly it would seem as if we ought not to further aggravate a bad situation by bringing into cultivation more lands under reclamation projects.

In taking this attitude I do not want to be understood as being sectional in my viewpoint. I am trying to look at the matter in its larger aspects. We all want to go along together, but it seems to me under the general situation of agriculture at the present time it is a fair statement to say that we ought to put our foot down upon any further extension of reclamation projects, particularly those that are new or that are in contemplation, for the very reason I stated in the beginning, that when the investigations are begun, then some way or other the temper of the House of Representatives is to regard the project as having been put under way, and we hesitate to stop it.

I certainly hope this item will be stricken from the bill. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN].

The question was taken; and there were, on a division (demanded by Mr. McFADDEN)—ayes 20, noes 44.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations necessary to determine the economic conditions and financial feasibility of new projects and for investigations and other activities relating to the reorganization, settlement of lands, and financial adjustments of existing projects, including examination of soils, classification of land, land-settlement activities, including advertising in newspapers and other publications, and obtaining general economic and settlement data, \$50,000: *Provided*, That the expenditures from this appropriation for any reclamation project shall be considered as supplementary to the appropriation for that project and shall be accounted for and returned to the reclamation fund as other expenditures under the reclamation act.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McFADDEN: Page 80, strike out lines 12 to 14, inclusive.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the gentleman wants to debate the amendment?

Mr. McFADDEN. Just briefly.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 10 minutes, of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have 5 minutes and the committee 5 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether under the subject of land-settlement activities there was any information before the committee from the Reclamation Bureau or the Department of the Interior that this should not contemplate a possible investigation of some land-settlement propositions in the Southern States?

Mr. CRAMTON. This provision does not contemplate that for this reason. The item before us is an appropriation from the reclamation fund. Some appropriations have been made for such study as the gentleman from Alabama mentions, but that was from the Treasury and not from the reclamation fund. It is a separate investigation and has never been appropriated for from the reclamation fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, this provision in the bill is a direct authority to proceed with new undertakings, because it says "For investigations necessary to determine the economic conditions and financial feasibility of new projects and for investigations and other activities," and so forth.

This is directly putting "the nose of the camel" under the tent with respect to new irrigation projects, and the provision is in here for that very definite purpose.

The item provides also for obtaining settlement data and advertising. If there ever were authority given for new irrigation projects, it is contained in this provision, and I want the House to understand what it is voting on when it votes for this provision, and I want the country to know that it is the intention of Congress, if they vote for this kind of provision, to continue the big irrigation programs which ultimately will mean the recovery of vast areas of agricultural lands upon which large expenditures, running into hundreds of millions of dollars, will be made and as a result of which additional surplus products in the form of agricultural products will be produced and forced on the market, a market already overfull; and we have created the Farm Board, with \$500,000 appropriation, to take care of the present surplus from the farms of the country.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the item before us proposes an expenditure from the reclamation fund which is derived from sale of public lands and proceeds of mineral leases on the public lands, and so forth, money that is derived from natural resources of the West; and here is an appropriation from that fund of \$50,000—

For investigations necessary to determine the economic conditions and financial feasibility of new projects and for investigations and other activities relating to the reorganization, settlement of lands, and financial adjustments of existing projects, including examination of soils, classification of land, land-settlement activities.

And so forth. The situation is that for the present there is a very definite program under way of no initiation of new projects. We are completing the construction of those under way and no new projects can be initiated without action of Congress, notwithstanding what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN] has said about their getting the thing started so we can not stop it.

In this whole bill out of the ten or twelve million dollars appropriated there is only \$125,000 that could be used in any way for new projects. They can not enter on construction at all without an appropriation by Congress, and the approval of the project. There is no danger of new projects being considered.

I want to be perfectly frank with the House, their studies may in the future lead up to new projects, assemble the information that some time may be brought to the attention of Congress so that Congress can get that information, but there is no certainty that that may happen.

The great importance of this item is that we have \$150,000,000 invested in existing projects that is due to the Treasury of the United States. Settlement has not progressed properly in all.

We have an opportunity for them to study the economic conditions, the settlement of land, financial adjustment, study the reorganization necessary to existing projects, and does my friend from Pennsylvania really desire—I am sure that my colleague from Michigan does not desire—that the farmers who go onto these new lands, taking their families there to work for years and make a home, that we shall condemn them to eternal poverty through a lack of reorganization and development of these projects. If this item is stricken out, it means that the hands of the bureau are tied, and they are not going to be able to make the studies necessary to make a success of the projects now under way.

Mr. KETCHAM. Would my colleague object to striking out the word "new"?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; because next year there will not be any large expenditure for that purpose, and any study that is made leading up to new projects can not commit the Government in the slightest degree because actual construction on any new project can not begin until this House votes its approval. I will defy my friend from Pennsylvania to point to any case where the Bureau of Reclamation has spent any money, in any way, except of that authorized by law. The law does not permit them to spend this money except on the project for which it is appropriated.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Does my colleague know whether or not any investigation of new projects has been submitted by the Bureau of Reclamation which has been refused by Congress?

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, yes; repeatedly. There have been numerous cases of that kind. I will tell the gentleman one thing, that there have been many unsuccessful projects which were put in by Congress without any investigation by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McFADDEN) there were—ayes 1, noes 29.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit an amendment. On page 80 strike out lines 12 and 13 and the word "and" in line 14.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 80, beginning with line 12, strike out all of lines 12 and 13 and the word "and" in line 14.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that debate has been exhausted?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. There are two minutes remaining.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The unanimous consent provided that there should be five minutes for the gentleman from Pennsylvania and five minutes for the committee. If there is two minutes remaining that should be for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the unanimous-consent request was that there be 10 minutes debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto. The Chair has repeatedly stated that no unanimous-consent request can be submitted which deprives the Chair of the control of recognition.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to be fair. I am willing that there should be debate, but I do not want debate one sided on either side. The request I made was that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN] have 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan 5 minutes, and the committee

5 minutes. If there was any time that was not used, I think it was probably my time, but I am willing to waive that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the time that was not used was that which, under the theory of of the chairman of the subcommittee, should have belonged to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania consumed 3 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan 5 minutes, leaving 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CRAMTON. I present this unanimous-consent request. I have no desire that any part of the bill be lacking in debate. I ask unanimous consent that there be on the pending amendment and all amendments to the section 10 minutes debate, 5 minutes for the proponents of the amendment and 5 minutes for the opposition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Reserving the right to object, what is the hurry?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am willing to take in whoever wants to speak.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I know, but here is a little dispute going on over a certain two minutes either used or not used by somebody, and we have available about all the time from now until a week after Christmas, while we are organizing the several committees of the House which are not yet in position to function.

Mr. CRAMTON. Frankly, my worry was that those two minutes would be used on behalf of the amendment, and no opportunity given to reply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, I could use two minutes on either side [laughter], but I shall not object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, before that is put, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TEMPLE. Can a request for unanimous consent be proposed to the committee about a matter that has already been settled by action of the committee in accepting a previous unanimous-consent agreement?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it can by unanimous consent.

Mr. TEMPLE. Would it not require a request to vacate the previous action of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. That was the action of the committee, and the debate contemplated by that action has been practically concluded. There is now a new unanimous-consent request for debate on a new proposition.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, a unanimous-consent agreement is the strongest kind of agreement by motion. No motion would be in order to reverse an action taken a few minutes before.

The CHAIRMAN. But it occurs to the Chair that an order made by unanimous consent may be rescinded or modified by unanimous consent.

Mr. TEMPLE. But the request has not been put to vacate the previous action of the committee. No request of that kind is pending.

The CHAIRMAN. There are two minutes remaining of the time already fixed for debate under the previous unanimous-consent order. If the gentleman from Michigan desires to consume that time, he is entitled to it; he was recognized and has the floor. The Chair will then put any unanimous-consent request that may be proposed by any member of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is the gentleman quite sure he can use the entire two minutes?

Mr. KETCHAM. I think one minute will be sufficient to present the argument that I have. I am perfectly willing to divide with the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. I accept the proposition.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, what I wish to say is just to again call attention to the fundamentals in this proposition. It is true that the chairman of the subcommittee has said that the House of Representatives has the power to take negative action should the project be advanced to a point in legislation involving appropriation. When we are confronted with a favorable report by a bureau of the Government, then those of us who may not be on the floor and actively interested at the time simply take the word of the great bureau like the Bureau of Reclamation and the project starts. When work is started we are met with all these fine pleas that the project ought not to be held up longer and ought to be completed, and when that is completed we are urged to step in and stop other new projects. That is the argument advanced, and I take the position that

this idea of new projects should be rejected. As to the urgency of this item, may I point out the fact that this very same appropriation was carried last year. This is a continuing appropriation, and not a dollar of it was used last year.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is wrong there.

Mr. KETCHAM. I am only confirming the report, and the report says that this is a continuing appropriation.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is a continuing job, but they spend money every year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is this a reappropriation?

Mr. CRAMTON. This is a reappropriation.

Mr. KETCHAM. If no money was used last year, what is the harm of cutting it out and putting the House on record as opposed to new projects until the agricultural condition of the country is restored.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The time for debate is exhausted under the unanimous-consent agreement made a few minutes ago.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the Chair hold that by unanimous consent we can not permit further debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak for three minutes, following the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman perhaps will not object to my having two minutes, too.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Preceding the gentleman from Michigan.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized simply to call the attention of the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to the situation. It shows exactly how a Budget-directed appropriation bill can slide through the House. Either last year or the year before, or at some time since the Budget system went into effect, this particular matter went through as legislation on an appropriation bill, although we were given to understand in the incipency of the Budget system that there would be no legislation offered by the committee to appropriation bills.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Is the gentleman opposed to the Budget system?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; but it needs to be greatly reformed. I am opposed to a policy here whereby the hearings are hurried and held after but little notice, without much attention on the part of the average Member, and where here, in the Committee of the Whole, it becomes inadvisable, sometimes difficult, and often inopportune, for an ordinary Member to secure five minutes in which to speak on an item in the bill.

I doubt if one-half of the Members here now know or care just what the present little flare-up is about, although five minutes have been used on one side and five minutes on the other side. Apparently, the quarrel is chiefly about the use of two minutes. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington yields back one-half minute.

Mr. CRAMTON. I ask recognition for three and one-half minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, many things have been said that may give to members of the committee a misunderstanding. In the first place, the item pending is not legislation, and is not subject to a point of order. It is an item to let the Bureau of Reclamation carry on the work for which it is organized. There is plenty of legislative authority for it.

It is not a continuing appropriation. Each year an appropriation has been made. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania

[Mr. McFADDEN] does not get any more accurate information from bank statements than he does from the report of the committee, he is going to be misled.

Mr. McFADDEN. I call the gentleman's attention to page 25 of the gentleman's own report.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes, I call attention to that. There was no appropriation last year. It also says that the balance of \$75,000 appropriated for the preceding year was appropriated for 1930. But for 1931 we proposed a new appropriation of \$50,000. We were appropriating each year for this \$100,000. The reason less is now expended is because, in general, we are not contemplating new projects in addition to those that exist. Most of this money will be expended on old projects, but we do not want them to be hampered in their work or prevented from investigating new projects. I say the big blunders made in reclamation have been made in consequence of the fact that there was not enough information before the Congress. The King Hill project in Montana failed. That was entered upon without sufficient information. The Williston project failed, but was authorized by Congress without an investigation. Congress itself initiated the Owyhee, the Vale, the Kittitas, without investigations. If sufficient investigations had been made before those projects were authorized, they would not have been authorized on so gigantic scale or so soon.

If you want to shut off new projects, just shut off the authorization and appropriations for them. But if you do not want the existing projects to be successful, then shut off the appropriation that may be necessary for further investigations.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman cited some projects that had failed for lack of investigation. Can the gentleman cite any that have failed after investigation?

Mr. CRAMTON. Several of them have been disapproved by the department, and Congress so far has followed that recommendation. That was the case in the Casper-Alcova project, and in the case of two in the State of Utah and others. The department has been pretty honest about it and has disapproved numerous proposed projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired upon the paragraph. Without objection, the Clerk will report the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 80, beginning with line 12, strike out all of lines 12 and 13 and the word "and" in line 14.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ten per cent of the foregoing amounts shall be available interchangeably for expenditures on the reclamation projects named; but not more than 10 per cent shall be added to the amount appropriated for any one of said projects, except that should existing works or the water supply for lands under cultivation be endangered by floods or other unusual conditions an amount sufficient to make necessary emergency repairs shall become available for expenditure by further transfer of appropriation from any of said projects upon approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed for five minutes out of order. I ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring this to the attention of those who think we should not proceed with new projects, and I have a great deal of sympathy with some part of that attitude. I want to say to them that the Interior Department bill is not the bill they want to watch on that. It would be better for them to be watching the bill making appropriations for the War Department. That is an astonishing statement to make, but the fact is that for every dollar that is being spent by the Reclamation Service, created by law for that purpose, with a view of studying reclamation problems, \$10 or maybe \$50 is being spent by the War Department. This House, in connection with the river and harbor bill, if you please, two or three years ago put in a provision that never should have been put in. It did not belong in the river and harbor bill and was something the river and harbor authorities ought not to have anything to do with. But it was one of these very broad provisions, and under that provision the War Department is going, according to my information, to the absolute limit of the authority given. I think they are going further than Congress ever dreamed they would. So that they are studying not only questions of flood

control and questions of navigation, over which they have some shadow of jurisdiction, but they are making studies of reclamation. Their studies are so far-reaching that they are really usurping the powers of the Bureau of Reclamation.

They are spending this year, as I understand, several hundred thousand dollars, a great deal of which has to do with the possibilities of new reclamation projects. This House watched with care the Columbia Basin proposition. Some of us felt it had not yet gotten to the point where we wanted to authorize that tremendously big project. We were watching it and we were making sure that if further investigation was to be made the investigation should be surrounded by certain safeguards. We came to an agreement as to what those safeguards should be. We agreed that there should be these financial studies and other studies we felt were necessary. Then through a mix up that bill did not get through Congress and Congress apparently failed to give any authority for continuing the investigation of the Columbia Basin project. Did that stop the investigation? No. The people up there were willing that the State and the communities should pay half the bill, but the War Department is making the investigation and paying for it 100 per cent out of the Federal Treasury—not out of the reclamation fund but out of the Federal Treasury. More than that, they are not carrying on and they are not qualified to carry on the financial and economic studies which ought to accompany that investigation, and what they are doing on that they are doing elsewhere. They are assembling all this data and all this information that may be used for new projects. I will say to my colleague from Michigan that is the bill he wants to watch and not this bill. They are not only studying the problem of flood control, but they have gone far beyond that. They have asked for every old book that has been used on projects which have been running for 20 years. Why should the War Department have anything to do with financial matters on projects 20 years old?

I want to challenge the attention of gentlemen to these reclamation studies by the War Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Congress of one or two years ago got loose, got out of bounds and out of the control of the Committee on Appropriations, and did something through another committee? Is that what the gentleman infers?

Mr. CRAMTON. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It sounded very much like it.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; not at all. Congress failed to take any action whatever through any committee, but manifested that it did not desire a bill reported from a legislative committee of this House. That is the bill I am talking about, a bill that came from the Committee on Irrigation, the chairman of which is now in the House. That is the bill which failed; but ignoring the failure of the House to pass any legislation the War Department goes on, entirely contrary to the policy which had formerly obtained in the House.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, we are learning something. If my hearing was good, I heard it said that the bill which we should watch was the War Department appropriation bill, because that bill in some previous Congress contained an appropriation and some authority which was sufficient to allow reclamation inquiries to be made by the engineers of the War Department, and that, it seems, was bad from the viewpoint of some.

Mr. CRAMTON. And that resulted from legislation carried in the river and harbor authorization bill that came from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors about two years ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman for that statement. If I have made one protest since the beginning of the Budget, I have made a dozen against legislative enactments on these appropriation bills, in direct violation of the Budget injunction, and the understanding that legislative riders would not be put on the appropriation bills by the Appropriation Committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. Nothing I said indicated that there was any legislation in the War Department appropriation bill. The legislation was in the river and harbor bill that came from the River and Harbor Legislative Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will ask the gentleman if the bill now being considered in this committee contains any new legislation?

Mr. CRAMTON. Practically nothing. There are some that would have been subject to a point of order, but nothing that is real legislation. There is occasionally some provision that is necessary to tie in a particular appropriation, but nothing of a permanent legislative character.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Perhaps it can not be in actual practice any other way but, nevertheless, I suspect it is true in this particular bill. I know it was true in the bill of the year before and the year before that. Yet we were told in the beginning of the Budget system that there would be no legislation on appropriation bills; and we are presumed to believe all the time that there is no legislation in appropriation bills now.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Two propositions were brought to our attention, one of them relating to the national parks and one of them relating to public lands. They were referred by our committee to the legislative committees, to the gentleman from Utah, Mr. COLTON, the chairman of Public Lands, and the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. SMITH, the chairman of Irrigation. These gentlemen are both here and know these bills were referred to them; and no permanent legislation is proposed in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. None whatever?

Mr. CRAMTON. No permanent legislation. Occasionally there is a provision that under a very technical construction might be subject to a point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In the words of the couplet from Pinafore—"What, never?" "No, hardly ever." [Laughter.]

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

The Clerk read as follows:

For a topographic survey of the proposed Shenandoah National Park in the State of Virginia, and the proposed Great Smoky Mountain National Park in the States of North Carolina and Tennessee, for expenditure by the Geological Survey under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the computation and adjustment of control data; the office drafting and publication of the resulting maps; the purchase of equipment, and for the securing of such aerial photographs as are needed to make the field surveys, \$75,000, to be immediately available.

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

I think the House may be interested, as a matter of information, in hearing of the progress that has been made in regard to the great park projects mentioned in the paragraph in the latter part of page 84.

The work has been going on for about four years, and the commission which has had charge of the selection of sites for parks in the southern Appalachian Mountains is very glad to know that for the Great Smoky Mountain Park \$10,000,000 has been raised and is in the hands of the authorities, without taking a single dollar out of the National Treasury for that purpose. So when the \$10,000,000 has been expended and the land has been bought the land will be turned over to the Interior Department to be used for park purposes without any cost whatever to the United States Government except such cost as this in surveying the land.

About two and a quarter million dollars has been raised so far for the Shenandoah National Park, which is within two hours' drive of the National Capitol. This also has been raised without appropriation from the National Treasury.

One park has over 400 square miles and the other considerably more than 225 square miles. Both of these parks will be secured, so far as purchase is concerned, without any cost at all to the National Government. We do pay the expense of "looking the gift horse in the mouth." It does cost us something for the survey of the boundaries and the survey of the interior lines. The appropriation provided in this bill is for that purpose. The maps resulting from the surveys will be necessary in the work of laying out roads and trails, in locating camp sites with water supply and sanitary drainage when the land has become the property of the United States Government.

I mention this purely as a matter of information for the Members who may not have been in close touch with it.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. I yield.

Mr. BRIGGS. The gentleman was the author of the plan for a topographic survey of the country, and while the gentleman is on his feet can he give the House any information as to

what the status of that work is at the present time and how the work is proceeding?

Mr. TEMPLE. The general survey?

Mr. BRIGGS. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. Forty-three and six-tenths per cent of the United States has been finished and 56.4 per cent remains to be finished, and the appropriation this year is something more than \$300,000 for the whole Geological Survey above the appropriation of last year.

I think fairly satisfactory progress is being made. Not so rapid as some of us would like, but the work is being carried on successfully.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is \$534,000 in this bill for purely cooperative purposes, matching State funds, so there will be over \$1,000,000 used in 1931 for topographic surveys in addition to about \$200,000 that will be used in purely Federal projects, in national forests, national parks, and so forth. So there will be between \$1,200,000 and \$1,300,000 expended.

Mr. BRIGGS. Can the gentleman indicate how long he estimates the Government will be in the completion of this work?

Mr. TEMPLE. The rate of progress is increasing. If it were going on year after year at the present rate it would take possibly 50 years, but with the development of new engineers—and this kind of engineering requires very special training—and with the growing sentiment in favor of the survey, the progress will be with increasing speed in years to come.

For the general expenses of the Geological Survey the bill appropriates \$360,000 more than the Bureau of the Budget recommended. The Bureau of the Budget itself is being converted rapidly to this work and the Committee on Appropriations with still greater rapidity.

Mr. BRIGGS. How does the appropriation compare with the previous appropriation?

Mr. TEMPLE. It is larger by \$696,000 than the appropriation for last year, and is \$360,000 more than the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

As I remember, the amount in the current bill is \$497,000, and this is \$534,000, but for the last several years the committee has been carrying out an agreement arrived at with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others interested, to the effect that the committee would recommend to the House an appropriation for topographic mapping in an amount equal to their conservative estimate of the amount which the States would provide for this cooperative work.

So if the States want to go on more rapidly and they will offer more, we will match their offer dollar for dollar.

May I say a further word in connection with what Doctor TEMPLE has said? These two national parks result from a suggestion by Secretary Work that a survey be made to determine whether there were areas east of the Mississippi that were desirable for national-park purposes. Carrying out that idea, a commission was appointed, of which Doctor TEMPLE was chairman. That commission performed, without compensation, a tremendous amount of work. They visited every area east of the Mississippi that was offered, and after very careful consideration they recommended to Congress these two areas as being the most desirable areas for this purpose, and Congress approved of both projects, the legislation to become effective when the areas were presented to the Government, which is to be in the near future, as stated by Doctor TEMPLE. But a great deal of credit for the creation of the parks is due to our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Doctor TEMPLE. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For volcanological surveys, measurements, and observatories in Hawaii, including subordinate stations elsewhere, \$21,000.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 85, line 8, strike out the sign and figures "\$21,000" and insert in lieu thereof the sign and figures "\$50,000."

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to bear testimony to the absolute fairness of the chairman of the subcommittee and to the very sympathetic treatment of all questions that have to do with the Territory of Hawaii.

This particular section, as you will note on line 7, provides not only for the volcanological surveys in Hawaii but includes certain subordinate stations elsewhere, and that the small sum of

\$21,000, the sum that has been granted for the last several years, is appropriated. This small section undertakes to administer volcanological stations in one State and one Territory besides that of Hawaii. The whole Pacific mainland is rimmed intermittently with volcanoes; starting at the north, in the Aleutian group through Alaska, down into California, and then into the southern continent. On the Atlantic seaboard we have in Iceland 25 to 30 volcanoes that have been active in historical times, and we have volcanoes in Martinique and other West Indies Islands.

We have seen recently, in the years past, what has happened when earthquakes, the result of subterranean activity, have occurred without accurate observation. Not only do earthquakes come along, but in their wake come tidal waves, which create havoc on the coast. We have but few trained scientists for such observations. Recently the observer at Georgetown University, Father Tondorf, died, and we had to go to Europe to find a man skilled enough to carry on the observatory.

For \$21,000 a year we employ scientists at the various stations and provide, or attempt to provide, material facilities for these observatories. It is needless to say that it has not been possible for the Government to do it. They have been assisted by the Hawaiian Volcano Research Association in the last year to the extent of \$11,000. This help comes to the Government in order that they may carry out this function, and also assistance has come from the National Geographic Society.

Now, it seems to me a most unusual thing that this big, rich country of ours should begrudge and be so parsimonious on this question; this matter of pure science whose application to practical matters is so important to the country.

We see what happened in San Francisco in 1906. There are geologic faults all along that area, and to the northward is Mount Lassen, which is active, and Shasta, which is still giving some sign of subterranean activity. Then we have the geysers and the mud flows, and in Alaska there are active volcanoes, not only on land but there are submarine volcanoes. The island of Bogolof rose out of the sea one fine day without anybody ever having heard of it, and not far from there is another one called Fire Island. Perry Island appeared at the time of the 1906 California earthquake. Those are the scientific symptoms of disturbances going on under ground all the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Delegate from Hawaii has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Houston of Hawaii was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. With the funds provided in the past there have been maintained two observatories and five seismographs in Hawaii. One observatory and seismograph at Mineral, Calif., the Lassen Volcano Observatory, and two Alaska stations where seismographs have been operated and records kept by resident employees of other services.

The \$21,000 has been wholly inadequate for operating the above services and issue at the same time both weekly and monthly bulletins. Most of the equipment, including the two Hawaiian observatories and the expense of issuing bulletins, is contributed by the Hawaiian Volcanic Research Association. The special boats used in Alaska for volcanological survey were provided by the National Geographic Society.

The \$21,000 allotment last year was budgeted as follows:

Volcanologist, Hawaii	\$5,600
Assistant volcanologist, California	3,400
First assistant volcanologist, Hawaii	2,000
Clerk volcanologist, Hawaii	2,300
	\$13,300
Expenses, Hawaiian station	2,875
Expenses, California station	900
Expenses, Alaska station	1,500
Contingent	2,084
Stationery	341
	7,700
Total	21,000

It had been hoped to budget the \$50,000 allotment as follows:

Salaries:	
T. A. Jaggar	\$5,600
R. H. Finch	3,500
R. M. Wilson	4,000
H. A. Powers	2,600
Clerk	2,200
Physicist	3,500
	\$21,400
2 per cent salary reserve	428
Stationery reserve	76
Allotments, Hawaiian station:	
Fireproof physical laboratory	\$2,000
Mauna Loa Observatory	2,000
Mauna Loa equipment	500
Mauna Loa expenses	1,000
Geologic mapping	800
Kilauea station expenses	4,700
Traveling expenses	1,750
	12,750

Allotments, California station:	
Station expenses-----	\$1,500
Traveling expenses-----	250
Geologic mapping-----	500
Total, California station-----	\$2,250
Allotments, Alaska stations:	
Observer, Dutch Harbor-----	\$300
Observer, Kodiak-----	300
Traveling expenses-----	1,200
Expenses, field mapping-----	9,000
Total, Alaska stations-----	10,800
Contingent and miscellaneous-----	2,297
Grand total-----	59,000

The fundamental addition to the personnel which this appropriation would have supplied are a physicist for Hawaii at \$3,500 and a geodesist-topographer with some volcano training for Alaska at \$4,000.

The allotment to Hawaii includes the building of a fireproof physical laboratory at \$2,000. A Mauna Loa observatory to be occupied during the summer at \$2,000. Otherwise this allotment will care for administrative travel, geologic mapping on the topographic base maps now finished in Hawaii, and such assistants as are needed for bringing the physical work of computing seismographic records up to date and for operating the Mauna Loa station.

The allotment to Alaska contemplates travel of the engineer in charge and expenses of a systematic reconnaissance mapping of a new volcano group each summer following the standard set by recent mapping and geological reconnaissance of the Alaskan branch in the mineral resources districts of the Alaskan Peninsula. This topographer to return to Washington for winter office work.

The allotment to California adds to the routine work of the seismograph station at Lassen reconnaissance geological mapping, to be gradually extended for investigation of the volcanoes of the Northwest.

It will be seen that in each of the three districts the new project contemplates geologic mapping of volcano areas. This foresees in the future gradual extension of geologic surveys in the Territory of Hawaii, among the northwestern volcanoes of the continent, such as Shasta, Crater Lake, and so forth, and the beginnings of mapping and charting in the Aleutian Islands under the United States Government. This last is a very large project, for which the Coast and Geodetic Survey has plans that will come to fruition for hydrography in future years. With volcanology taking the lead, the Biological Survey, the Weather Bureau, the Bureau of Fisheries, and the various geophysical organizations may be expected to collaborate in summer explorations among the Aleutian Islands. The Coast Guard is willing to assist in transportation.

It would hardly seem that any argument in justification of the above moderate program, which is a bottom minimum for carrying on respectably what 20 years of work in volcanology have barely begun, is needed.

The present observatory is a wooden shack hardly deserving the name, and, because of the valuable instruments it houses, should be replaced by a fireproof building.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us proposes to add approximately 150 per cent to this appropriation, increasing it from \$21,000 to \$50,000. The trouble we have is with totals. The committee has been enough interested in this particular item so that it was set aside as a separate paragraph two or three years ago, and a considerable increase was given at that time, as a result of which certain branches were established. The work in California at Lassen Park and in the Aleutian Islands was entered upon. We are in sympathy with it and admire Doctor Jagger, who is carrying on the work, but, as I said in my opening statement, we can not be guided entirely by the approval of separate expenditures. We have to keep in mind the totals. When you come to totals the Geological Survey has been pretty well cared for in this bill without any more increase. They have for the current year, \$2,085,800. The Budget proposed, for 1931, \$2,441,800, and the amount carried in the bill is \$2,781,800, an increase of approximately \$700,000 over the current year, something over 33½ per cent. Altogether we think the Geological Survey has been pretty well cared for. I am not sure that the service is ready to enter on as large an expenditure as is proposed in this amendment. I think when the work is expanded it ought to be on a plan that has come up under the Geological Survey and has been approved there and has come through with some examination by the Budget and the committee. In due time, no doubt, there will be expansion; there ought to be. I hope the House will not in this rather sudden way increase the appropriation 150 per cent. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Hawaii.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

During the fiscal years 1930 and 1931, upon the request of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to furnish aerial photographs required for topographic mapping projects, in so far as the furnishing of such photographs will be economical to the Federal Government and does not conflict with military or naval operations or the other parts of the regular training program of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps flying services, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to reimburse the War or Navy Department for the cost of making the photographs, such cost to be confined to the actual cost of gasoline, oil, film, paper, chemicals, and the labor performed in developing the photographic negatives and the printing of copies of photographs, and the per diem expenses of the personnel authorized by law, together with such incidental expenses as care and minor repairs to plane and transportation of personnel to and from projects, and the War Department or the Navy Department, on the request of the Department of the Interior, is authorized to furnish copies to any State, county, or municipal agency cooperating with the Federal Government in the mapping project for which the photographs were taken. In the event that the Director of the Geological Survey deems it advantageous to the Government, the Geological Survey is authorized to contract with civilian aerial photographic concerns for the furnishing of such photographs.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I believe this is the paragraph referred to by the gentleman from Michigan in his general explanation of the bill as to the difficulty which the Interior Department is having in securing aerial photographic copies from the War Department. I have examined the hearings as far as the index indicates, but I can not get much information as to the reason why the Congress in this paragraph should authorize one department to furnish service to another. I think it is deserving of a fuller explanation if we are going to make it a congressional mandate.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the situation is this: In this topographic mapping which has been spoken of, and which is proceeding at the rate of a million dollars a year, half of which is contributed by the States and municipalities and half by the Federal Government, the work can be very greatly expedited by means of aerial photography. Of course, it is hardly desirable to think of the Geological Survey organizing an aviation force to carry on that photographic work. We have certain branches of the Government that are building up such service. Whether it is in the War Department or the Navy Department or in the Interior Department, they are just the same a part of the same Government and the same Treasury has to pay the bills. This work is training and experience for the Army and Navy air service to carry on this photographic mapping. It is the same kind of work which in case of military emergency they would have to carry on. Hence we have sought to bring about this cooperation in the interest of economy. We do not require it. It would not be wise to say that in any event the War Department much furnish this service. We simply authorize them to perform this service upon the request of the Interior Department if it "does not conflict with military or naval operations or the other parts of the regular training program of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps flying services." That part has been in for a year or two. The part that is new is in determining what shall be the cost of the service.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood from the explanatory speech of the gentleman that the War Department was not furnishing to the Interior Department satisfactory topographic maps and that he was attempting in this provision to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to have a sort of direction of affairs over the Secretary of War.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, no. We can not do that. We hope the attention of Congress and a little more consideration will lead the War Department to cooperate and recognize that it is a part of the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the fault at present? I did not interrupt the gentleman to ask a fuller explanation at the time he was making his general statement, but what is the fault of the War Department in the present instance?

Mr. CRAMTON. Their fault has been the present year that they have so delayed and failed to keep any sort of schedule that was promised, that everything else was disarranged and cooperation made very difficult. Furthermore, the work that they did was not satisfactory. I can not go into the details further as to that, because I do not know just in what respect it was not satisfactory.

Mr. STAFFORD. And not being satisfactory, how are you going to compel them to make it satisfactory?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am trying to tell the gentleman that this is not to force them, so far as the language in the bill is concerned. We can not do that. We authorize the cooperation. We do, however, fix here how the costs shall be charged, how much of it shall be charged to this appropriation, and then the former legislation was such that whether the War Department did the work satisfactorily or not, whether the maps could be used or not, the Geological Survey had its hands tied and could not do anything but accept them and could not get what they needed. This gives the Geological Survey authority—

in the event that the Director of the Geological Survey deems it advantageous to the Government, * * * to contract with civilian aerial photographic concerns for the furnishing of such photographs.

If the War Department does not come across on a schedule that fits in and can be used, or if they do work of a character that can not be used, then the Geological Survey can turn elsewhere to commercial concerns to get the work done. We can not force the War Department in this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. My thought was that Doctor Wilbur could go to the new Secretary of War and ask this service, and if it was compatible with the activities of the War Department it would be furnished; but whether we should have the distinguished educator go to the head of the Military Establishment and say, "We wish topographic maps," and change the activities of the War Department, is another matter. I question the advisability of Congress doing that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will withhold his point of order for a minute further.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may proceed for five minutes in order to give him opportunity to explain.

Mr. CRAMTON. In the language of the bill, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing compulsory. It says that "upon the request of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized," and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, with that explanation, as it is an experimental matter, I shall withdraw my opposition. I do not believe that any one department head should have authority over another; but if there are instrumentalities that can be utilized by another department, I am willing to have them utilized. Therefore I will withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Glacier National Park, Mont.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including necessary repairs to the roads from Glacier Park Station through the Blackfeet Indian Reservation to various points in the boundary line of the Glacier National Park, and the international boundary, including not exceeding \$1,300 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven, passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$193,300; for construction of physical improvements, \$33,700, including not exceeding \$21,300 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$5,500 shall be available for a residence for the assistant superintendent, \$5,000 for three combination shower baths and laundries in public camp grounds, \$4,900 for the completion of the warehouse at headquarters; in all, \$227,000.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, reading the item on page 92, referring to Glacier National Park, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. The chairman of the committee will recall that we have expended a large sum of money in building a transmountain road commonly called the Logan Post Road and that the appropriation for the continuation of that work was omitted last year because of conditions. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if there has been any change of those conditions, and what is the prospect of continuing that work?

Mr. CRAMTON. As the gentleman knows, we have been trying to clean up the private-land situation in the various national parks, including the Glacier National Park. That has been done. We have been making appropriations for the purchase of such private lands.

Those appropriations were conditioned upon their being matched dollar for dollar. As yet those sums have not been matched. I think the reason is that a very large proposition in the Yosemite has engaged the attention of those who might be interested in matching the funds and the situation has not yet been cleared up.

The committee was very desirous that something should be done to clear up this private-land proposition in other parks. Therefore there is an item in this bill that proposes that \$200,000 of money heretofore appropriated for the purchase of such buildings in the national parks shall be available for expenditure and without being immediately matched. Later the funds would have to be matched. If that item goes through as it stands in the bill, with the little correction we propose to offer from the floor, it means that there would be at once available \$200,000 that could be used to purchase private holdings in national parks. If that is the case, it is the purpose of the National Park Service at once to take up the Glacier Park situation, and particularly those lands that have been the occasion of controversy heretofore.

I have a great hope that within the present fiscal year, with the use of that money, which would be immediately available, that difficult situation in Glacier Park would be closed up and taken care of satisfactorily. If that should prove to be the case, then there would be no reason, so far as funds are available in the road fund, why work on the mountain road should not be continued.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Of course, we think that at the earliest possible moment the project ought to be carried on as speedily as possible.

Mr. CRAMTON. The expenditures for roads in the Glacier Park are quite out of proportion to those in other parks in comparison of attendance. In every park there is a growing need for more money for roads.

If the money is not spent on this park, it will be spent on others that have needs equally or more urgent. There is a road called the Roosevelt Highway in the national forest which opens communication that is not quite so direct, but which will be a great improvement over the old route. As I understand, that Roosevelt Highway is nearing completion and lessens somewhat the urgency for the transmountain road.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hawaii National Park: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$1,500 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$26,500; for construction of physical improvements, \$9,300, including not exceeding \$6,050 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$1,650 for a warehouse; in all, \$35,800.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman of the committee advise me as to the expenditures for the Haleakala section?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. The assurance was given to the authorities of the Territory of Hawaii two or three years ago that if the Territory would build a road coming up to the park boundary the Federal Government would construct a road from the boundary to the rim of the crater. I understand at the last session of the legislature they made arrangements for a Territorial road. I have communicated with the Park Service since receiving that information. They say they do not expect that the road will be completed in this calendar year, but they do hope that in the next calendar year the Territorial road will have been completed, and assure me that as soon as it is completed they will go on with the construction of the road on up to the rim of the crater. Incidentally, I may say to the gentleman that when that road is completed it will be one of the scenic events of a lifetime, to leave the steamer at sea level at Kahului and drive by automobile over good roads for, perhaps, a couple of hours, and maybe something more than that, up to the rim of the crater, 10,000 feet above sea level, all the time with a view of the sugar plantations, and so forth, of the islands below, together with a wonderful view of sunset and sunrise when you get up above the clouds.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. I thank the gentleman. May I ask the gentleman with respect to the Kilauea National Park? At the present time the rim of the volcano is in a very unstable situation, and during the past year they have had considerable difficulty, due to the lack of ranger force, in keeping people from going into really dangerous positions. We have had during the last year the very unfortunate experience of one of the foreign journalists being scalded to death in the Yellowstone, I believe it was, and it seems to me that the ranger force at Kilauea should be of sufficient strength to obviate the possibility of such danger in that location.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, of course, there is difficulty in getting people who visit these sections to do what they are told to do and keeping them from doing the things they are told not to do. They will get into places where they are told personally and by signs not to go and thereby incur danger. The appropriation for this park is somewhat enlarged and will permit some increase in the ranger force, although I have not at hand the exact information as to how much. It is not a large increase, but it is some increase.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. The number of people who visited the park last year was in excess of 100,000, and the gentleman can understand, and I hope the committee will understand, that there is great danger of people getting into places where they should not go. Signs are there I will admit.

Mr. CRAMTON. Since the gentleman is on his feet and has called attention to it, I would like to bring another thing to his attention. There is a crying need of better local cooperation in connection with that park in regard to law enforcement. The authorities of Hilo, which is just outside of that park, have not given proper cooperation, that is, the law officers. Some very distressing events have occurred there, and without the local authorities showing any interest whatever or making any proper response. I hope the people of Hilo will come to understand, as well as other people of that island, that this park is a great asset and to the degree that they cooperate and take an interest in the proper management of the park the Government will increase its interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Delegate from Hawaii has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mesa Verde National Park, Colo.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$750 for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, \$51,000; for construction of physical improvements, \$45,800, including not exceeding \$3,300 for the construction of buildings, of which \$2,000 shall be available for quarters for the United States commissioner, \$500 for an addition to the chief ranger's quarters, and not exceeding \$2,500 for the completion of a telephone line; in all, \$96,800. Hereafter appropriations made for Mesa Verde National Park shall be available for the operation of the Aileen Nusbaum Hospital and the furnishing of the necessary service in connection therewith at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against this paragraph. I rise to obtain some information as to the transfer of this hospital. I have examined the hearings but can not locate any testimony relating to the transfer, so that I do not know whether this is a new project or whether it has been established.

Mr. CRAMTON. It developed after the hearings. This item as it stands is technically legislative in character and subject to a point of order, the last sentence beginning with the word "Hereafter." But here is the situation: The Nusbaum Hospital was appropriated for and constructed three or four years ago. It was a small amount of money, as I remember, \$7,500. It is one of the finest hospitals the gentleman ever saw for the amount of money involved. However, no increase was provided for personnel, no personnel was provided. Since then we know of two cases where life was saved because of this hospital, one of them a few weeks ago when a man working in the park was run over by a tractor. The service has been largely that furnished by Mrs. Nusbaum herself. She has contributed that and it has been an unfair burden.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was this hospital constructed at Government expense?

Mr. CRAMTON. It was constructed at Government expense; yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. This merely provides for its maintenance?

Mr. CRAMTON. This merely provides for its maintenance. The legislative feature is this, that it provides "the furnishing of the necessary service in connection therewith at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior," so that those who get service there may have an opportunity of paying something for the service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Yellowstone National Park, Wyo.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding \$7,500 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, not exceeding \$8,400 for maintenance of the road in the forest reserve leading out of the park from the east bound-

ary, not exceeding \$7,500 for maintenance of the road in the forest reserve leading out of the park from the south boundary, and including feed for buffalo and other animals and salaries of buffalo keepers, \$422,675; for construction of physical improvements, \$78,600, including not exceeding \$58,600 for extension of water, sewers, and sanitary systems and garbage-disposal facilities, not exceeding \$5,000 for auto camps, and not exceeding \$16,500 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$3,200 shall be available for two comfort stations, \$2,500 for moving and remodeling Old Faithful Ranger Station, and \$1,500 for a mess house; in all, \$501,275.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEAVITT: Page 98, line 1 and line 3, after the word "the," strike out "forest reserve" and insert "national forest."

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered entirely in the interest of accuracy in naming these areas that surround the Yellowstone National Park.

I think it was in 1905 that the name forest reserve was officially dropped and these areas became designated as national forests. Each of these areas now carries the name of a national forest. The impression given by calling them forest reserves is entirely erroneous. They are not reserved, they are set aside and conserved by wise use. All of their resources are available to the people of this country. There are many cattle and sheep and horses that graze on the grazing areas within them.

Extensive lumbering operations are carried on. The timber areas that are ready for cutting, under wise forestry practice, are available to the lumber industries, and we might continue this discussion much further. They are national forests for the use of the Nation and not reserved from use, and I offer the amendment as the beginning of a practice I expect to continue of correcting the use of the erroneous phrase "forest reserve" wherever it is brought to the floor of the House in any proposed legislation and inserting instead the correct name of "national forest."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Carlsbad Cave National Monument, New Mexico: For administration, protection, maintenance, development, and preservation, including not exceeding \$1,800 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general monument work, \$62,600; for construction of physical improvements, \$103,000, including \$85,000 for the installation of a passenger elevator, and including not exceeding \$10,000 for the construction of buildings, of which not exceeding \$4,000 shall be available for a shop, \$3,000 for two employees' quarters; in all, \$165,600.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, from the reading of the paragraph by the Clerk, my attention is called to an item of \$85,000 for the installation of a passenger elevator. What are the circumstances that would warrant such a large expenditure for this purpose?

Mr. CRAMTON. Carlsbad Cave, without doubt, is the most wonderful underground cavern known, not only in size of the various chambers, one of them being half a mile long, with ceilings 300 feet high, and so forth; but there is found here a marvelous display of stalactites and stalagmites. Naturally, to see this you have to go down into the ground, and it is quite a climb to get out. It takes six or seven hours of constant traveling to properly see a portion of the cavern. A great many people who have physical disabilities find it impossible to go in because of the climb to bring them out again. So at some point it is proposed to install this elevator where, after they have completed their trip through the cavern, they may be taken in groups out to the surface again.

Mr. STAFFORD. The elevator is only to take them out and not to take them down into the cavern?

Mr. CRAMTON. The need is emphasized for exit. If I were running it, I think they would have to show a certificate from a doctor in order to let them go down in the elevator because the entrance is a wonderful entrance, and they lose a lot of it if they do not walk down the steps.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are not held up by any fee that is charged for admission?

Mr. CRAMTON. There may be a fee charged for the use of the elevator.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is a national monument. Are we going to install an elevator for private purposes?

Mr. CRAMTON. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. Or for private benefit?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; the situation there is different from the situation at any other national park or monument, and this is one reason for the liberality of the appropriations. A charge is being made for admission to this national monument, a charge of \$2 a person, for all over 16, being collected by the Government, and it has been the theory of our committee that we ought not to try to make any money for the Government out of these fees, and that any needed development for the monument, up to the limit of a conservative estimate of revenues, should be appropriated for park development. The estimate for the current year was \$100,000 and our committee appropriated \$100,000. The first five months brought in \$82,000. The estimate given us for 1931 is \$165,000 and the program of maintenance and development in the bill is \$165,000. In other words, this will be paid for by the revenues collected by the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman's reference to the fees charged to citizens entering this national monument brings the query to my mind as to what the policy now is as to charging fees for admission to our national parks, as for instance, the Yosemite. Do we still maintain the policy of charging a certain designated fee for every automobile that enters Yosemite National Park?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. There is no admission fee to the park, but there is an automobile license fee collected, and these fees were materially reduced some two or three years ago and since then we have heard no complaints whatever as to the fees.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is that local to the Yosemite or is that the general practice of the Government with respect to all the parks?

Mr. CRAMTON. It pertains to nearly all of them. At Carlsbad it does not, because we do not maintain any roads there, but in any park where we have a large road mileage we do make such a collection. Formerly, the fee was turned directly to the maintenance of the park in the development of roads. Now the money goes into the Treasury, but we are spending \$5,000,000 a year on roads in these parks.

These fees from automobiles serve another purpose, in addition to helping to pay somewhat for the care of the roads. It plays an important purpose in this, that through checking up on these permits or licenses the park authorities have it entirely in their hands to regulate the use of automobiles in the park, and if anyone gets drunk they would not get a permit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think it is 15 years since I visited the Yosemite National Park, and became acquainted with the system of charging every person a fee who entered the park by automobile. I then thought that it was a national park and should be open to the citizens of the Republic without charge. As travel by automobiles has become so general I question the propriety of this system of levying a fee under the ostensible disguise of regulating and taking care of imaginary drunks. If we are going to have national parks they ought to be free to the many persons who tour the country annually. They ought not to have to pay for entering what is their national park.

As far as the item of \$85,000 for a passenger elevator to take persons who are stricken in the dark below in the Carlsbad Cavern and lifting them up to the light above, or to make easy ascent for the ever-increasing number with increasing girths, I suppose it would be more expensive to carry them out on a litter after they were prostrated. We certainly are going to far extremes of appropriation when we provide \$85,000 for an elevator for the convenience of heart-affected visitors. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. First, as to the elevator, the real need of that is, as reported to the committee, not that anybody has been carried out, but that the fear that persons might have to be carried out. When our committee visited there our colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], did not feel that it was safe for him to go down, and he waited for several hours outside while we went down. He was afraid to attempt the climb in coming out. That is true of a good many people. This will be paid for from the revenues from the fees.

As to the general proposition of park admission fees, I share with the gentleman from Wisconsin the feeling that he has. I hope to see the time when the Carlsbad fee will be materially reduced if it is not done away with. It is necessary that for

every party there should be a guide to protect the stalactites as well as to keep people from getting lost.

The automobile fee as at present collected is a marked reduction that took place a few years ago, and we have not been hearing any complaints that it is unreasonable. Some seven hundred thousand automobiles visited the park this year. For their use we have built roads that were not dreamed of in the old horse-vehicle days. We are spending \$5,000,000 a year, as I have stated. It is not simply to prevent drunks from being in the park, but anybody who has seen the roads that are constructed in that park wants to be sure that the fellow that is approaching in another car has possession of all of his faculties. They do not want any undesirable drivers, and this will help regulate it.

Mr. STAFFORD. It does not require the charge of a license fee to keep out undesirable people.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is very effective. But it is worthy of note that anyone who drives in and wants to camp in the Yellowstone or the Yosemite can set up a camp in any place he desires. Even at the Grand Canyon, where the water has to be drawn by rail 125 miles, it is furnished to the camper gratis. Furthermore, he can camp anywhere he wants, but if he will go to one of the automobile camps, he gets his water and firewood and laundry facilities and bath facilities and sanitary facilities, all without charge. We do not hear of any automobile driver who makes any complaint these days. In other days the charge was a little larger and the roads were not so good, and there used to be some complaint. So far as we know it is satisfactory now.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Mention has been made of intoxicated vehicle drivers going through the park. Does the record show that there has been an increase in the number of intoxicated vehicle drivers in the park? I know that in neighboring States the police records indicate that the number of intoxicated vehicle drivers has increased by leaps and bounds since the enactment of the Federal prohibition laws.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman will be happy to know that where the Federal Government is supreme and is entirely in control of the situation, practically no complaints of that kind are heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That not to exceed \$200,000 of the unexpended balance of appropriations heretofore made for the acquisition of privately owned lands and/or standing timber in the national parks and national monuments as contained in the Interior Department appropriation acts for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1928, June 30, 1929, and June 30, 1930, shall be, and is hereby authorized to be used for the payment in full of the purchase price of any said lands and/or standing timber as may be agreed to by the Secretary of the Interior, said amount to be matched by subsequent donations which are not allotted for the purchase of any specific lands by the donor, the total expenditure of the Federal Government in any one national park or monument for acquisition of such lands therein not to exceed 50 per cent of the total cost of such lands acquired hereafter in any such park or monument.

Mr. CRAMTON. I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 104, line 3, after the words "to be used," insert the words "in the fiscal year 1930 and thereafter."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of that amendment is to make it entirely clear that as to this \$200,000 it can be used as soon as this bill becomes law without matching under the terms of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is that in the nature of legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is very little in that that is legislative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But it is legislative?

Mr. CRAMTON. I think there is some language in it that technically might be subject to a point of order, but there is nothing of a permanent legislative policy involved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What I want to get at—

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit me to make this statement, I shall then be very glad to yield to whatever the gentleman has to say. The general program was provided a year ago, and this makes no particular change in it. The material change is that instead of the money being matched by private sources as it is expended, it may be matched later.

There is nothing here that would apply to any other appropriation except the one before us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The point I am trying to make—and I shall use my own time rather than the gentleman's—is this: In spite of the declaration that we would not have legislation on appropriation bills, we do have it. I am not opposed to this particular legislation but, rather, am in sympathy with much that the gentleman is doing toward certain reorganizations, coordination, and uniformity.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say this frankly to the gentleman, that what our committee is trying to do, without any flubdub about it, is to do what we think the House wants us to do; and if it is necessary to safeguard an expenditure, to put in a few words that relate to that expenditure and not to other expenditures that might be made as a permanent policy, we put those words in, and we find some that were in the law before we came on the scene. Congress had appropriated year after year that way, and we have taken it to be the desire of the House that it should be continued. Any time that our policy does not meet with the approval of the House, if anything is subject to a point of order, and the gentleman thinks that we are going further than is desirable as a policy, a point by him would result in it being stricken out of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is the point.

Mr. CRAMTON. The fact that the gentleman has not made a point of order makes us feel that we have the compliment of his approval. I must say frankly that the policy of the subcommittee, especially this year, has been to guard against anything of a legislative character.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am not quarreling with this particular subcommittee or any other subcommittee, or the whole grand committee of 35, but I do insist that the passage of legislation as riders on appropriation bills backed by the prestige of a grand committee of 35, prepared well in advance, and aided by power of the Budget Bureau and all of its machinery, is contrary to the legislative processes provided by the Constitution, and is dangerous to our form of free representative Government. It brings us too near to legislative oligarchy. Of course, the committee's power extends by the very nature of its work. These hard-working members of the grand committee of 35 little realize what they do—they are so close, and power comes so gradually. Little by little the rest of the membership is stripped of real opportunity to have any say about new legislation, even on matters vitally affecting the districts they represent.

This very minute we have an illustration. The distinguished chairman of this appropriating subcommittee has just declared that I have a right to object to legislation on this bill. Of course I have the right, and so has every other member. But, Mr. Chairman, what is gained? What the committee offers in legislative riders the committee believes to be desirable. If its riders are stricken out on a mere point of order, when under this system will the proper committee consider the legislation or the House have its opportunity to deliberate on it?

Besides, this plan builds bureaucracy instead of subducing it, as the Budget plan was guaranteed to do. An intelligent chief suggests legislation along with appropriations, and lo and behold, his suggestions become riders!

The committee of 35 is so strong that the individual member is powerless against it. The individual members are not cowards. They see the thing being done. As a matter of fact, the Budget committee has no right or authority to even propose new legislation on an appropriation bill. It was agreed that they should not. Legislative riders on the appropriation bills of the various appropriating committees were often wrong and sometimes offensive. One of the chief reasons advanced for the Budget system was that it would remedy such abuses. The other committees were promised that their legislative jurisdiction and discretion would not be usurped. The reverse has happened, as shown by this very bill. And, by the way, this bill is quite modest.

There is a remedy. The Appropriations Committee should ask to have a rule brought in for its new legislation, so that every Member of the House could have his say.

To go on with present methods is to invite further attacks of press and public; to continue this system is to further weaken the other committees, and to lessen individual responsibility, and to ultimately undermine a true form of representative government. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the failure to appoint committees, and particularly the failure to appoint the Committee

on Immigration and Naturalization, is not the fault of the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, it is true, has not been organized. There is a big field for that committee to work on.

I have one matter that I hope will be taken up for consideration before that committee when it is organized at this session. Heretofore the Immigration Service, aided by the eloquence of the gentleman from Washington, have come to our committee for large appropriations to deport undesirable aliens. Recently the arm of the law went into an interior county in Michigan and grabbed a young man from Canada, subject to no quota restrictions whatsoever, who had come across at Port Huron while still a minor and thought he became a citizen of Michigan when he became of age. He married and settled on a farm. They have discovered that he had never complied with the technicalities and formalities of the law when he crossed the river. He did cross the river without making a formal entry. There was some question about whether he could read and write when he came in, but now he can. The Immigration Service reached up there and took him away from his farm, and brought him back to Port Huron, or to Detroit, and held him as a prisoner for three weeks, sitting on his case. They took him away from his home, his farm, and his family, without notice—without opportunity to arrange with anyone to take care of his farm or even to milk the cows.

The Department of Labor talk about his "becoming a public charge" and take him away from his American-born wife and American-born children having them liable to become public charges because of his absence. Finally they decide he can go across the river and comply with some formalities and come back. But why such severity of method? Why so much needless expense? Why keep him away three weeks from his family to tell him that? Why pounce upon him like an escaped felon? The Department of Labor needs to exercise these responsibilities with more sense, spend money with more judgment, treat aliens as not necessarily felons or paupers. I contend that legislation should be passed that can not be manhandled by the Department of Labor in the enforcement of the immigration laws. I hope it will be the first job which the gentleman's committee will take up; a bill that can not be misinterpreted by the Immigration Service of the Department of Labor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes in opposition. I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, in the case of that particular alien in the district of the gentleman from Michigan, let me ask if he is not the very fellow who went across the river a few weeks ago from Michigan to Canada, and while he was over there purchased a quart of liquor and on his attempt to return was captured, not by the immigration patrol, but by the customs officers and held for bringing in, without paying the tax, this contraband? Thereupon this alien was jailed, and I think it did take two or three weeks to ascertain whether the immigration authorities or the customs authorities should take charge of him, or whether he should be deported as being an alien; or whether moral turpitude was involved. Is that the case, may I ask? [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAMTON. That is not the case. This man has not been out of the country for four years. I think the case described must have been up in the State of Washington. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, no! It was a recent Michigan case, and brings up the question as to whether an alien domiciled in the United States has, when returning from Canada, preferential rights over a citizen.

But if the gentleman from Michigan has in mind another kind of case, he will remember that at the very end of the session, a bill was passed and signed by the President, which is now a law, which provides that any alien here who has been here prior to June 3, 1921, might, if he could show continuous residence and present good conduct, pay a fine of \$20 in lieu of the head tax not paid and go about the business of becoming naturalized. The act is generous, and should take care of even an alien Michigander returning from Canada. The bill, as once written required not only continuous domicile, but continuous good conduct, but your committee, believing along with the Methodists that—

While the lamp holds out to burn,

The vilest sinner may return—

amended the act so that present good conduct is all that is necessary, and Mr. Chairman, that should take care of the case presented so tearfully by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Perhaps the gentleman who had the bottle of liquor had it in accordance with the law. It may have been prescription liquor and if he crossed the border near Michigan or Minnesota, perhaps there would not have been a chance for the immigration, customs, and prohibition departments to disagree. He might have been assassinated without trial, like Henry Virkula was assassinated near International Falls.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Nevertheless, if this alien had prescription liquor and if he were domiciled here and wanted to be a citizen, it would have been a good plan for him to have had his prescription filled in the United States of America rather than in a neighboring country. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing Michigan and the aliens, I do wish that the people of Michigan would give some serious attention to the matter of border crossing at Detroit and elsewhere. The House passed such a bill to regulate such crossings but it was lost in the other body. To me it is clear that persons who come here to daily work should not be admitted as visitors, but should be prepared to domicile themselves here.

They get the benefit of our American wages. They desire to live across the line and spend those wages in a country which does not maintain much of a protective tariff against goods from overseas countries. I do not reflect on the gentleman from Michigan, but I do know that certain citizens of Michigan made an appeal that was sufficient to defeat that bill after it had left the House. When the Immigration Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, does get organized there is lots of work for it to do, and I sincerely hope that we will be able to get some of the bills that will be reported lifted from the calendar for speedy action. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

WORK IN ALASKA

Education in Alaska: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion and under his direction, to provide for the education and support of the Eskimos, Aleuts, Indians, and other natives of Alaska, including necessary traveling expenses of pupils to and from industrial boarding schools in Alaska; erection, purchase, repair, and rental of school buildings; textbooks and industrial apparatus; pay and necessary traveling expenses of superintendents, teachers, physicians, and other employees; repair, equipment, maintenance, and operation of U. S. S. *Bower*; and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses which are not included under the above special heads, including \$328,890 for salaries in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$20,000 for traveling expenses, \$180,500 for equipment, supplies, fuel, and light, \$30,000 for repairs of buildings, \$104,200 for purchase or erection of buildings, \$75,000 for freight, including operation of U. S. S. *Bower*, \$9,500 for equipment and repairs to U. S. S. *Bower*, \$3,000 for rentals, and \$1,600 for telephone and telegraph; total, \$752,690, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That not to exceed 10 per cent of the amounts appropriated for the various items in this paragraph shall be available interchangeably for expenditures on the objects included in this paragraph, but no more than 10 per cent shall be added to any one item of appropriation except in cases of extraordinary emergency and then only upon the written order of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That of said sum not exceeding \$8,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That all expenditures of money appropriated herein for school purposes in Alaska for schools other than those for the education of white children under the jurisdiction of the governor thereof shall be under the supervision and direction of the Commissioner of Education and in conformity with such conditions, rules, and regulations as to conduct and methods of instruction and expenditures of money as may from time to time be recommended by him and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contracts with duly established school boards which maintain schools in certain cities and towns to educate the children of non-tax-paying natives including those of mixed native and white blood; to lease school buildings owned by the United States Government to such contracting school boards; and to pay such school boards for service rendered an amount which shall not be in excess of the cost of operating a school for natives under present appropriations in such town.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against this paragraph. I wish to inquire whether this is the

identical language, other than the amounts, as carried in the existing law.

Mr. CRAMTON. The language at the end of the paragraph is new, the last proviso which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with duly established school boards which maintain schools in certain cities.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was that paragraph to which I wished to direct my inquiry. I desire to inquire especially as to the conditions which demand this policy.

Mr. CRAMTON. The situation is that in the mixed communities, particularly, this would allow them to do much as they do in the Indian Service and put these native children in the public schools instead of necessarily establishing a school for them.

Mr. STAFFORD. The provision also carries an authorization for leasing school buildings owned by the Government.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. It might be that in some cases where we have a school building there are not only natives who under present conditions may attend such schools conducted by the Federal Government, but there may be children of whites as well, and they can make an arrangement by which the Federal Government will cease to conduct a school there; they will lease the school building to the community; the community will carry on a school there, and the natives will attend such school.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the purpose of the committee to have the Government give up full supervision and direction of education in these sparsely settled Alaskan communities?

Mr. CRAMTON. Not as a general rule, and they will not, of course, cease from maintaining a certain amount of supervision. The head of the Bureau of Education has been in Alaska and he felt that occasionally a situation of this kind might arise, but it is not expected to be the uniform practice. We are expanding very materially the purely native schools in this bill, schools where there are enough natives and no public school facilities, but enough natives to warrant us in establishing a school there for natives, such school to be conducted by the Federal Government. Some community might have a half dozen or a dozen native children or there might be 20, 30, or 40 there. Now, instead of conducting a school for those natives alone at heavy expense we might lease the school building to the public authorities of Alaska and they will conduct a school there.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rose to gain information about this new policy which has not been followed generally by the Government. I concede the advisability of having the Government transfer this function to the local authorities. We are going very far in the way of legislation in this bill, but I am not going to take the responsibility of making any points of order. There are many instances here where legislation is carried, yet the committee has confidence in the subcommittee, particularly in the chairman of this subcommittee, and I will not assert my prerogative by interposing a point of order even though I think these matters should be given consideration by the legislative committees of the House. Here you are establishing a policy as to education that is very different from the policy that has been established heretofore.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, I think probably it is subject to a point of order, although the legislation is not of a permanent character, but relates to the expenditures in the bill. It proposes to do what we have for a long time done with respect to the Indians in this country. For instance, in Utah we have in this bill an item for the support of white schools in that State that the Indians attend.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the gentleman exercised his high privilege here during the special session to have the bill introduced by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HALL], passed to extend a similar privilege to local conditions in his district. I rose at that time and questioned its propriety, because I remembered when that innovation was established at the instance of the senior Senator from Utah, to have the National Government participate in public-school functions at the expense of the National Government. It is a question of policy, of course. These municipalities are only too willing to have Uncle Sam undertake the burden. We erect the school buildings in Alaska and after a while we will dispose of them under a lease and get very little in return.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The effect of this proposal would be to relieve the Government of the burden to a certain extent.

Mr. STAFFORD. Partly so, but we are to erect the building. We are not giving the matter the thorough consideration it deserves. I have served on subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations in the past. Members on that committee are pressed for time and can not give the subject the consideration it deserves. Offhand, from the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], I am impressed with its feasibility

and I will not take the responsibility of pressing the point of order although it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws the reservation of the point of order and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction at Shoemaker Bay, Alaska, of the necessary buildings and physical improvements for the establishment of an industrial boarding school for natives of Alaska, \$71,000; and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contract or contracts for such construction at a cost not to exceed \$171,000.

Mr. STAFFORD and Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri rose.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. Has the construction of this building been provided for by substantive law?

Mr. CRAMTON. I think the substantive law that gives the Bureau of Education the authority to provide education for the natives of Alaska amply supports this appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. The general omnibus authorization?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. STAFFORD. There has been no special legislative enactment providing for the construction of an industrial school at Shoemaker Bay?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; there has been none for this particular school.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is a general act, however, providing for industrial schools for the natives.

Mr. STAFFORD. How many industrial schools have been established, I will ask the Delegate from Alaska?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think this is the third that they would establish.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to press the point of order. I merely rose to find out whether there is any authorization for this school.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: On page 110, line 20, strike out the period, insert a comma and the words "to be immediately available."

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am not specially interested in this item, but I want to call the attention of the House to the action of the President in inviting the business men of the country to speed up new construction. A bad situation exists in the country. This can not be denied and it warranted the President in acting and I wish him every success, for it means work for the unemployed.

I propose to support the President in every way possible to relieve the situation, and I feel that the Congress should support the President. If we are to ask the business men of the country, the governors of the States, and the mayors of the municipalities, to speed up new construction, I feel that the Congress should word appropriation bills, where new construction is provided for so that the departments, if they are ready to go ahead with such new construction, will have the money to undertake the work immediately.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman think the building of an industrial school in Alaska will help put Wall Street on its feet? [Laughter.]

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. As I have said, I am not at this time interested in this item, but there are other items in the bill providing for new construction, for instance, at Howard University and at St. Elizabeths Hospital.

There are people out of work and, if the President wants the business people to speed up new construction and wants the cities and States to speed up new construction, let us place the authority and the money in the hands of the departments so that, if they want to go ahead now, they can do so and not wait until the 1st of July. It would not be mandatory upon the departments to spend the money now. They could wait until July 1, if they so desired, or wait until a year from now. My only purpose is to make the money available in case they wish to go ahead.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Has the gentleman consulted the Budget about his proposition?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. No; I do not take the same position that the gentleman from Washington takes here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman knows his program can not go through without their approval.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I feel that if the gentleman would exercise his rights here on the floor he could override the Bureau of the Budget, especially if his proposal is one of merit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. One Member?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. With the gentleman's eloquence, I think he could. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I have simply offered the amendment to call the situation to the attention of the committee. If the Chairman does not care to accept it, I will withdraw it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the committee has a great deal of sympathy with the gentleman's point of view, and at different places in the bill where there seemed to be proper opportunity such authority has been provided. In some cases it is not going to be possible to use the money immediately, and there seemed to be no point in putting it in the bill. Unless there is a real reason for putting this language in the bill it does upset the fiscal-year arrangement of the books of the Government in making it available for 1930 as well as 1931. In this particular case I do not imagine that anything is to be gained by it, because navigation does not open up until late, and it would not advance the work at all.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, with that explanation I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insane of Alaska: For care and custody of persons legally adjudged insane in Alaska, including compensation of medical supervisor detailed from Public Health Service, transportation, burial, and other expenses, \$147,000: *Provided*, That authority is granted to the Secretary of the Interior to pay from this appropriation to the Sanitarium Co., of Portland, Oreg., or to other contracting institution or institutions, not to exceed \$564 per capita per annum for the care and maintenance of Alaskan insane patients during the fiscal year 1931: *Provided further*, That so much of this sum as may be required shall be available for all necessary expenses in ascertaining the residence of inmates and in returning those who are not legal residents of Alaska to their legal residence or to their friends, and the Secretary of the Interior shall, so soon as practicable, return to their places of residence or to their friends all inmates not residents of Alaska at the time they became insane, and the commitment papers for any person hereafter adjudged insane shall include a statement by the committing authority as to the legal residence of such person.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order, and I would like to ask the chairman if this phraseology is carried in existing law?

Mr. CRAMTON. That language has been carried for several years:

That so much of this sum as may be required shall be available for all necessary expenses in ascertaining the residence of inmates and in returning those who are not legal residents of Alaska to their legal residence.

Mr. STAFFORD. We never carried any such appropriation as that for other Territories; what is the reason for carrying it for Alaska?

Mr. CRAMTON. We do not care for the insane of other Territories in any separate institution, but we do conduct an institution for insane in Alaska, and this item has to do with that institution. The reason for the language is that so we will not have the insane from places in the States of Washington and Oregon and some other States. We wanted to safeguard that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Were those States not dumping their insane people upon Alaska?

Mr. CRAMTON. This institution—

Mr. STAFFORD. I am sorry that the erudite gentleman from Washington, who has been on the floor most of the afternoon, is not now in the Chamber.

Mr. CRAMTON. Many times they go from Washington or Oregon to Alaska for employment and, if insane, are sent down at the Federal expense. We think they ought to be maintained at the expense of the State from which they come.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Traffic in intoxicating liquors: For suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors among the natives of Alaska, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, \$16,200.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Page 113, beginning with line 18, strike out the paragraph down to line 21.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some member of the Appropriations Committee why it is necessary to have three separate branches of the Government enforcing prohibition in Alaska? They have the Enforcement Bureau of the Territory, the Federal Enforcement Bureau under the Treasury Department, and the bureau under the Secretary of the Interior covered by appropriations in this paragraph.

Mr. CRAMTON. We think it better to have three branches, if necessary, in order to get proper enforcement. We do not care to be like Wisconsin, without enforcement. I have myself noted in Wisconsin the lack of law enforcement in counties adjacent to the Keshena Indian Reservation, and adjacent to other Indian reservations.

I read in the paper the other day, too, that even those who are wet in Wisconsin are coming to complain because they have no State law now that enables them to punish the sale of liquor, even to children of 10 or 12 years of age, and that instances have arisen which have embarrassed even the wets of Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, let me state to the gentleman that the propaganda of one of the notorious dry organizations is making a mountain out of a mole hill and singling out the State of Wisconsin because, perhaps, a minor did purchase liquor in a State with a population of several million people. This does not indicate that the people of Wisconsin are not law-abiding citizens. I suggest that the gentleman direct his attention to the State of Ohio, where the Anti-Saloon League was conceived, born, and reared, and has its national headquarters to-day, and request the officials of that disreputable organization to turn the guns of their dry crusaders onto the State of Ohio. If he will look at the police statistics of the city of Cleveland, the largest city in the State of Ohio, he will find a shocking increase of drunks, drunkenness, and drunken drivers under the Federal prohibition law which he so valiantly champions. The police statistics of Cleveland will cause him to sit up and take notice and realize that the Federal prohibition laws are not functioning in the cause of temperance.

I would further call the attention of the gentleman who has just attempted to answer my question that this paragraph contains remarkable language for a legislator to sponsor. You provide for an appropriation of \$16,200 for the Secretary of the Interior to enforce prohibition against natives of Alaska. What about the other people in Alaska? If you believe in law enforcement, you can not very well provide an officer to enforce the law and say that he can see a hijacker, a bootlegger, or a transporter of liquor on the street and leave him alone, if he is not a native, but if he is a native arrest him, simply because he is a native. One of the reasons why I supported President Hoover during the last election was because he advocated the principle of consolidation of governmental departments and agencies. His message advocated the principle of consolidation, and I believe by striking out this section and preventing the Secretary of the Interior from continuing to be a prohibition enforcement officer in Alaska you will be able in a little way to follow the consolidation program of the Chief Executive. I hope that the amendment will be passed, although I am somewhat doubtful, because I see that a majority of the Members attending to-day at this late hour seem to be those who have not yet reached the realization that the prohibition laws are not functioning, as a great majority of the dries claim they are, from a temperance standpoint.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I regret that the liquor question has seemed to override the question of the insane in Alaska, provided for in the preceding paragraph. The question of the insane in Alaska is a serious matter. People go there from all the States, and people when are not even citizens of the United States are found in Alaska who are numbered among the insane. When the last boat goes out from Alaska it is the custom to push such people onto the boat and force the steamships to keep and transport these insane, whether they are charges on the Federal Government itself, and carry them to the port of Seattle in the State of Washington, where they are left as public charges. I have attempted in every possible way before the proper committees to secure legislation to have that situation corrected. In addition to the fact that it has not been corrected, I beg to say the sum appropriated, something less than \$600 per year per patient for care at a private asylum in Oregon, is in my opinion not sufficient. I presume I shall never be able

to change it. Less than \$50 a month in these days is not sufficient to take care of an ordinary insane person, where he is not confined in a large institution. The proof of that is the money expended in the Veterans' Bureau on account of insane patients. Further proof is that in the District of Columbia here no one pretends for a minute that for \$50 a month you can care completely for an insane person. I hope some day that Congress or its committees, the Appropriations Committee or the Budget or the Judiciary Committee or some committee, will find some way to take care of those unfortunate persons from that far-away possession of the United States where our flag flies.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman perhaps knows, or if he does not he will be glad to know, that in the past year an important change in the management of that institution was made, so that while it is a private institution caring for these insane under contract—a condition that I have always regretted and hoped would not be permanent—still the actual management of the institution, the care of the inmates, is under the direction of a psychiatrist from the Public Health Service, experienced in the management of such institutions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. CRAMTON. So that we know that now the management is not conducted from a commercial point of view.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, I doubt if it ever has been.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would not say that there has been, either, but there has always been that possibility.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Personally, I think the effort put forth for the money expended has been good, but how can it be properly sufficient with less than \$50 a month to clothe and furnish shoes and tobacco and food for an insane patient?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFFER] that this item has been carried in this identical language in appropriation bills for the Department of the Interior for 21 years. The amount involved, \$16,500, is to be expended to suppress the sale of liquor over an area ten times as large as Wisconsin, among something over 30,000 people. The small amount contained in the item ought to impress the gentleman. I do not imagine he could successfully enforce prohibition in the city of Milwaukee in one ward on that amount.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman think they need this additional amount because these prohibition laws have stimulated the intemperate use of liquor in Alaska? It is believed that the people in Alaska do consume intoxicating liquor despite the three separate branches of the Government which try to enforce the law.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is very little consumption of intoxicating liquor among the Indians in Alaska. Of course, the temperament of the Alaskan Indian is peculiar, but he is not a law violator. I doubt if under the United States flag any people observe the prohibition law as closely and well as the southeastern Alaskan Indians. Those Indians seem to believe that that law was passed to be obeyed, and all the exponents of personal liberty in Alaska who talk to the Indians can not budge them from entertaining that impression. The Alaskan Indians observe the prohibition law to the letter, and it is very rare indeed that the Indian gets into trouble by violating the law. An Indian was taken up at Ketchikan not long ago, and aside from that very few other Indians have been taken up for violation of the prohibition law.

I have in mind a little community where two natives were taken up. They have their local Indian municipal government there. These two Indians got some liquor from a white man. The local justice could not act in the case of the white man, but in the case of the natives both were fined severely and given, each one, a jail sentence, which they were bound to serve. I think that is the sentiment in southern Alaska among the Indians. I want to remind the gentleman from Wisconsin that there are some citizens up there in Alaska who feel that way about the law and believe it should be obeyed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFFER]. The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Governor, \$10,000; secretary, \$5,800; in all, \$15,800.

For contingent expenses, to be expended by the governor, for stationery, postage, and incidentals, \$1,000; private secretary to the governor, \$3,100; temporary clerk hire, \$500; for traveling expenses of the governor while absent from the capital on official business, \$500; in all, \$5,100.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the committee to the misspelling of the word "absent" on line 13. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to correct it. There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

For support, clothing, and treatment in St. Elizabeths Hospital for the insane persons from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, insane inmates of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, persons charged with or convicted of crimes against the United States who are insane, all persons who have become insane since their entry into the military and naval service of the United States, insane civilians in the quartermaster service of the Army, insane persons transferred from the Canal Zone who have been admitted to the hospital and who are indigent, American citizens legally adjudged insane in the Dominion of Canada whose legal residence in one of the States, Territories, or the District of Columbia it has been impossible to establish, insane beneficiaries of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and insane beneficiaries of the United States Veterans' Bureau, including not exceeding \$27,000 for the purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent, purchasing agent, and general hospital business, and including not to exceed \$280,000 for repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds \$1,093,248, including maintenance and operation of necessary facilities for feeding employees and others (at not less than cost), and the proceeds therefrom shall reimburse the appropriation for the institution; and not exceeding \$1,500 of this sum may be expended in the removal of patients to their friends, not exceeding \$1,500 in the purchase of such books, periodicals, and newspapers, for which payment may be made in advance, as may be required for the purposes of the hospital and for the medical library, and not exceeding \$1,500 for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the apprehension and return to the hospital of escaped patients: *Provided*, That so much of this sum as may be required shall be available for all necessary expenses in ascertaining the residence of inmates who are not or who cease to be properly chargeable to Federal maintenance in the institution and in returning them to such places of residence: *Provided, however*, That during the fiscal year 1931 the District of Columbia, or any branch of the Government requiring St. Elizabeths Hospital to care for patients for which they are responsible, shall pay by check to the superintendent, upon his written request, either in advance or at the end of each month, all or part of the estimated or actual cost of such maintenance, as the case may be, and bills rendered by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital in accordance herewith shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; proper adjustments on the basis of the actual cost of the care of patients paid for in advance shall be made monthly or quarterly, as may be agreed upon between the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital and the District of Columbia government, department, or establishments concerned. All sums paid to the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital for the care of patients that he is authorized by law to receive shall be deposited to the credit on the books of the Treasury Department of the appropriation made for the care and maintenance of the patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital for the year in which the support, clothing, and treatment is provided, and be subject to requisition by the disbursing agent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That the practice of allowing quarters, heat, light, household equipment, subsistence, and laundry service to the superintendent and other employees who are required to live at St. Elizabeths Hospital may be continued without deduction from their salary, notwithstanding the act of March 5, 1928 (45 Stat. 193), pending determination by the Personnel Classification Board, in accordance with said act.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order as to the proviso contained in lines 15 to 22, inclusive, on page 118 of the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman has in mind to make a point of order I would be glad if he would make it, and I, of course, would concede the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I do not care to discuss the point of order; that it lies is obvious. I want to discuss briefly the failure of the classification board to perform its duty.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I will reserve it.

Mr. CRAMTON. I wish the gentleman would make it.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I prefer to reserve the point of order. I have not occupied much time heretofore in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman wants to make a point of order I request him to make it. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, then I make the point of order that the proviso I referred to changes existing law and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is made on the language beginning on line 15 down to and including line 22, on page 118. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction and equipment of a tuberculosis building, \$120,000.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph just read and ask for an opportunity to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the gentleman's amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMSON: Page 118, strike out lines 23 and 24.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I want to call attention to the proviso which was just stricken out on a point of order. The proviso is intended to cover up and excuse a particularly flagrant case of a Government agency refusing to do its plain duty under the law. Under the classification act of 1923 and also that of 1926 the Personnel Classification Board is required to ascertain the value of quarters, subsistence, and other perquisites which may be allowed to civil employees of the United States Government. In every other Government hospital in the country, so far as I am aware, where civilian employees are furnished with quarters, heat, light, subsistence, laundry service, and the like, the classification board has ascertained the value of such allowances and made proper deductions from salaries of employees affected. Why has not the law been complied with at St. Elizabeths? The attention of the board was called to this matter by the Comptroller General several years ago, and every subsequent year until last year, when an investigation was had by our Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The board has never offered a satisfactory explanation of its failure to act in the case of St. Elizabeths. Obviously it is not a matter of discretion with the classification board whether it shall or shall not ascertain the value of such allowances and make the proper deductions from the salaries of employees. Such adjustments are mandatory. The proviso was inserted last year in the Interior Department appropriation bill by the Committee on Appropriations, but it went out on a point of order. It was later restored in the Senate. What excuse there is for again inserting it in the bill I do not know.

The classification board has had one more year in which to ascertain the value of the gratuities allowed at St. Elizabeths Hospital, but, so far as I know, they have not done one single, solitary thing with respect to ascertaining the value of such gratuities. It is about time that the classification board does its plain duty in this case. If it is proper to furnish quarters, subsistence, maid service, and the like at St. Elizabeths Hospital free of charge, as has been the case in the past as a result of the negligence and downright refusal of the classification board to comply with the law, let it be done in a legal way. It is not the function of the Appropriations Committee to exempt the employees from proper deductions or to attempt to justify the action of the board. If anyone is in favor of continuing these gratuities, let him introduce a bill and have it considered by the proper legislative committee. I am opposed to this idea of having the classification board get away with this thing, and I am opposed to letting the superintendent and employees of St. Elizabeths Hospital get away with it. It is one of the things that has led to a great deal of criticism of the superintendent and is detrimental to the usefulness of the institution. I think it is about time that something is done to stop this violation of the law. It is not a question as to whether, in view of the situation at the hospital, such allowances would be justified. It is a question of obeying the law.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my motion to strike out lines 23 and 24 on page 118.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to withdraw his motion. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield in his time, I would like to make a 1-minute statement.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from South Dakota may proceed for one more minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, last year we endeavored to learn the attitude of the Personnel Board and I understood they wanted an opportunity to fix these matters rather than to have the Comptroller General do it. This language was put in by the Senate; it was brought back and by a separate vote in the House the House put the language in the bill, so that this year our committee is only continuing what the House voted into the bill. The gratuities which are spoken of are made necessary, in large degree, because the law requires these men to live there and the service is not so much for their benefit as it is for the necessary and proper administration of the institution. I would like to see a proper solution of it and I supposed the Personnel Board would arrive at that solution, but they do not seem to have done so.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

For beginning the construction and equipment of a male receiving building, \$300,000; and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contract or contracts for such construction and equipment at a cost not to exceed \$1,050,000.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to answer the brief remarks of the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee. I do not agree with him that the three or four personal servants and allowances in excess of \$10,000 a year should be furnished to the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital because the superintendent is required to live on those grounds. The superintendents of neuropsychiatric hospitals which care for the disabled veterans of the Nation's wars are required to live on the grounds. The superintendents of hospitals at the national homes for disabled volunteer soldiers, located throughout this Nation, are required to live on the grounds and Congress has not appropriated about \$11,000 a year in extra allowances for such superintendents. I agree that the law provides that the superintendent of the St. Elizabeths Hospital shall devote his entire time to his position and reside on the grounds of the institution. We find that Doctor White appears before the Expenditures Committee and quotes this provision of the law in behalf of his receiving these personal allowances of over \$10,000 a year, while on the other hand, we pick up the newspapers and find that he does not devote his entire time to the St. Elizabeths Hospital.

Several years ago he devoted his entire time to the hospital by traveling halfway across the continent to testify as an expert in the murder trial of Leopold and Loeb, two of the most fiendish murderers this Nation has ever known. His testimony helped to save them from the gallows, where they should have gone. Their parents happened to have millions of dollars and were able to pay high fees for mental experts. And what do we see in the press these past few months? We find Doctor White, the superintendent of St. Elizabeths, who came before the Expenditures Committee and said he must have these allowances because the law requires him to devote his entire time to his Government position and live on the grounds, out in California on the pay roll of a multimillionaire, testifying as a mental expert in the McCormick insanity court proceedings.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that this farce ceases to exist. Doctor White, the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, should resign from the service of the United States, the same as his former partner, Frederick A. Fenning, who resigned under fire a few years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct typographical errors and also to correct all totals.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized and directed to correct typographical errors and also to correct all totals. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, under the consent just granted, I call the attention of the Clerk to the fact that certain lines are transposed in the last paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the Clerk may transpose certain lines in the last section of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry

amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDELOM, 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. 6564, the Interior Department appropriation bill, 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. CRAMTON. 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 them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 minutes and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF THE PHYSICALLY DISABLED

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, since Congress convened on December 2 a great many Members of the House have advised me that they are receiving letters and telegrams from their constituents urging the extension of aid to the States under the national program of vocational rehabilitation of the physically disabled. For the information of the Members I wish to say that the bill which I have introduced, H. R. 7138, provides this authorization for continued participation by the Federal Government in the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons. The bill proposes to extend the authorization of appropriations for a period of six years in amounts increasing annually by the sum of \$250,000 up to a maximum of \$2,500,000.

On June 2, 1920, the National Government inaugurated a program of participation with the States for vocationally rehabilitating disabled persons, initiated through an act originally known as the industrial rehabilitation act, which made available to the States an appropriation of \$1,000,000 annually for a period of four years.

As the intent of this act was to provide continuous participation by the Government in the program (opinion by office of Attorney General, December 10, 1923), Congress amended the act, effective June 5, 1923, providing authorization of aid to the States of \$1,000,000 annually for a period of six years.

The second period of authorization of aid to the States terminates June 30, 1930. Therefore the extension of the appropriations sections of the national act will logically come before the Seventy-first Congress.

To date 44 States of the Union have accepted the provisions of the national rehabilitation act and are cooperating with the Federal Government in retraining and returning to remunerative employment their disabled citizens. Some of the States are appropriating three or four times the amount allotted by the Federal Government.

This counseling, training, and placing of disabled persons costs on the average only \$250 per case. Figures from the various States show that it costs from \$300 to \$500 annually to maintain these persons in idleness at State expense in poorhouses and other institutions before they are rehabilitated.

The average age of rehabilitated persons is 30 years, which gives them on the average a working expectancy of 20 years. During the first year after rehabilitation they earn on an average more than the cost of their rehabilitation and still have a period of 19 years in which to be earners.

The rehabilitation program has been in operation for over nine years. During a large part of this period the work in the States first cooperating was in the experimental stage, as is now the case with those States which have inaugurated their program more recently. Therefore it is imperative that Federal aid be extended for such period of years as will give equal opportunity to all States in the development of standards of efficiency in practice and methods.

The urgent need for more funds is indicated by the fact that annually there are 50,000 persons vocationally handicapped through physical disability who need rehabilitation, and under the present program only about 5,000 of these persons are definitely being reached and aided through the service.

This is a humanitarian service in that it helps those who are not able to help themselves and places them in a position to live

happy lives of usefulness. It is a social service in that it converts those who are not able to take their places in society into self-respecting citizens. It is an economic service in that it converts liabilities into assets. [Applause.]

ARMISTICE DAY ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT HOOVER

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the Armistice Day speech of the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of President Hoover at the ceremonies on the eleventh anniversary of Armistice Day, under the auspices of the American Legion, at the Washington Auditorium Monday, November 11, 1929.

The address is as follows:

My fellow countrymen, 11 years have gone by since the day of the armistice, when the guns ceased firing. It was a day of thanksgiving that marked the ending of the shambles of the trenches. For us it will be remembered always as a day of pride; pride in the memory of those who suffered and of those who made the last sacrifice of life in that great cause; pride in the proven valor of our Army and Navy; pride in the greatness of our national strength; pride in the high purpose for which we entered the war; and pride that we neither wanted nor got from it anything of profit for ourselves. Those stirring memories will always remain, and on each Armistice Day will glow again.

From the war we have two paramount obligations. We owe to those who suffered and yet lived an obligation of national assistance, each according to his need. We owe it to the dead that we redeem our promise that their sacrifice would help bring peace to the world. The Nation will discharge its obligations.

The men who fought know the real meaning and dreadfulness of war. No man came from that furnace a swash-buckling militarist. Those who saw its realities and its backwash in the sacrifice of women and children are not the men who glorify war. They are the men who pray for peace for their children. But they rightly demand that peace be had without the sacrifice of our independence or of those principles of justice without which civilization must fall.

Such a sacrifice of freedom and justice is the one calamity greater than war. The task of statesmen is to build a road to peace which avoids both of these calamities. This road requires preparedness for defense; it equally requires preparedness for peace.

The world to-day is comparatively at peace. The outlook for a peaceable future is more bright than for half a century past. Yet after all it is an armed peace. The men under arms including active reserves in the world are almost 30,000,000 in numbers, or nearly 10,000,000 more than before the Great War. Due to the Washington Arms Conference and the destruction of the German Navy, the combatant ships in the world show some decrease since the war. But aircraft and other instruments of destruction are far more potent than they were even in the Great War. There are fears, distrusts, and smoldering injuries among nations which are the tinder of war. Nor does a single quarter of a century during all the ages of human experience warrant the assumption that war will not occur again.

Gloomy as this picture may be, yet we can say with truth that the world is becoming more genuinely inclined to peace; that the forces of imperial domination and aggression, of fear and suspicion, are dying down; that they are being replaced with the desire for security and peaceful development. The old objectives of tortuous diplomacy are being replaced with frank and open relations directed to peace. There is no more significant step in this progress than the solemn covenant that civilized nations have now entered, to renounce war and to settle disputes by pacific means. It is this realignment of the mind of the world that gives the hope of peace.

But peace is not a static thing. To maintain peace is as dynamic in its requirements as is the conduct of war. We can not say "let there be peace" and go about other business. Nor are the methods by which peace is to be maintained and war prevented to be established by slogans or by abstract phrases or by academic theory. Progress toward peace can be attained only as a result of realistic practical daily conduct amongst nations. It can be the result only of a frank recognition of forces which may disturb peace. For instance, we must realize that our industrial life, our employment, our comfort, and our culture depend greatly upon our interchange of goods and ideas with other nations. We must realize that this interchange can not be carried on unless our citizens are flung into every quarter of the globe and the citizens of every other nation are represented in our country.

We must realize that some of them will get into trouble somewhere. Certainly their troubles will multiply if other nations are at war. We have an obligation and every other nation has an obligation to see to the protection of their lives, and that justice is done to them so long

as they comply with the laws of the countries in which they reside. From all these relationships frictions and controversies will arise daily.

By our undertaking under the Kellogg pact, to use only pacific means to settle such controversies as these, we have again reaffirmed the doctrine enunciated by that far-sighted statesman, Mr. Elihu Root, in his famous declaration at Rio de Janeiro in 1907. At that time he announced that we would not use war or warlike means to enforce or collect upon private business contracts. It is our settled policy.

But there are other more deep-seated and more dangerous forces which produce friction and controversy than these eruptions over the rights of citizens. We must realize that there are many unsolved problems of boundaries between nations. There are peoples aspiring to a greater measure of self-government. There are the fears of invasion and domination bequeathed to all humanity from its former wars. There are a host of age-old controversies whose specters haunt the world, which at any time may touch the springs of fear and ill will.

We must frankly accept the fact, therefore, that we and all the nations of the world will be involved, for all future time, in small or great controversies and frictions arising out of all of these multiple causes. In these controversies lurk the subtle danger that national temper at any moment may become a heat and that emotion may rise to the flaming point. Therefore, peace must be the result of unceasing endeavor.

I have said that recently we have covenanted with other civilized nations not only to renounce war as an instrument of national policy but also we have agreed that we shall settle all controversies by pacific means. But the machinery for pacific settlement of disputes among nations is, as yet, inadequate. We need to strengthen our own provisions for it. Our State Department is the first of these means. It must be strengthened and supported as the great arm of our Government, dedicated to the organization of peace. We need further to extend our treaties with other countries providing methods for reference of controversies to conference, to inquiry as to fact, or to arbitration, or to judicial determination. We have need to define the rules of conduct of nations and to formulate an authoritative system of international law. We have need under proper reservations to support the World Court in order that we may secure judicial determination of certain types of controversies and build up precedents which add to the body of international law. By these agencies we relegate a thousand frictions to orderly processes of settlement and by deliberation in action we prevent their development into national inflammation.

We are also interested that other nations shall settle by pacific means the controversies arising between them. From every selfish point of view the preservation of peace among other nations is of interest to the United States. In such wars we are in constant danger of entanglement because of interference with the widespread activities of our citizens. But of far more importance than this, our ideals and our hopes are for the progress of justice through the entire world. We desire to see all humanity relieved of the hideous blight of war and of the cruelties and injustices that lead to war. We are interested in all methods that can be devised to assure the settlement of all controversies between nations.

There are to-day two roads to that end. The European nations have, by the covenant of the League of Nations, agreed that if nations fail to settle their differences peaceably then force should be applied by other nations to compel them to be reasonable. We have refused to travel this road. We are confident that at least in the Western Hemisphere public opinion will suffice to check violence. This is the road we propose to travel. What we urgently need in this direction is a further development of methods for reference of unsettled controversies to joint inquiry by the parties assisted by friendly nations, in order that action may be stayed and that the aggressor may be subjected to the searchlight of public opinion.

And we have another task equally great as the settlement of incidental controversies. We must, where opportunity offers, work steadfastly to remove the deeper causes and frictions which lead to disputes and ill will. One of those causes is competition in armament. In order to stir a nation to the expenditures and burdens of increased armament, some danger and some enemy must be envisaged. Fears and distrust must be used as a goad to stir the Nation forward to competitive effort. No one denies that the maintenance of great armament is a burden upon the backs of all who toil. The expenditure for it curtails vast projects of human betterment which governments might undertake. Every man under arms means that some other man must bear an extra burden somewhere. But a greater cost is the ill will resulting from rivalry between nations in construction of armament.

It is first and foremost to rid ourselves of this danger that I have again initiated naval negotiations. I have full confidence in the success of the conference which will assemble next January. In setting up this conference we have already agreed with Great Britain that there shall be a parity in naval strength between us. I am in hopes that there will be a serious reduction in navies as a relief to the economic burdens of all peoples. And I believe that men and

women throughout the world demand such reduction. We must reduce and limit warships by agreement only. I have no faith in the reduction of armaments by example alone.

Until such time as nations can build the agencies of pacific settlement on stronger foundations; until fear, the most dangerous of all national emotions, has been proved groundless by long proof of international honesty; until the power of world public opinion as a restraint of aggression has had many years of test, there will not have been established that confidence which warrants the abandonment of preparedness for defense among nations. To do so may invite war.

I am for adequate preparedness as a guaranty that no foreign soldier shall ever step upon the soil of our country.

Our Nation has said with millions of voices that we desire only defense. That is the effect of the covenant we have entered into, not to use war as an instrument of national policy. No American will arise to-day and say that we wish one gun or one armed man beyond that necessary for the defense of our people. To do so would create distrust in other nations, and also would be an invitation to war. Proper defense requires military strength relative to that of other nations. We will reduce our naval strength in proportion to any other. Having said that, it only remains for the others to say how low they will go. It can not be too low for us.

There is another of these age-old controversies which stir men's minds and their fears. That is the so-called freedom of the seas. In reality in our day it is simply the rights of private citizens to trade in time of war, for there is to-day complete freedom of the seas in times of peace. If the world succeeds in establishing peaceful methods of settlement of controversies, the whole question of trading rights in time of war becomes a purely academic discussion. Peace is its final solution.

But I am going to have the temerity to put forward an idea which might break through the involved legal questions and age-old interpretations of right and wrong by a practical step which would solve a large part of the intrinsic problem. It would act as a preventive as well as a limitation of war. I offer it only for the consideration of the world. I have not made it a governmental proposition to any nation and do not do so now. I know that any wide departure from accepted ideas requires long and searching examination. No idea can be perfected except upon the anvil of debate. This is not a proposition for the forthcoming naval conference, as that session is for a definite purpose, and this proposal will not be injected into it.

For many years, and born of a poignant personal experience, I have held that food ships should be made free of any interference in times of war. I would place all vessels laden solely with food supplies on the same footing as hospital ships. The time has come when we should remove starvation of women and children from the weapons of warfare.

The rapid growth of industrial civilization during the past half century has created in many countries populations far in excess of their domestic food supply and thus steadily weakened their natural defenses. As a consequence, protection for overseas or imported supplies has been one of the most impelling causes of increasing naval armaments and military alliances. Again, in countries which produce surplus food their economic stability is also to a considerable degree dependent upon keeping open the avenues of their trade in the export of such surplus, and this again stimulates armament on their part to protect such outlets.

Thus the fear of an interruption in sea-borne food supplies has powerfully tended toward naval development in both importing and exporting nations. In all important wars of recent years to cut off or to protect such supplies has formed a large element in the strategy of all combatants. We can not condemn any one nation; almost all who have been engaged in war have participated in it. The world must sooner or later recognize this as one of the underlying causes of its armed situation, but, far beyond this, starvation should be rejected among the weapons of warfare.

To those who doubt the practicability of the idea, and who insist that agreements are futile for the purpose of controlling conduct in war, I may point out that the Belgian Relief Commission delivered more than 2,000 shiploads of food through two rings of blockade and did it under neutral guarantees continuously during the whole World War. The protection of food movements in time of war would constitute a most important contribution to the rights of all parties, whether neutrals or belligerents, and would greatly tend toward lessening the pressure for naval strength. Foodstuffs comprise about 25 per cent of the commerce of the world but would constitute a much more important portion of the trade likely to be interfered with by a blockade.

Men of good will throughout the world are working earnestly and honestly to perfect the equipment and preparedness for peace. But there is something high above and infinitely more powerful than the work of all ambassadors and ministers, something far more powerful than treaties and the machinery of arbitration and conciliation and judicial decision, something more vital than even our covenants to abolish war, something more mighty than armies and navies in defense.

That is to build the spirit of good will and friendliness, to create respect and confidence, to stimulate esteem between peoples—this is the far greatest guaranty of peace. In that atmosphere, all controversies become but passing incidents of the day. Nor does this friendliness,

respect, and esteem come to nations who behave weakly or supinely. It comes to those who are strong but who use their strength not in arrogance or injustice. It is through these means that we establish the sincerity, the justice, and the dignity of a great people. That is a new vision of diplomacy that is dawning in the world.

The colossal power of the United States overshadows scores of freedom-loving nations. Their defense against us is a moral defense. To give to them confidence that with the high moral sense of the American people this defense is more powerful than all armies or navies, is a sacred duty which lies upon us.

It has been my cherished hope to organize positively the foreign relations of the United States on this high foundation and to do it in reality, not simply in diplomatic phrases. The establishment of that relationship is vastly more important than the mere settlement of the details of any of our chronic international problems. In such pure air and in that alone can both sides with frankness and candor present their points of view and either find just formulas for settlement, or, alternatively, agree to disagree until time finds a solution. We have in recent years heard a vast chatter of enmity and criticism both within and without our borders where there is no real enmity and no conflict of vital interest and no unsolvable controversy.

It is a homely parallel but equally true that relations between nations are much like relations between individuals. Questions which arise between friends are settled as the passing incidents of a day. The very same questions between men who distrust and suspect each other may lead to enmity and conflict.

It was in this endeavor that I visited the Presidents of the South American Republics. That is why I welcomed the visit of the Prime Minister of Great Britain to the United States.

All these men have talked of their problems in a spirit charged with the gravest responsibility, not only for our own relations but for the peace and safety of the world. We have thought out loud together as men can not think in diplomatic notes. We made no commitments. We drove no discussion to final conclusion. We explored the areas of possible constructive action and possible controversy. We examined the pitfalls of international relations frankly and openly. With this wider understanding of mutual difficulties and aspirations we can each in our own sphere better contribute to broaden good will, to assist those forces which make for peace in the world, to curb those forces which make for distrust. Thereby do we secure the imponderable yet transcendent spiritual gains which come from successful organization of peace and confidence in peace. That is why I have endeavored to meet the leaders of their nations, for I have no fear that we are not able to impress every country with the single-minded good will which lies in the American heart.

DECEASED SERVICE MEN OF WORLD WAR BURIED IN OVERSEAS CEMETERIES

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include the list of deceased soldiers and sailors from Hawaii, Porto Rico, Philippine Islands, and Alaska who are buried in permanent American cemeteries in Europe.

The list is as follows:

KEY TO PERMANENT AMERICAN CEMETERIES IN EUROPE

FRANCE

No. 1232. Meuse-Argonne American Cemetery, Romagne-sous-Montfaucon, Meuse.

No. 1764. Aisne-Marne American Cemetery, Belleau, Aisne.

No. 34. Suresnes American Cemetery, Suresnes, Seine (near Paris).

No. 636. Somme American Cemetery, Bony, Aisne.

No. 608. Oise-Aisne American Cemetery, Seringes-et-Nesles, Aisne.

No. 1233. St. Mihiel American Cemetery, Thiaucourt, Meurthe-et-Moselle.

BELGIUM

No. 1252. Flanders Field American Cemetery, Waereghem, Belgium.

ENGLAND

No. 107-E. Brookwood American Cemetery, Brookwood (near London), England.

Deceased service men of World War buried in overseas cemeteries

Name	Rank and organization	Cemetery	Grave	Row	Block
HAWAII					
Gaspar, Louis J.....	Pvt. Co. F. 2d Engrs., 2d Div.	1232	10	25	H
PORTO RICO					
Cintron, Santiago.....	Sgt. Co. G, 6th Inf., 5th Div.	1232	9	34	B
PHILIPPINE ISLANDS					
Oliveros, Faustino.....	Ms. Att., U. S. Navy.....	34	28	4	A
Roglan, Alfonso.....	Ms. Att. 3cl., U. S. Navy...	608	34	42	D
ALASKA					
Wissel, Albert G.....	Corporal, headquarters company, 30th Inf.	34	32	A

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE AT OR NEAR WESLACO, TEX.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill that I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1909) to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Weslaco, Tex.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Texas if this is an emergency?

Mr. GARNER. Yes. The mayor of the city advises me that they are ready to construct the bridge, and they are holding back very desirable construction for the benefit of commerce.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved May 28, 1928, to be built by the Los Olmos International Bridge Co. across the Rio Grande at or near Weslaco, Tex., are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

A motion by Mr. GARNER to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CARING FOR THE INDIANS

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the general Indian situation, and in so doing to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in presenting the 1931 Interior Department appropriation bill to the House December 7, I discussed at some length the Indian problem and the fundamental policies that should obtain in its handling. Under leave granted me to extend, I present the following editorial in the New York Times of December 10, which is indicative of a saner point of view, a tendency toward a sounder consideration of this problem than has of late obtained in eastern publications:

CARING FOR THE INDIANS

In discussing the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior, Representative CRAMTON, who for years has been a close student of Indian affairs, expressed doubts concerning some of the suggestions of Secretary Wilbur for changing our Indian policy, but added that the estimates "are not disrupting, but keep our Indian policy on a sound basis." There are increased appropriations for health and educational work. The former item calls for more than three times the amount expended in 1928.

Speaking from his long experience and practical knowledge of Indian affairs, Mr. CRAMTON made observations which deserve attention. He admitted that the wording of Secretary Wilbur's proposals is somewhat ambiguous. For example, the Secretary announced that the Indians were to be considered as "potential citizens" rather than as "wards" of the Nation as if the two were incompatible. Even if the Indians were removed from the category of wards, they would suffer because of lack of Government protection. More ominous is the suggestion that the health and education work be turned over to the States. This, as Mr. CRAMTON pointed out, would almost certainly result in very limited funds being made available. The final proposal is that Indians be allotted their lands in full individual ownership. Whenever this has been tried it has had unhappy consequences, since the Indian is incapable of protecting himself against unscrupulous white neighbors.

There is much to be criticized in our past dealings with the Indians. Many needed reforms can and should be effected. But at present it is almost impossible to transfer the extensive activities of the Indian Bureau to the States or to other organizations. What should be done is to modernize the existing machine. The Indian reservations still exist. There are Indian schools and hospitals, and a personnel trained in looking after the Indians. The problems are to enlarge and improve the reservations; to fit the educational system to the needs of the Indians; to modernize the hospitals and extend the visiting-nurse system; to raise the pay and facilitate the work of Indian agents; in short, to make cautious changes from within rather than to embark on revolutionary experiments.

The total appropriations for the Indian Bureau are almost twice what they were in 1922. The effects of the steady annual increase are manifested in improvements during the last decade. But extensive reorganization of the Indian service has been recommended by students of Indian affairs, including the members of the commission which made a survey for the Institute for Government Research last year. When some of these have been carried out—and the appropriations this year

call for sums long needed to do so—it will be easier to judge the extent to which it may be advisable to inaugurate far-reaching changes of basic policy.

ADJOURNMENT

And then, on motion of Mr. CRAMTON (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 12, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, December 12, 1929, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m. and 2 p. m.)

State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Departments appropriation bill.

(10 a. m. and 1.30 p. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

165. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, dated December 9, 1929, transmitting report of the withdrawals and restorations of public lands in certain cases; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

166. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting draft of a bill recommending to the Congress the early enactment of legislation for the disposition of effects in the General Accounting Office of persons dying while subject to military law; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HAWLEY: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6585. A bill to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the French Republic to the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7110) granting a pension to John O. Collings, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 7233) to amend the national prohibition act to permit 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7234) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 7235) to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in certain areas of the National Capital; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 7236) to authorize the expenditure of \$175,000 to purchase land for and build an Indian hospital, and to furnish necessary equipment, to be located in Sawyer, Ashland, or Bayfield County, Wis, as may be deemed advisable by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 7237) to authorize the Secretary of War to expend not to exceed \$50,000 for the protection from glacier-stream floods at Valdez, Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7238) to amend section 8 of chapter 3547, Thirty-fourth Statutes at Large, part 1, entitled "An act for the protection and regulation of the fisheries of Alaska," approved June 26, 1906; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 7239) to provide for the commemoration of the historic events which occurred at Fort Mitchell, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 7240) making an appropriation for improving the Arkansas River from Tulsa, Okla., to the point where it flows into the Mississippi River, for purposes of navigation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 7241) to amend sections 206 and 209 of the World War veterans' act of 1924, as amended, by striking out said sections; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7242) to amend section 202, subdivision 7, of the World War veterans' act, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7243) amending the statutes of the United States to provide for copyright registration of designs; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HILL of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 7244) to authorize appropriations for construction at Maxwell Field, Ala., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7245) to provide for the commemoration of the massacre of Fort Mims, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7246) to provide for the commemoration of the siege of Spanish Fort, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7247) to provide for the commemoration of the siege of Blakely, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7248) to provide for the commemoration of the historic events which occurred at Jackson Oak, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 7249) to create a department of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD: A bill (H. R. 7250) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Jackson, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7251) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Thomaston, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7252) to construct a public building for a post office at the city of Monticello, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 7253) for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7254) to amend an act entitled "An act making an appropriation for the survey of public lands lying within the limits of land grants, to provide for the forfeiture to the United States of unsurveyed land grants to railroads, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DRIVER: A bill (H. R. 7255) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Helena, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 7256) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to purchase certain buildings at the United States naval station, Tutuila, Samoa; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 7257) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Emporium, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 7258) granting preference within the quota to certain aliens trained and skilled in a particular art, craft, technique, business, or science; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 7259) to require the War Department to ascertain if the Miami and Maumee Rivers are available for use in canalization from Toledo on Lake Erie to Cincinnati on the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 7260) authorizing Oscar Baertch, Christ Buhmann, Fred Reiter, and John W. Shaffer, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Alma, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 7261) to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Burnt Corn, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7262) to provide for the commemoration of the historic events which occurred at Fort St. Stephens, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7263) to provide for the commemoration of the historic events which occurred at Fort Stoddard, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7264) to provide for the commemoration of the surrender of the forces commanded by General Taylor to

General Canby at Citronelle, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 7265) providing for the appointment of a crier for the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Judicial Circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 7266) to provide for the commemoration of the historic events which occurred at Fort Jackson (Fort Toulouse), Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 7267) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and to form a free and independent government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7268) providing for a memorial day for the deceased newspaper men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 7269) to amend the bankruptcy law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JEFFERS: A bill (H. R. 7270) to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Talladega, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7271) to provide for the commemoration of historic events which occurred at Fort Williams, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 7272) to provide for the paving of the Government road across Fort Sill (Okla.) Military Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 7273) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Crescent, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7274) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Marshall, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7275) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Wynnewood, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7276) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Purcell, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7277) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lindsay, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7278) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Yale, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7279) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sulphur, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7280) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Pauls Valley, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7281) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Edmond, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7282) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Cushing, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7283) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Stillwater, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7284) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon, a substation to be located south of the Canadian River in that section of the city commonly known as Capitol Hill, Oklahoma City, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7285) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Norman, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CELLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 155) establishing a peace college; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 156) authorizing the Postmaster General to make a just and equitable compensation for the past use in the Postal Service of a certain invention and device for the postmarking of mail packages and for the more permanent cancellation of postage stamps during the time the said device was in use by the Post Office Department not exceeding or going beyond the life of the letters patent thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 14) creating a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives for the purpose of discussing problems concerning the Philippine Islands; 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. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 7286) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 7287) granting an increase of pension to Agnes M. Ulrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 7288) for the relief of Amos D. Carver, S. E. Turner, Clifford N. Carver, Scott Blanchard, P. B. Blanchard, James B. Parse, A. N. Blanchard, and W. A. Blanchard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 7289) providing for preliminary examination and survey of channel from Phoebus to the deep waters of Hampton Roads; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 7290) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under the extension by the Commissioner of Patents of the patent granted to Frederick G. Ransford and Peter Low as assignees of Marcus P. Norton, No. 25036, August 9, 1859; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7291) for the relief of Edward J. Devine; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRIGHAM: A bill (H. R. 7292) granting an increase of pension to Bridget K. Sheridan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 7293) to advance Maj. Julian P. Willeox to the permanent rank of major; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 7294) granting an increase of pension to Elbert W. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7295) for the relief of the legal representatives of Gallus Kerchner, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7296) making William P. Zickler eligible to receive the benefits of the civil service retirement act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 7297) granting an increase of pension to Diana C. Alters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7298) for the relief of Julian Simon, Ira Simon, and Herbert Simon, doing business as J. Simon & Sons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 7299) for the relief of Hannah Odekirk; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CRADDOCK: A bill (H. R. 7300) for the relief of George D. Hopper; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7301) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Matthews; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 7302) for the relief of Jeremiah F. Mahoney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7303) for the relief of Charles H. Evans; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 7304) granting a pension to Daniel E. Porter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7305) granting an increase of pension to Anna May Harness; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7306) granting a pension to Mattie Wade; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7307) granting an increase of pension to Mary Burkhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7308) granting an increase of pension to Bertha Minch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7309) granting an increase of pension to Irene Gillespie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7310) granting a pension to Mrs. Frederick J. Oppermann; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EATON of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7311) granting a pension to Charlotte S. Fink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 7312) granting an increase of pension to Hollen E. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7313) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Simmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7314) granting a pension to Mary E. R. Bridges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7315) granting a pension to Jennie E. Caster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7316) granting a pension to Elizabeth Aulgur; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7317) granting a pension to Alice C. McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7318) granting a pension to Sarah C. Lane; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7319) granting a pension to Katie Cummings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7320) granting a pension to Dewitt C. Hackley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7321) for the relief of Ernest C. Silvers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 7322) for the relief of Charles L. Chaffee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7323) granting a pension to Marion A. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7324) granting a pension to Margaret A. Olinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 7325) granting an increase of pension to John Stoll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 7326) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Merrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 7327) granting a pension to Amanda Bastian; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7328) granting a pension to Anna Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7329) granting an increase of pension to Jane Bowser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7330) granting an increase of pension to Priscilla Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 7331) granting a pension to Bruce Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 7332) granting a pension to Viola Musser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7333) for the relief of Allen Nichols; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7334) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Jane McCoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAYNOR: A bill (H. R. 7335) granting an increase of pension to Rose Meher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 7336) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 7337) granting an increase of pension to Honore Marois; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 7338) for the relief of John H. Hughes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 7339) for the relief of H. H. Lee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 7340) to allow the distinguished service cross for service in the World War to be awarded to Otis B. Merrithew; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 7341) for the relief of Nellie T. Francis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 7342) granting a pension to William B. Edgar; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7343) granting a pension to Decatur D. Kinser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 7344) granting a pension to Nannie O. Hinds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 7345) granting a pension to Alice McCloskey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. RUTH PRATT: A bill (H. R. 7346) for the relief of Katharine Hanna; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARCOURT J. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 7347) granting an increase of pension to Helena K. Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 7348) granting a pension to Emma N. Gurney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7349) granting a pension to Maria Griggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7350) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7351) granting a pension to Susan Hogan Duncan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 7352) for the relief of Charles H. Clemechire, alias George Wright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 7353) granting an increase of pension to Nannie L. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7354) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ellen Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 7355) for the relief of William Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 7356) for the relief of the American Foreign Trade Corporation and Fils d'Aslan Fresco; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 7357) for the relief of Albert Alonzo Gilmore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7358) granting a pension to Charles O. B. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 7359) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hertzinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 7360) for the relief of W. L. Inabnit; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7361) for the relief of Charles L. Clark, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7362) for the relief of Emma L. Albrecht; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7363) granting a pension to Anna Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 7364) granting a pension to Matthew S. Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 7365) granting a pension to Charles M. Loring; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7366) granting a pension to George E. Bayliss; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7367) granting an increase of pension to George Bingham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7368) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Renshaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7369) granting an increase of pension to Virginia A. Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7370) granting an increase of pension to Orvilla J. Woofter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7371) granting an increase of pension to Lelia M. Marple; 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:

1814. Petition of Portland Realty Board, of the city of Portland, State of Oregon, urging the enactment of a Federal bill for the construction of a dam, power house, and locks in the Columbia River at or below the Cascades, for development of economical power in said river; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1815. By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: Petition of citizens of the eleventh district of New Jersey urging that legislation be enacted increasing pensions for Civil War veterans, widows, etc.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1816. By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: Petition of 43 citizens of Sanborn, O'Brien County, Iowa, asking that legislation be enacted giving increased pensions to Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1817. By Mr. CANNON: Petition of Mrs. M. Atkinson and other citizens of Franklin County, Mo., in support of increase in pensions of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1818. Also, petition of Louis W. Hahn and other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., in support of increase of pensions to Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1819. By Mr. CARTER of California: Petition signed by Mrs. B. Houston, Leona L. Ellis, and 14 others, of Alameda County, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 2562, increasing the pension of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

1820. Also, petition signed by Charles W. Bennett, C. H. Aznay, and 73 others, of Alameda County, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 2562, granting increased pension to Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

1821. Also, petition signed by M. F. Pursley, F. Smith, and 37 others, of Alameda County, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 2562, increasing the pensions of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

1822. Also, petition signed by Herbert S. Haddock, Matt Farley, and 23 others, of Oakland, Calif., urging the passage of legislation increasing the pensions of veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1823. Also, petition signed by Charles S. Warner, Frank A. Atwell, and 54 others, of Alameda County, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 2562, increasing the pension of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

1924. Also, petition signed by Rev. T. D. Scott, Pearl Baranco, and 75 others, of Alameda County, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 2562, increasing the pension of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

1825. Also, petition signed by Maude Johnson, Gertrude E. Logan, and 36 others, of Alameda County, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 2562, increasing the pension of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

1826. Also, petition signed by Mrs. R. L. Chaphe, Mrs. C. W. Hubbell, and 75 others, of Alameda County, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 2562, increasing the pension of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

1827. Also, petition signed by Sophronia A. Smith, Christine Bush, and 50 others, of Alameda County, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 2562, increasing the pension of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

1828. Also, petition of the State Council of California, Junior Order United American Mechanics, urging the creation of a department of education with a secretary in the Cabinet; to the Committee on Education.

1829. By Mr. COLTON: Petition of citizens of Park City, Utah, urging the passage of the Robison-Capper free public school bill (H. R. 10); to the Committee on Education.

1830. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of the citizens of Lynn, Mass., for pension for Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1831. Also, petition of American Federation of Labor, protesting against any effort to repeal or to weaken the antitrust provisions of the present radio law; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1832. By Mr. CONNOLLY: Petition signed by sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging passage of the bill (H. R. 2562) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

1833. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of numerous athletic clubs of southern California, for repeal of luxury tax on dues and initiation fees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1834. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of Susan E. Kamersley and other citizens of Davis Creek, Calif., urging more adequate relief for the veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1835. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of California Retail Grocers and Merchants Association, heartily and unreservedly supporting the Capper-Kelly bill now pending (S. 1418 and H. R. 11) known as the fair trade act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1836. Also, petition of Retail Merchants Association of Pennsylvania, earnestly indorsing Capper-Kelly price maintenance bill (H. R. 11); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1837. Also, petition of Association of State Foresters, Oklahoma City, Okla., indorsing work in connection with the United States plant quarantine and the New York Conservation Department along a barrier zone in New York to prevent the westward spread of the gypsy moth, an insect very destructive to forest growth; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1838. Also, petition of National Association of Broadcasters (Inc.), New York, N. Y., for amendment to the radio law of 1927, incorporating provisions, etc., as set forth in resolution adopted by that association; to the Committee on Patents.

1839. By Mr. HICKEY: Petition of James C. Aurand and other residents of Elkhart, Ind., urging early action on bills increasing pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

1840. Also, petition of Mary Newcomb and other residents of Michigan City, urging the early passage of a bill increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1841. By Mr. HOPKINS: Petition presented by Ora S. Small, of 2006 South Eighteenth Street, St. Joseph, Mo., signed by many citizens of St. Joseph, Mo., appealing for more equitable pension for our Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

1842. By Mr. KAYNOR: Petition of the city council of Springfield, Mass., urging enactment of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

1843. Also, petition of voters of Agawan, Mass., urging increase in Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1844. By Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky: Petition of citizens of Jackson, Breathitt County, Ky., submitted by J. G. C. Spencer, Jackson, Ky., urging that an immediate vote be taken on House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

1845. Also, petition submitted by J. M. Back, 3016 Simpson Road, Ashland, Ky., and signed by the citizens of Ashland, requesting that immediate action be taken on House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

1846. By Mr. KIESS: Petition from citizens of Lycoming County, Pa., favoring the Robson-Capper bill; to the Committee on Education.

1847. Also, petition from citizens of Lycoming County, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War soldiers and widows of soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1848. By Mr. LEAVITT: Petition of Gertrude Pierce and other residents of Harlowton, Mont., urging increased pensions for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1849. Also, petition of Helen Seekins and 82 other residents of Sunburst, Mont., urging higher pension rates for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1850. By Mr. LOZIER: Petition of 57 citizens of Laclede, Mo., and vicinity, urging the enactment of more liberal pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1851. By Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts: Petition of American Federation of Labor, Frank Morrison, secretary, Washington, D. C., indorsing the efforts of broadcasting station WCFL to secure the unlimited use of a radio-frequency, with adequate power and time of operation, in order that it may serve the labor movement and the general public by the promulgation of the principles and policies and ideals of organized labor; also protesting, as contrary to the public welfare, of the Federal Radio Commission turning over this important new means of communication to a small group of corporations and metropolitan newspapers, to be used in their private interests; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1852. Also, petition of American Federation of Labor, Frank Morrison, secretary, Washington, D. C., protesting against any effort to repeal or to weaken the antitrust provisions of the present radio law of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1853. By Mr. McFADDEN: Petition of Eugene F. Buckland, New Milford, Pa., and other citizens of New Milford, Pa., urging a bill to properly care for the Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1854. Also, petition of Mrs. A. Richards and other citizens of Ulster and Athens, Pa., urging a bill to properly care for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1855. Also, petition of Mrs. S. A. Young and other citizens of Monroeton, Pa., urging a bill to properly care for all veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1856. Also, petition of Mrs. Alpha S. Allard and other citizens of Montrose, Pa., urging a bill to properly care for all Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1857. Also, petition of citizens of Towanda and Wysox, Pa., urging immediate action on Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing pensions for Spanish war veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

1858. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Polish Everybody's Daily, of Buffalo, N. Y., in favor of creating an embassy in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1859. By Mr. MENGES: Petition presented by Joseph Dice and others, citizens of Glen Rock, Pa., requesting an increase in pensions allowed veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1860. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Fairview Country Club, Elmsford, N. Y., protesting against continuing the amendment made to the revenue act of 1928 assessing 10 per cent of any amount paid as the purchase price of any "shares of stock, bonds, or other securities, ownership of which is a condition precedent to membership"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1861. Also, petition of Casual Post, No. 614, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Fort Bayard, N. Mex., favoring an amendment to the World War veterans' act of 1924, to extend the presumptive date for tubercular veterans from January 1, 1925, to January 1, 1930; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1862. By Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma: Petition of Jesse Grant and seven other citizens of Oklahoma, praying for an increase in pension allowances to veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

1863. Also, petition of C. T. Swain and 27 other members of Miami Camp No. 23, United Spanish War Veterans, of Miami,

Okla., requesting early action on increase of pensions for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

1864. Also, petition of Nellie Price and 129 other citizens of Dewey, Okla., praying for an increase of the pension allowance to veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1865. Also, petition of O. L. Cole and 188 other citizens of Fairland, Okla., praying for an increase in pension allowances to veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1866. Also, petition of Mrs. M. C. Shelton and 151 other citizens of Hominy, Okla., praying for an increase in pension allowances to veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1867. Also, petition of Alexander W. Brown and 24 other citizens of Tulsa County, Okla., and the surrounding district, praying for an increased allowance in pensions for veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1868. Also, petition of C. P. Campbell and 247 other citizens of Owasso, Okla., praying for increased pension allowances to veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1869. Also, petition of Rhoda Bennett and 34 other citizens of Pawnee County, Okla., praying for an increase in pension allowances to veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1870. Also, petition of Margaret Blunt and 74 other citizens of Commerce, Okla., praying for increased pension allowances to veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1871. By Mr. PEAVEY: Petition from citizens of Clear Lake, Wis., for an increase of pension to veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1872. Also, petition from a number of citizens of Ashland, Wis., urging an increase of pension to veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

1873. By Mr. QUAYLE: Petition of Douglas I. McKay, past department commander, the American Legion, Department of New York, New York, N. Y., urging the passage of the Legion's hospital bill; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1874. Also, petition of United Textile Workers of America, Pompton Lakes, N. J., with reference to certain rates on fabrics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1875. Also, petition of American Institute of Accountants, of New York, commending the proposal for a reduction of Federal taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1876. Also, petition of American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C., protesting against any effort to repeal or to weaken the antitrust provisions of the present radio law of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1877. Also, petition of Fairview Country Club, Elmsford, N. Y., with reference to the 10 per cent tax attached to initiation fees and dues as unjust in the Federal reserve act of 1928; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1878. Also, petition of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Fort Bayard, N. Mex., requesting that the World War veterans' act be amended to extend the presumptive date for tubercular veterans from January 1, 1925, to January 1, 1930; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1879. Also, petition of the Young Israel, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Lankford Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1880. Also, petition of Maurice Stember, adjutant, American Legion, New York State, urging the passage of the Legion's hospital bill; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1881. By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: Petition of Harry E. Saner and other residents of Springfield, Ill., urging the passage of bills providing for increased rates of pensions for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

1882. By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of citizens of Ottumwa, Iowa, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the bill to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1883. By Mr. SIMMS: Petition of various citizens of Reserve, N. Mex., urging the increase of Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1884. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of Clement F. Aimes and 84 others, of Russell, Kans., favoring increase of pensions for veterans of the Civil War and widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1885. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Apollo, Armstrong County, Pa., in favor of increased pension for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

1886. By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Patrick J. O'Neill and other citizens of New Haven, West Haven, and East Haven, Conn., urging passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

1887. Also, petition of Philip Isaacs and other citizens of New Haven, Conn., praying for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

1888. By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolution adopted by the Western Massachusetts Employers' Association, urging immediate adoption and enactment of a tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1889. By Mr. UNDERWOOD: Petition of members of Mrs. Phil Sheridan Tent No. 60, Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Somerset, Ohio, petitioning Congress to give support to any pension bill that will give increased pensions to their fathers and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1890. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of residents of Saginaw, Mich., urging more liberal pension legislation for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1891. By Mr. WALKER: Petitions from citizens of the eighth congressional district of Kentucky, urging immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1892. By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Petition of the Hon. James H. McGinnis, past State commander of the American Legion, and the Hon. James A. Duff, department commander, American Legion, Department of West Virginia, urging the action of the House of Representatives on House bill 1678 (1st sess., 71st Cong.) providing for the erection of a United States veterans' hospital in West Virginia, and that said bill may be passed by the House before Christmas; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1893. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Sylvia Hale, 714 Decatur Street, Lincoln, Ill.; Florence Coombs, 1219 Delaware Street, Lincoln, Ill.; Kennell Niff, Lincoln, Ill.; Henry L. Bruce, 802 Burlington Street, Lincoln, Ill.; C. F. Peek, 828 North Kankakee Street, Lincoln, Ill.; and Mr. and Mrs. Overbey, Lincoln, Ill., urging support of House bill 2667, increasing tariff on pottery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1894. Also, petition of Louis Bru, 928 North Kickapoo Street, Lincoln, Ill.; Viola Lisk, 1621 East Delevan Street, Lincoln, Ill.; Pearl Appeman, 1425 Pekin Street, Lincoln, Ill.; and Clarence Agnew, secretary the Lincoln Trades and Labor Council, Lincoln, Ill., urging support of House bill 2667, increasing tariff on pottery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1895. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. S. R. Goff, Lincoln, Ill.; Anna Voyles, Lincoln, Ill.; George W. Tutwiler, Lincoln, Ill.; Edward Gatlin; Ada Buss, 1425 Pekin Street, Lincoln, Ill.; and Fred J. Keats, Illinois China Co., member local union No. 116, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, Lincoln, Ill., urging support of House bill 2667, increasing tariff on pottery, china, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1896. Also, petition of Alton Brateker, 728 North Kickapoo Street, Lincoln, Ill.; J. E. Semple, Lincoln, Ill.; Kenneth Barron, Lincoln, Ill.; Isabell Tumulty, 806 Fifth Street, Lincoln, Ill.; Leona A. Ingram, Lincoln, Ill.; and Harry Thompson, Lincoln, Ill., urging support of House bill 2667, increasing tariff on pottery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1897. Also, petition of Hilma Stotz and Josephine Stotz, 309 Seventh Street, Lincoln, Ill.; Mr. and Mrs. Russell Smith, 1214 North Kankakee Street, Lincoln, Ill.; Everett Webb, Lincoln, Ill.; and Floyd R. Lisk, 1621 East Delevan Street, Lincoln, Ill., urging support of House bill 2667, increasing tariff on pottery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1898. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition by citizens of Garrett County, Md., in support of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, urging speedy and favorable action; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE

THURSDAY, December 12, 1929

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 4, 1929)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

HUBERT D. STEPHENS, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, appeared in his seat to-day.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER

The Chief Clerk read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1929.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SIMON D. FESS, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

GEO. H. MOSES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. FESS took the chair as Presiding Officer.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fletcher	La Follette	Smith
Ashurst	Frazier	McCulloch	Smoot
Baird	George	McKellar	Steck
Barkley	Gillett	McMaster	Stelwer
Bingham	Glenn	McNary	Stephens
Black	Goldsborough	Moses	Sullivan
Blaine	Gould	Norbeck	Swanson
Blease	Greene	Norris	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Hale	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Harris	Oddie	Townsend
Brock	Harrison	Patterson	Trammell
Brookhart	Hastings	Phipps	Tydings
Broussard	Hatfield	Pine	Vandenberg
Capper	Hawes	Ransdell	Wagner
Caraway	Hayden	Reed	Walcott
Connally	Hebert	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Heffin	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Howell	Sackett	Waterman
Cutting	Johnson	Schall	Watson
Dale	Jones	Sheppard	Wheeler
Dill	Kean	Shortridge	
Fess	Keyes	Simmons	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

RADIO BROADCASTING LICENSES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Federal Radio Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 166, agreed to November 22, 1929, an analysis concerning radio broadcasting in the several radio zones, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS

Mr. GILLETT presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FESS presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Milwaukee and the National Military Home, in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VANDENBERG presented petitions of sundry citizens of Flint and Grand Rapids, in the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma presented a petition of sundry citizens of Stillwater, Okla., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SULLIVAN presented resolutions adopted by the Cody Club and the Cody Lions Club, both of Cody, Wyo., favoring the