

May S. Williams, Hanover.
 Harker Miley, Harrisburg.
 Hugo L. Schneider, Highland Park.
 Samuel A. McCullough, Irvington.
 Martin W. Mensching, Itasca.
 Herman W. Behrens, Kampsville.
 Martin J. Riedy, Lisle.
 Sophie Benhart, Medinah.
 Samuel J. Davis, Moosehart.
 Edward H. Hannant, Mount Sterling.
 Junius A. Beger, Nauvoo.
 Chester A. Bailey, Okawville.
 George H. Townsend, Onarga.
 Louis J. Gauss, Peoria.
 Raymond W. Peters, St. Joseph.
 Willie E. Rudolph, Sibley.
 John W. Vangilder, Sumner.
 Charles E. Van Buren, Victoria.
 Horace E. Collom, Western Springs.
 Ulysses G. Dennison, Winnebago.

INDIANA

Jacob W. Mintzer, Ashley.
 Otto A. Weillbrenner, Mount Vernon.

IOWA

Cora B. Peck, Colesburg.
 Leonard E. Sims, Ladora.
 Jay A. Bargar, Lakota.
 Martha Slatter, Manson.
 Elmer L. Langlie, Marquette.
 Harley S. Rittenhouse, Monona.
 Andrew C. Ries, Ringsted.
 Luvern Leigh, Rockford.
 Charles E. Lovett, Volga.

MARYLAND

August W. Clark, Lutherville.

MICHIGAN

Thomas N. Graham, Peck.

MISSOURI

Albert W. Mueller, Altenburg.
 William O. Tout, Archie.
 Frederick D. Williams, Fulton.
 Vyra M. Brooke, Kingsville.

MONTANA

T. Lester Morris, Corvallis.
 Ernest M. Goodell, Dutton.

NEW JERSEY

Walter A. Smith, Avalon.
 Frank Hill, Dumont.
 Milton A. Whyard, Englewood.
 Mary E. Helmuth, Lavallette.
 Charles B. Sprague, Manahawkin.
 Fannie H. Clayton, Seaside Park.

PENNSYLVANIA

Fred Ungard, Allenwood.
 Charles F. Rugaber, Galeton.
 Harriett S. Earnest, Millflintburg.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ralph W. Adams, Abbeville.
 Seabrook C. Carter, Chester.
 Eli Parker, Elloree.
 John S. Meggs, Marion.
 Floyd E. Kerr, McBee.
 Loula B. O'Connor, Meggett.
 Porter B. Kennedy, Sharon.

UTAH

Albert R. Lyman, Blanding.
 C. Thomas Martin, Milford.

VERMONT

Clarence E. Badger, Hyde Park.

VIRGINIA

Robert Irby, Appomattox.
 William C. Roberson, Galax.

WISCONSIN

Velma C. Grossman, Dale.
 Elmer A. Disgarden, Ellison Bay.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, June 24, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Father of Mercies, again Thou hast drawn the curtain of night and shown us the radiance and beauty of Thy handiwork; Thy infinite presence underlies all. We humble ourselves before Thee, yet we approach Thee with filial trust and confidence. Blessed Lord God, be with us, for the words we speak and the things we do may seem to be lost, but are not. Direct us and lead us to do something for others—to love the unloving, to extend the hand to the forbidding, to plan and win the cause that is just, to will that our light may shine, and, above all, to add strength of character and acceptable conduct to our daily living. In the name of Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday 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 with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10381. An act to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 12696. An act authorizing an appropriation for the purchase of the Vollbehr collection of incunabula.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 941) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to regulate interstate transportation of black bass, and for other purposes,' approved May 20, 1926," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COUZENS, Mr. WATSON, and Mr. PITTMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the following titles:

S. 968. An act for the relief of Anna Faceina;
 S. 1252. An act for the relief of Christina Arbuckle, administratrix of the estate of John Arbuckle, deceased;
 S. 2972. An act for the relief of DeWitt & Shobe;
 S. 3038. An act for the relief of the National Surety Co.;
 S. 3472. An act for the relief of H. F. Frick and others; and
 S. 3726. An act for the relief of the owner of the American steam tug *Charles Runyon*.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 2370, entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force and the fire department of the District of Columbia."

PARK DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, we are getting very close to the end of the fiscal year, with the District of Columbia appropriation bill not yet enacted into law. The situation is sufficiently serious if we keep to the facts without letting any misunderstandings arise or permitting false issues to creep in.

The Washington Evening Star of yesterday carried this story with reference to the striking out of the million-dollar park item from the pending deficiency appropriation bill:

ONE MILLION DOLLAR ITEM TAKEN OUT

Another important development came this afternoon when the Senate Appropriations Committee struck from the second deficiency bill the \$1,000,000 approved by the House to begin carrying out the Cramton park-development program.

It was learned that Members of the Senate took the view that Washington has all of the parks an ordinary city of this size would want, and that the additional parks contemplated by the Cramton bill are desirable because this is the National Capital. It was indicated that the Senators felt that if Congress is willing to bear a larger share in the cost of maintaining the Capital, then the purchase of more parks could be carried on, but if there is not to be an increase in the Federal share, then they take the view that the parks should not come ahead of school buildings and other similar local needs.

The action of the Senate committee in eliminating the park item, if approved by the Senate, would make this item subject to final settlement in conference.

The striking out of the park item from the deficiency bill, therefore, has a close bearing on the disagreement between the two Houses over the amount of the Federal contribution toward District expenses. The indications were that the final decision as to whether the \$1,000,000 for parks is to be restored or left out of the deficiency bill will depend largely on whether the Federal contribution toward the National Capital is increased above the \$9,000,000 now allowed.

I am bound to assume that able legislators would not act against the million-dollar item for parks simply because I happen to be the author of both the bill which has recently become a law for the acquisition for parks and also of the so-called lump-sum plan for Federal contribution to District expenses now in disagreement in the District bill. It is not to be believed that it is possible that such a personal element as that would cause such action.

But, with an understanding of the facts, that personal element being left out of consideration, the million-dollar item should not be left out of the deficiency appropriation because of any disagreement about the lump-sum plan. The new park bill does not add 1 penny to the financial obligations of the District of Columbia with reference to parks; but, on the contrary, relieves the District very materially. That million dollars which the House has authorized in the second deficiency bill for the beginning of the new park program is available for any of the purposes of H. R. 26, now Public, 284. It does not add a penny to the financial burdens of the District of Columbia. It is an appropriation of funds of the United States, not of funds of the District of Columbia. Hence, how can anyone fairly say, "the final decision as to whether the \$1,000,000 for parks is to be restored or left out of the deficiency bill will depend largely on whether the Federal contribution toward the National Capital is increased above the \$9,000,000 now allowed"? Neither this million-dollar appropriation nor H. R. 26, Public, 284, which authorizes it, has anything to do with the fiscal dispute. To drag it into the fiscal controversy indicates a remarkable lack of knowledge in very distinguished quarters, since I can not countenance any thought any effort is being made to coerce me.

The million-dollar appropriation proposed in the pending second deficiency bill is available for any of the purposes of H. R. 26, now Public 284. It may be used for the George Washington Memorial Parkway under section 1 (a) of the law, or for the Rock Creek (Anacostia) extensions in Maryland under section 1 (b) of the law, or for lands in the District of Columbia under section 4 of the law.

If spent under section 1 (a) or section 1 (b) for lands in Maryland or Virginia, it is never charged to the District, never reimbursed by the District, in no way at any time a financial burden upon the District.

If spent under section 4 for lands in the District, it is ultimately shared by the District of Columbia and the Federal Government as other expenses of the District of Columbia are shared.

As to lands in the District of Columbia, Public 284 authorizes an advance of \$16,000,000 from the Federal Treasury to the District of Columbia, as the National Capital Park and Planning Commission requires it, for "the expeditious, economical, and efficient accomplishment of the purposes of the act." This money is to be repaid \$1,000,000 a year for 16 years from the District of Columbia treasury, without interest. The item referred to in the pending deficiency appropriation bill states:

Provided, That the reimbursement to be made to the United States by the District of Columbia for advances under section 4 of such act of May 29, 1930, shall commence on June 30, 1932, instead of on June 30, 1931, as provided in such section.

By June 30, 1932, we anticipate the advances without interest from the Federal Treasury under Public, 284 for purchase of lands for parks, parkways, and playgrounds in the District of Columbia will have reached several million dollars, but only \$1,000,000 will be reimbursed by the District of Columbia in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932. If the new law—Public, 284—had not been enacted, \$1,000,000 or more would have been appropriated in the District bill for purchase of such lands. That amount was appropriated in the District appropriation act for 1930, is approved by the Senate in the pending District bill for 1931, and would no doubt have been continued in 1932 without enactment of Public, 284.

As to the payment for such lands, the law now authorizes an annual appropriation in the District of Columbia appropriation act of a sum not exceeding 1 cent for each inhabitant for

the continental United States, as determined by the last census, or about \$1,200,000. It is further provided that—

The funds so appropriated shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia and the general funds of the Treasury in the same proportion as other expenses of the District of Columbia.

As to lands in the District the law of 1924 authorized appropriations of \$1,200,000 a year for an indefinite, unlimited number of years, payable as other expenses of the District of Columbia. Public 284 provides for advance of \$16,000,000 from the Federal Treasury without interest, to be reimbursed \$1,000,000 a year for 16 years. H. R. 26, Public 284, as to lands in the District, did not increase the usual burden, lessened the possible burden.

As to the lands in Virginia and Maryland H. R. 26, now Public 284, relieved the District from the financial responsibility placed on the District by the legislation of 1924. The legislation of 1924 gave this direction to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission then created—

It is authorized and directed to acquire such lands as, in its judgment, shall be necessary and desirable in the District of Columbia and adjacent areas in Maryland and Virginia, within the limits of appropriations made for such purposes, for suitable development of the National Capital park, parkway, and playground systems.

It provided for payment for such lands by the District of Columbia on the same basis as to lands in Maryland and Virginia as the lands in the District of Columbia. Under H. R. 26, now Public 284, the District is freed from any financial responsibility for the park areas of the National Capital outside the District of Columbia.

No additional burden is therefore placed on the District, but, rather, its burdens are lessened by H. R. 26, now Public 284. The advantages to the District are very briefly these:

First. A large saving in ultimate cost, paying \$1,000,000 a year for a definite period of 16 years instead of for an indefinite period that would probably run the cost up to \$30,000,000 or more.

Second. Saves for use of people of the District areas of importance for recreational use that would otherwise be lost.

Third. Gives the people here the use of the park and playground areas a generation sooner than would otherwise be possible.

Fourth. It relieves the District from any share in the cost of lands to be acquired outside the District, although the present law places the same responsibility on the District for lands outside the District as it does for those within.

Enactment of H. R. 26, now Public 284, does not therefore give any reason for increasing the Federal contribution to District expenses above \$9,000,000.

As a matter of fact, the District of Columbia has the same need for parks outside its borders as other cities have, and if it were not the National Capital, would have to pay for them as have other cities, but under the legislation that we have just enacted into law, the District will not have to contribute a penny for them. There will be parkways in the valleys of Rock Creek, Anacostia, Sligo Branch, Indian Creek, Northwest Branch, Cabin John Creek, aggregating probably 50 miles of beautiful drives, with numberless recreation spots and constant scenic beauty that will be used by people of the District, but with no expenditure by them for acquisition, development, or maintenance. In addition, the George Washington Parkway along the Potomac will be a great asset to the District, and will improve property values in the District of Columbia and afford recreational facilities for the people, but with no expenditure by them for acquisition, development, or maintenance. As to the lands in the District, not only do the people use the parks but there are \$6,000,000 worth of playgrounds essentially of local benefit, and it is not unfair that the purchase of lands for parks and playgrounds in the District be shared ultimately as other expenses of the District of Columbia. But because this is the National Capital the new law provides not only that the Federal Government share ultimately in the cost of the purchases in the District of Columbia as in other expenses of the District but that it also advance the whole amount without interest to be repaid as stated, and shares in the cost of establishment and maintenance of parks in adjacent areas in Maryland and Virginia.

I reiterate that the new park legislation which the million dollars' item in the deficiency bill is to carry into effect adds not a penny to the financial obligations of the District, but, on the contrary, lessens the financial obligations outside of the Districts for parks, and hence, if the facts are understood, it

can not properly enter into the pending controversy over the lump-sum plan unless there is a disposition somewhere to punish the father of the lump-sum idea, and I can not think that any serious legislative body would legislate upon that principle.

REFUNDS TO TAXPAYERS

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I have asked for this time to again call attention to refunds out of the Treasury to various taxpayers. This morning's mail brought me a letter from Mr. Parker, chief of the staff of the joint committee, in which a refund for \$871,264.96 is made to the Honolulu Consolidated Oil Co., of San Francisco, Calif. It involves the years 1913, 1916, and 1920, inclusive. Gentlemen will recall when we had the Steel Corporation refund up that I called attention to the fact that the Baldwin Locomotive people had a refund for the taxes of 1912, and I have never heard an explanation of that. I really do not know why this 1913 tax is being refunded at this time. If there is a member of the Ways and Means Committee or a Member of the House here who understands how you can make a refund for that time, I wish he would rise and tell the House.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Could not a controversy of that kind have been kept alive by waivers?

Mr. GARNER. Since 1913?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I doubt it; but I say to the gentleman that this is not a question of waiver.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The thing that is waived is the statute of limitations. There is no waiver of any amount of tax by anybody, or of the rights of the Government. The gentleman knows that the waiver is for the purpose of securing consideration of all of the questions involved during a long term of years.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of waiver at all. What other law does the gentleman know of?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. How does the gentleman know that it is not a question of waiver?

Mr. GARNER. Because I was told so by Mr. Parker, who has examined it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And the 1913 tax is not considered under a waiver?

Mr. GARNER. No; it is not now refunded under a waiver.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to the fact that on June 21 there was a tax refund to the extent of five hundred and some odd thousand dollars. In other words, within the last four days there has been refunded to taxpayers \$1,300,000, and yet we are standing on the floor of the House and the President is filling the press of the country discussing the advisability of legislation for the benefit of World War veterans, involving from \$35,000,000 to \$75,000,000, and the Treasury gives away more money each day than it would take to pay these veterans what Congress says they are justly entitled to.

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

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman makes the statement that he is giving away money. As a matter of fact if we owe the money to the people should it not be returned?

Mr. GARNER. I agree with the gentleman from New York, but I call his attention to the fact that some of the refunds have been made and the courts have later decided that they had no right to refund that money, and that the Treasury was legally entitled to that money. Twenty-six million dollars was given to the United States Steel Corporation. I say that is giving it away in face of court decisions.

Mr. SNELL. Has the gentleman definite information so as to know that they are not entitled to the refund?

Mr. GARNER. Yes. I pointed it out the other day. We have a joint committee, with the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] as the chairman, and with five ranking Members of the House Committee on Ways and Means and five ranking Members of the Senate Finance Committee. We have a staff of experts headed by Mr. Parker, who examined this refund that I called attention to the other day, and recommended that the committee disapprove it. What do we have? We have some Members not reading it or being asked what they were going to vote for. In other words, Mr. HAWLEY does not give any consideration to it. He simply carries out Mr. Mellon's wishes. His chief of staff condemned it; Senator REED voted against it, and said it could not be defended.

We have an organization composed of ranking members of the House Ways and Means Committee and ranking members of the Senate Finance Committee, who blindly, without any consideration, do the bidding of the Secretary of the Treasury and

put Congress in the humiliating attitude of having indorsed through its organized committee a transaction that you can not defend, and which its own committee staff has condemned and said should not be paid.

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

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Has Mr. Parker, chief of staff, passed upon the merits or demerits of the claim now pending before the gentlemen?

Mr. GARNER. No. It has just reached the committee, but it makes no difference. If Mr. Parker should point out, as he did in a case the other day when the gentleman was not there, that it was not authorized by law, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts, if we can judge the future by the past, would have voted for Secretary Mellon's statement, without knowing anything about it.

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

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Has not the joint committee taken up Mr. Parker's recommendations from time to time, and has not Mr. Parker himself, recognized even by the gentleman as an expert, passed favorably on all of these large cases, except the one to which the gentleman has just referred?

Mr. GARNER. Yes, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House; that is correct. Mr. Parker has condemned three of them, and in spite of that criticism and his recommendation that the committee not agree with the Treasury Department, the gentleman from Massachusetts has voted for two of them and was absent on the last consideration.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask the gentleman another question? I do not want to take the gentleman's time, but I think the gentleman overstates the case very frequently in unintentional exaggeration. Let me ask if in the principal case which was considered by the committee, Mr. Parker did not say it was a very close decision, even in his mind, and he did not condemn it, except to that extent?

Mr. GARNER. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TREADWAY. But he said it was a close decision.

Mr. GARNER. Yes, Mr. Speaker; but here is what happened in the United States Steel Corporation case. There was the Packard Motor Car case pending before the Court of Claims, involving questions contained in the United States Steel case. Ex-Members of this House are on that court, and a judge by the name of Williams wrote the decision. I think you will remember it. This case was pending there, and the Treasury was anxious to settle the Steel case before that suit was decided, and they did pay the claim, and within two weeks that court held, in effect, that the United States Steel Corporation was not entitled to that refund, but the Treasury Department, anxious to serve certain interests in this country, insisted upon making that refund, although it had been pending for 11 years, anticipating that that decision might be against them.

The result of that decision showed that they paid the United States Steel Corporation \$26,000,000 that they were not entitled to. That is the reason I use the word "gift." It is a gift.

In this connection I desire to call attention to an article in the New York Times under date of June 19, as follows:

SEE OF \$5,000,000 FROM UNITED STATES STEEL IS CLAIMED BY LAWYER FOR AID IN \$33,000,000 TAX REFUND

Wayne Johnson, former Solicitor of Internal Revenue, and member of the law firm of Johnson & Shores, 50 Broadway, has claimed a fee of \$5,000,000 for obtaining an income tax refund of \$33,000,000 for the United States Steel Corporation, the claim being arbitrated by former Judge Samuel Seabury, it was learned yesterday.

Former Judge Seabury will resume hearings in the arbitration proceedings on Monday. According to counsel for the United States Steel Corporation yesterday, the corporation has consented that Mr. Johnson's fee was to have been determined by the late Elbert H. Gary, who was chairman of the corporation's board of directors, under the terms of a contract with Mr. Johnson.

The hearings have been arranged in the hope of an amicable settlement of differences of opinion regarding the extent of Mr. Johnson's participation in obtaining the refund. Former Governor Nathan L. Miller, head of the company's legal department, is representing United States Steel in the proceedings. Morgan J. O'Brien and Arthur Ballantine are counsel for Mr. Johnson.

The \$33,000,000 refund to the United States Steel Corporation on income and profits taxes collected for 1918, 1919, and 1920 was announced on March 14 by Secretary of the Treasury Mellon. However, only \$4,000,000 was actually returned to the company by the Government. The balance of \$17,000,000, plus about \$12,000,000 interest, has been credited to the corporation's 1930 taxes. For 1918

the refund and credit was \$14,369,612; for 1919, \$4,391,025, and for 1920, \$2,336,240; these amounts with interest making the total of more than \$33,000,000.

The refund was the result of the settlement of an action brought in the Court of Claims to protect the corporation under the statute of limitations. The steel company claimed a refund of approximately \$77,000,000, and interest of \$55,000,000. The settlement at \$33,000,000 represented principal of \$21,000,000 and interest of \$12,000,000.

It was said at the Treasury that the Steel company's income tax for 1929, payable this year, would be about \$17,000,000.

Secretary Mellon's announcement of the tax refund incensed Representative GARNER, Democratic leader, who asked Congress to investigate tax-refund methods. He accused Mr. Mellon of favoritism to big taxpayers and asserted that failure of the Treasury Department to "contest claims of the United States Steel Corporation has resulted in a direct loss to the Government of at least \$9,000,000 and possibly \$26,000,000." He declared that the \$33,000,000 refund was passed on by the joint committee on internal-revenue taxation with only one member of the majority party present.

The gift the other day to the Hawaiian sugar company was a gift. I do not know about this case. Mr. Parker said this morning when I called him up that he had not examined it. It takes a long time to examine them. We have only 30 days from the time it is reported to the committee until the joint committee acts upon it, so Mr. Parker and his associates are doing the best they can to serve the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent in extending my remarks to include again, for the information of the House, the amount that has been refunded by Secretary Mellon since he has been in office.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Fiscal year:	
1922	\$182,371,597.88
1923	440,173,211.82
1924	452,582,691.87
1925	381,069,220.21
1926	424,072,181.86
1927	304,264,847.42
1928	208,398,978.14
1929	339,528,941.51
1930 to June 21 (approximate)	129,390,615.37
	2,861,852,286.08

A partial list of the larger refunds allowed by the Treasury under Secretary Mellon:

United States Steel Corporation	\$96,384,865.93
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana (Illinois)	5,062,893.82
Harkness, William L., estate (New York)	1,113,692.03
Hillman & Sons Co. (Pennsylvania)	899,906.19
Swift & Co. (Chicago)	1,496,633.90
Brooks, Peter C., estate (Boston)	1,368,826.75
Sage, Margaret Olivia, estate (New York)	1,618,940.00
American Tobacco Co. and subsidiaries (New York)	4,271,290.62
Federal Shipbuilding Co. (Kearney, N. J.)	3,654,239.17
R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. (North Carolina)	6,213,808.00
The Texas Co. (Houston)	1,336,507.00
United Fuel Gas Co. (West Virginia)	1,235,962.00
Marine Securities Co. (Evanston, Ill.)	1,054,296.00
Standard Oil Co. of Kentucky	2,629,313.00
Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston	1,117,350.00
Kales, Alice G., Mrs., Detroit	3,134,780.00
Hill, Mary T., estate, St. Paul, Minn.	1,221,968.00
Botany Worsted Mills, Passaic, N. J.	1,007,771.00
Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., Newark, N. J.	1,075,361.00
Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.	3,788,130.00
Monell, Ambrose, estate (New York)	1,404,377.00
Central Leather Co. (New York)	1,104,850.00
Clyde, William P., estate, Brooklyn	1,404,931.00
W. R. Grace & Co., New York	3,510,449.00
P. Lorillard Co., New York	1,627,502.00
William Waldorf Astor	6,456,830.00
Ohio Oil Co. (Ohio)	1,789,341.00
Cannon, James W., estate, Concord, N. C.	1,081,560.00
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown, Ohio	1,234,155.00
American Window Glass Co., Pittsburgh	1,800,218.00
Westinghouse Air Brake Co. (Pennsylvania)	1,729,436.00
Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co., Pittsburgh	1,590,574.00
Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Milwaukee	2,461,796.00
Reed, Verner Z., estate, Denver	1,222,353.93
Moore Shipbuilding Co., San Francisco	537,338.51
Southern California Edison Co., Los Angeles	575,173.33
Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., Denver	669,130.04
Whitman, William, Co. (Inc.), Boston	696,274.34
Corning, Ephriam, estate (New York)	589,949.24
Czarnikow Rionda Co. (New York)	588,908.19
Macy, R. H., & Co. (New York)	508,065.35
United States Retail Stores Corporation (New York)	688,541.07
Texas Pacific Coal & Oil Co.	957,374.29
A. E. Clegg, New York	1,828,438.95
H. F. Kerr, New York	1,818,813.52
John N. Willys, New York	1,211,035.02
New England Cotton Yarn Co., Boston	1,029,052.76
Bartlett-Hayward Corporation, Baltimore	2,641,019.39
American Brass Co., Waterbury, Conn.	1,372,152.38
Amoskeag Manufacturing Co., Boston	2,247,588.98
International Harvester Co., Chicago	2,293,046.37
P. Lorillard & Co., New York	1,562,137.92

The Mackey Co., New York	\$4,985,327.22
Arlington Mills, Lawrence, Mass.	2,505,694.04
National Aniline & Chemical Co., New York	3,035,771.55
Armour & Co., Chicago	2,251,395.31
Cudaby Packing Co., Chicago	2,221,101.13
Libby, McNeil & Libby, Chicago	2,452,102.22
American Locomotive Co., New York	1,876,250.63
Burrhoughs Adding Machine Co.	1,531,746.21
American Shipbuilding Co., Cleveland	2,085,732.40
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron	2,960,290.98
Amalgamated Leather Co., New York	1,858,540.66
Plymouth Cordage Co., Plymouth, Mass.	2,468,798.17
William J. Haar, Savannah, Ga.	1,681,526.97
Curtis, Cornelia, estate, Detroit	1,363,207.18
Commercial Pacific Cable Co., New York	2,357,492.89
New Jersey Zinc Co., New York	1,440,214.14
Aluminum Co. of America, Pittsburgh	1,501,277.88
Francis H. Clerque, Montreal, Canada	1,377,188.04
Singer Manufacturing Co., Elizabeth, N. J.	1,623,473.92
Commercial Cable Co. of New York	1,537,945.61
Steward Farm Mortgage Co., Conrad H. Mann, receiver	3,048,546.20
Schoellkopf Aniline & Chemical Works, Buffalo	1,829,141.16
International Shell & Ordnance Co., New York	1,819,009.54
International Loading Co., New York	1,943,170.25
R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., North Carolina	1,698,265.47
American Car & Foundry Co.	5,209,294.74
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown, Ohio	3,482,610.51
Pittsburgh Steel Products Co.	1,830,227.55
Standard Steel Car Co., Pittsburgh	1,955,050.95
Gulf Oil Corporation, Pittsburgh	3,996,080.18
Honolulu Consolidated Oil Co., San Francisco	871,264.96
Philadelphia Rapid Transit Co.	1,721,134.40
Atlantic Refining Co., Philadelphia	1,016,567.36
Eastman Kodak Co.	2,542,304.59
Wilson & Co., Chicago	678,173.57
Employees' Liability Assurance Corporation, Boston	684,205.89
Endicott, Henry B., Estate, Boston	546,599.94
John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston	738,696.21
Hollingsworth & Whitley Co., Boston	516,446.33
Bourne, Frederick G., Estate, New York	603,751.22
Payne, Oliver H., Estate, New York	557,246.00
United States Finishing Co., New York	558,459.00
Miami Copper Co., New York	875,000.00
City Service Co., New York	692,929.00
Berwind White Coal Mining Co., Philadelphia	545,962.00
Emery, John J., Estate, Philadelphia	927,767.00
The Philadelphia Electric Co.	999,937.00
Aluminum Co. of America, Pittsburgh	555,926.75
Frick, Henry C., Estate, Pittsburgh	802,720.69
McClintic-Marshall Construction Co., Pittsburgh	874,255.38
Deering, Charles, Estate, Chicago	728,090.00
Standard Gas & Electric Co., Chicago	901,722.00
United Verde Extension Mining Co., New York	879,580.00
Crimmins & Pierce Co., Boston	783,107.00
New England Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston	542,812.00
Postum Cereal Co., Battle Creek	580,942.00
Kelly-Springfield Tire Co., New York	949,507.00
United States Industrial Alcohol Co., New York	670,164.00
General Electric Co.	922,445.00
Gans Steamship Line	578,247.00
Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, New York	574,611.00
Mutual Chemical Co. of America, New York	860,000.00
Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York	813,059.00
New York Life Insurance Co.	525,994.00
Mortimer L. Schiff	507,302.00
American Locomotive Co.	925,698.00
Atlantic & Pacific Steamship Co.	529,157.00
Atlantic Transport Co. of West Virginia, New York	786,374.00
Estate of Helen C. Bostwick, New York	675,218.00
Visayan Refining Co. (Inc.), New York	669,446.00
Estate of John J. Emery, Philadelphia	672,628.00
Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia	804,907.00
Philadelphia Storage Battery Co.	668,901.00
Aluminum Co. of America, Pittsburgh	620,539.00
John B. Semple & Co. (Pennsylvania)	633,388.00
National Life Insurance Co., Montpelier, Vt.	960,579.00

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman has called the attention of the House to some very serious things, and I refer particularly to this refund of \$26,000,000 to the Steel Corporation, in view of the subsequent decision of the Court of Claims. Has the Treasury Department since that decision was rendered taken any steps, so far as he knows, to recover that \$26,000,000?

Mr. GARNER. I do not know of it, but I understand not; none whatever that I know of, and will not. Let me tell the gentleman and others of this House, repeating again, that we were compelled to give the Treasury this discretion and authority, or else the income-tax system would break down, and we would have had to substitute a consumption tax, which I am opposed to. It would take 10 years to find out what the situation was and find out how much you owed the Government. An intolerable situation would result. Now, we gave them discretion, and in my opinion they are abusing that discretion against the Government in favor of certain specified taxpayers. [Applause.]

WILLIE LOUISE JOHNSON

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on the bill (H. R. 4101) to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Willie Louise Johnson.

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

There was no objection.

THE PRICE OF SHOES UNDER THE NEW TARIFF LAW

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, a great deal of misleading propaganda has been disbursed through our newspapers about the effect of the tariff upon the cost of shoes. Mr. George F. Johnson, of the Endicott-Johnson Shoe Co., the pioneer of philanthropists, has prepared a statement which I want to read to you.

Tariff experts, according to high authority, have stated: "The shoe duty would cost consumers \$78,000,000," presumably yearly.

THE FACTS

The provision for a protective tariff of 20 per cent will not cost the American shoe consumers *one penny* unless they insist upon buying foreign-made shoes; in which case they will pay 20 per cent more *than they have been paying*.

[Applause.]

The tariff duty of 10 per cent placed on hides will make shoes cost more (when the duty is added to the hide cost). This cost will vary according to the kind of shoes. Where more leather is used the cost will be more. Where little leather, *like women's shoes*, the tax will be small against each pair.

There is no article of public consumption more necessary than shoes. *There is no commodity or necessity where competition is keener*. The American shoe manufacturers (plus distributors) will see to it that no added cost shall be assessed against the "ultimate consumer" of American-made shoes.

In the case of hides—since the tariff of 10 per cent has been effective, *hides have sold for less money*. Hides are a by-product of beef and must be sold. *They can not be eaten nor buried*. Prices will depend on the "supply and demand." *With a tariff of 10 per cent, hides may sell for less money, and have already sold cheaper since the last tariff*.

The selling department informed me yesterday that our shoes were selling at *lower prices* on the average than maintained in the year 1914, *when wages were little more than half what they are to-day*. Our profits have suffered correspondingly, even after we credit any increased efficiency or economies of any kind which we have created since that time.

With double the capacity of manufacturing shoes that is required for the *natural markets*, the consumer need not feel seriously disturbed about a tariff duty on shoes, so far as it affects his or her pocketbook, unless (to repeat) *they very greatly desire to wear shoes manufactured in some foreign country*.

[Applause.]

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

RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11781) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the committee [Mr. DEMPSEY] what is the objection to carrying out the instructions of the committee by asking unanimous consent to concur in the Senate amendments before asking for a conference?

Mr. DEMPSEY. As I understand, the feeling is that the bill is quite a large bill, and that the more orderly way is to send it to the conference. There is no trouble at all about the conferees agreeing speedily, and the bill would come back and be passed to-day or to-morrow. I am assured on the Senate side there will be no trouble at all there. I have talked with those who will be the conferees. There will be no serious disputes. There will be no prolonged conference. I see no reason why the conferees can not get together immediately. In fact, I have agreed to call them this afternoon, and we expect to make and sign our report and have it back here this afternoon.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The chairman is favorable to the amendments added by the Senate, I assume?

Mr. DEMPSEY. At least I, as an individual, would be ready to concur in the Senate amendments for the purpose of the speedy enactment of the measure.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I have no desire to interfere with the regular processes of legislating, but it occurs to me that the chairman should at least have carried out the instructions of his

committee and made the first request. There might have been objection. I do not know now that there will be objection. None has been made, of course, because the request has not been made. It is a much better way to deal quickly with the problem. The chairman knows that our committee has considered the amendments. Certainly those who will have to deal with them, namely, the ranking minority Member, Judge MANSFIELD, and the two majority Members, understand the amendments. They will readily agree to them. Why could we not save the time of a conference and agree to the Senate amendments to-day? The House, I think, is ready to agree to them, and a vast majority of the people of the country approve the bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am not sure that the chairman of the committee would be recognized for that purpose, and I am quite sure that the feeling is that on account of the importance of the bill it should be sent to conference.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the chairman give us some idea as to when he will bring this bill back? These are the closing hours of the Congress.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have already said, and I repeat, that I have conferred both with the chairman of the committee in the Senate, with the leader and assistant leader in the Senate, and that we have agreed to have the conference this afternoon. We expect to be able to report back this afternoon, and we hope to take the matter up to-morrow.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I am glad to have that statement from the chairman, but this thought occurred to me, in view of the fact that the House committee has unanimously requested the chairman to ask unanimous consent to agree to the Senate amendments, I thought the chairman should carry out the instruction of the committee and put such a request if he can be recognized for that purpose by the Speaker.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am quite certain that the chairman has done all that he could do, and the chairman is doing all that can be done.

Mr. McDUFFIE. That begs the question.

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; it does not.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The question I raise is why the chairman does not carry out the instructions of his committee. That is the proposition.

Mr. CRAMTON. If that request had been made it would have been objected to, because there is no print of the bill showing the Members of the House what the amendments are, but if the bill is sent to conference there will be such a print.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The Senate amendments are set out in the bill copies of which were available last Saturday.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have not been able to get a copy of them.

Mr. FREAR. So that the House may know something about the facts which are being discussed in this casual way, will the gentleman, chairman of the committee, tell the House what was the amount of the rivers and harbors bill when it passed the House?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The authorizations for expenditures were \$110,000,000.

Mr. FREAR. What were they approximately when the bill passed the Senate?

Mr. DEMPSEY. One hundred and thirty-eight million dollars.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman from Alabama, a member of the committee, criticizes the chairman because he will not ask to have the bill rushed through the House instead of sending it to conference. I would object to such a course in view of the chairman's statement I am frank to tell the gentleman.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman will admit this is the orderly way to do it and that the bill should go to conference.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I am not objecting to its going to conference at all, but I thought the other way would be the quicker way to consider it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if the bill was referred to the committee after it returned from the Senate.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say to the gentleman that the Senate bill was taken up by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and a very careful abstract of the Senate amendments was made.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But it was not referred by the House to the committee, was it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It was considered by the committee and all of the Senate amendments were considered in detail.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The committee did not have the bill officially before it, did it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Well, I would not say it did have. I do not know.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Therefore, the committee had no authority to pass upon these amendments at all and the bill is still under the control of the House.

Mr. McDUFFIE. But the committee had a copy of the bill before it and considered these amendments.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But the House did not lose control of the bill by referring it to the committee.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as a matter of fact, the bill was messaged to the House on Saturday after the committee had met, but that is immaterial.

Mr. DEMPSEY. On Friday.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It was messaged on Saturday, as shown by the Record. However, I will say this: There are many amendments in the bill which some of us think ought to receive the consideration of the conferees. I have in mind, as everybody would know, the Illinois waterway proposition, in which some of us are very much interested. The House provision passed the House without any objection. It was stated openly that everything was satisfactory and agreeable, but in the other body a very material change has been made. An amendment has been placed upon the bill which subjects the Illinois waterway to a decree of the Supreme Court of the United States, which related entirely to the question of using water for sanitation and not at all to matters of waterway transportation, and I am hoping that the conferees will find some way in the consideration of that amendment and of that matter at least to provide for a little earlier survey than the action of the Senate is willing to give us, so that the survey can be begun as early as other surveys are begun and that the survey shall not have to wait until the whole waterway has been completed before the Secretary of War can proceed.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me say that it would not be necessary for the conferees or for the House to act upon that particular matter. Under the law the two committees have jurisdiction to pass on surveys, and we could pass a resolution for a survey at any time with regard to such a project.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman think the general law will apply when this law, which is subsequent to it, makes special provision with reference to a study of the Illinois waterway?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Both laws will be in force, and as the action of the committee would be subsequent to the action of the Congress, the action of the committee would be the one which would prevail.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But the Senate provision provides that as soon as practicable after the Illinois waterway shall have been completed, then the study shall be made. However, I am certain the conferees will give consideration to that question, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the declaration of Special Master—now Chief Justice—Hughes to the Supreme Court of the United States, in his report in the consolidated cases, involving the question of diversion of water from Lake Michigan into Sanitary District Canal at Chicago, which reads as follows:

Under the opinion of this court in the present suits the question of the allowance of the diversion of water from Lake Michigan in the interest of the waterway to the Mississippi is not deemed to be open to consideration.

When the States of Missouri, Kentucky, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana sought to be made defendants in the litigation on the ground of their rights and interests in the navigation of the Mississippi River, the Supreme Court, through Chief Justice Taft, said, on January 14, 1928:

They [the foregoing States] really seek affirmatively to preserve the diversion from Lake Michigan in the interest of such navigation and interstate commerce, though they have made no express prayer therefor. In our view of the permit of March 3, 1925, and in the absence of direct authority from Congress for a waterway from Lake Michigan to the Mississippi they show no rightful interest in the maintenance of the diversion. Their motions to dismiss the bills are overruled, and so far as their answer may suggest affirmative relief it is denied.

And still, in the Senate amendment, the flow of water for navigation purposes is fixed and limited by the decree of the court as to the amount of water that may hereafter be diverted for sanitation purposes alone through the Chicago Sanitary District Canal; and the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers are deprived of their usual authority in the control of navigable waters within the United States. Our hope must rest in the fairness and wisdom of future Congresses to give the great Middle West equal opportunities with sections more favorably located, as on the seaboard, in gaining an outlet to

the high seas for its wealth of agricultural and industrial production and its share of the commerce of the Nation.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, New York is vitally interested in this bill and in some of the amendments put on in the Senate that will come up in the conference. I am not going to take the position of trying to retard the passage of this bill in any way. I am for the bill, but I do hope the conferees on the part of the House will insist and see that the amendment relative to the widening and deepening of Newton Creek in the harbor of New York City are kept in the rivers and harbors bill, and I am placing implicit confidence in the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee to carry this out.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DEMPSEY, STRONG of Pennsylvania, and MANSFIELD.

CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES OF CANDIDATES FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 258

Resolved, That a special committee of five be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 1, 1931, the campaign expenditures of the various candidates for the House of Representatives in both parties, the names of the persons, firms, associations, or corporations subscribing, the amount contributed, the method of expenditure of said sums, and all facts in relation thereto, not only as to the subscriptions of money and expenditures thereof but as to the use of any other means or influence, including the promise or use of patronage, and all other facts in relation thereto that would not only be of public interest but would aid the Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

That said special committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the adjournment of Congress, and that said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby empowered to sit and act at such time and place as it may deem necessary; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses, the production of books, papers, and documents; to employ stenographers at a cost of not exceeding \$1 per printed page. The chairman of the committee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses. Subpoenas for witnesses shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee thereof. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Said committee is authorized to make such expenditures as it deems necessary and such expenses thereof shall be paid on vouchers ordered by said committee and approved by the chairman thereof.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the wording of this resolution sets forth as clearly and distinctly the intent and purpose of the Rules Committee as anything I could say at this time.

The only thing I may add is that it is not the intention to set up a smelling or snooping committee to annoy Members of Congress. The only idea is that if some abnormal situation develops during the campaign and it seems to be necessary to look into it, the machinery will be ready to operate without any delay. This is the only purpose I know of in connection with the establishment of this investigating committee.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Is the resolution substantially in the same form and language as the one adopted two years ago for the same purpose?

Mr. SNELL. It is almost absolutely the same.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HASTINGS. This is a House resolution?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I have not had an opportunity to study the resolution. Does it come from the Committee on Rules?

Mr. SNELL. It does.

Mr. HASTINGS. As I heard it read from the desk, it authorizes this House committee to make an investigation of the expenditures of candidates for the Senate.

Mr. SNELL. Oh, no; the gentleman misunderstood it. It applies only to the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Was there ever any report made of any investigation two years ago?

Mr. SNELL. I do not recall whether there was any formal report made, but they did some work at that time, and the effect of the work of that committee was brought to the attention of the House.

Mr. BLACK. A report was filed.

Mr. SNELL. Yes; I recall now that a report was filed.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey to answer that question.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I have here a copy of the report that was filed in accordance with that resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. If the gentleman will permit another question, in his opinion is this resolution broad enough to prevent such a fiasco as happened in another body when a certain bishop of Brazil refused to give any information to a duly authorized committee of that body as to what use he had made, if any, of over \$60,000 in the 1928 political campaign? Is this resolution broad enough to force a contemptuous Cannon to testify?

Mr. SNELL. This resolution is just as broad as we knew how to make it, and if there is anything that is not covered, it was not left out intentionally; and I think this resolution is broad enough to cover the expenditures of any man who is a candidate for the House of Representatives, or any emergency that may arise.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. And if any person contributes for or against the election of any Member of the Congress in one State or in more than one State, does the gentleman believe this resolution is broad enough to compel that person to answer before this House committee?

Mr. SNELL. We think so. That is the intent of the resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I hope the very recent disgraceful occurrence in another body was definitely in the minds of the drafters of this resolution.

Mr. SNELL. It was not, because that gentleman is not a candidate for the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. But the people of this country are entitled to know in these investigations who the person is who contributes toward the election or toward the defeat of a candidate, and how the money is spent, whether the spender is a candidate or an ecclesiastic.

Mr. SNELL. The language is—

The names of the persons, firms, associations, or corporations subscribing the amount contributed—

And so forth. This is just about as broad as we could make it.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Well, let us hope we will not go through that recent experience again. Does this resolution apply to primaries at all?

Mr. SNELL. No.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. The resolution which the gentleman has reported contains the language "any other means or influence."

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. Is that put in in order to take care of campaign assertions and statements on the part of various candidates?

Mr. SNELL. I guess we could not go quite as far as that.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Was there any special reason why you excluded primary elections?

Mr. SNELL. Why, no. There was not any special reason one way or the other, only as a usual thing we do not go into primaries.

So far as I know, Mr. Speaker, there is no desire to discuss the resolution further, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

WORLD WAR VETERANS' BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Control of the veterans' bill in the House having passed to the minority and the bill having gone to the Senate and back, I would like to know if I would be recognized as the ranking minority member of the Veterans' Committee to ask unanimous consent to take the bill from the Speaker's table and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. It would be in order provided the Chair recognized the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I asked if the Chair would recognize me for that purpose?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not want to embarrass the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not embarrassing the Chair at all.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Connecticut a question. When will the veterans' bill come up in the House?

Mr. TILSON. To-morrow it may be, and certainly by Thursday, I should hope.

Mr. RANKIN. Many Members have asked me if the bill would be taken up to-day, and my answer was that I hoped so.

Mr. TILSON. I should not like to have it called up to-day; the membership ought to have time to study the bill as it came back from the Senate, and a day is not too long a time to make the study.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, as I understand the gentleman, it will not be called up to-day?

Mr. TILSON. As far as my understanding goes, the Speaker will not recognize anybody to call it up to-day. I know of no way to call it up unless the Speaker recognizes some one for this purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the veterans' bill be taken up to-day?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not informed.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not trying to be facetious with the Chair, but a great many Members have asked me if it would come up to-day; but, of course, if the Chair will not recognize anyone to take it up I know that it will not come up.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that is a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SNELL. I should object to its being taken up to-day, anyway.

Mr. TILSON. One Member can object and thus prevent its being taken up.

Mr. RANKIN. I am sorry the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] objects. I had hoped that we might take the bill up to-day and agree to the Senate amendments.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN LONGVIEW, WASH., AND RAINIER, OREG.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the bill S. 4577, a bridge bill, from the Speaker's table and consider it, a similar House bill being on the calendar. It is a case of an emergency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

An act (S. 4577) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River between Longview, Wash., and Rainier, Oreg.

Whereas in order to complete technically the bridge across the Columbia River at Longview, Wash., it is necessary to allow the macadam roadbed to settle for approximately two years before putting on the concrete surface: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for completing the construction of the bridge across the Columbia River between Longview, Wash., and Rainier, Oreg., authorized to be built by W. D. Comer and Wesley Vandercok by act of Congress approved January 28, 1927, which time was extended to June 1, 1930, by act of Congress approved December 26, 1929, is hereby further extended to June 1, 1932.

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

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was stricken out.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE FOREST SERVICE

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the Consent Calendar, beginning at the star.

The first business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10782) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the act approved March 4, 1913, as provides: "That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to reimburse owners of horses, vehicles, and other equipment lost, damaged, or destroyed while being used for necessary fire fighting, trail, or official business, such reimbursement to be made from any available funds in the appropriation to which the hire of such equipment is properly chargeable." (Sec. 502, title 16, U. S. C.) is hereby amended

to read as follows: "The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe:

"(a) To hire or rent property from employees of the Forest Service for the use of officers of that service other than use by the employee from whom hired or rented, whenever the public interest will be promoted thereby.

"(b) To provide forage, care, and housing for animals, and storage for vehicles and other equipment obtained by the Forest Service for the use of that service from employees.

"(c) To reimburse owners for loss, damage, or destruction of horses, vehicles, and other equipment obtained by the Forest Service for the use of that service from employees or other private owners: *Provided*, That payments or reimbursements herein authorized may be made from the applicable appropriations for the Forest Service: *And provided further*, That except for fire-fighting emergencies no reimbursement herein authorized shall be made in an amount in excess of \$50 in any case unless supported by a written contract of hire or lease."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "prompted" and insert "promoted."

Page 2, line 6, after the word "thereby," strike out the period and insert a semicolon and add the following language:

"*Provided*, That the aggregate amount to be paid permanent employees under authorization of this subsection, exclusive of obligations occasioned by fire emergencies, shall not exceed \$3,000 in any one year."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE COTTON-OIL MILLS OF THE SOUTH

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert a short statement of the cottonseed hearing before the Federal Trade Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, on February 14 I addressed the House making certain charges against the cotton-oil mill industry that were denied by the representatives of this industry. On June 11 I extended my remarks and included therewith concrete facts from independent and commission buyers of seed, as well as ginners and others to prove my contentions. I hope you will honor me by reading these remarks.

Under a resolution passed some time ago the Federal Trade Commission has been conducting hearings and investigating these charges, with Mr. W. W. Shepperd, son of ex-Governor Shepperd of South Carolina as examiner and Mr. Wooden as attorney, representing the commission. My charges were that this industry, especially since the Memphis Trade Practice Conference held in 1928, were enjoying a hog-tied monopoly, fixing prices both in buying cottonseed and selling their products. I further charged that they were making loans on gin plants and buying and building gin plants, as well as buying up and forcing out independent cotton oil mills so that they would be able to have a complete control in price fixing.

You should read what cottonseed dealers, both commission and independent buyers, ginners, and others, have to say about these charges which are inserted in my remarks in the RECORD, June 11. We find in the hearings before Mr. WATSON, the examiner, with Mr. Ashbury representing the Southern Cotton Oil Co., relative to the charge in connection with buying up and forcing out independent cotton oil mills, absolute proof of this charge but you do not see anything in the press about Mr. Asbury's testimony. The men sent out by the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the files of Cotton Oil Mills and Christie Benet, the attorney for this industry, found in Mr. Benet's files plans which were worked out by the Southern Cotton Oil Co., Buckeye Cotton Oil Co., and the Swift Cotton Oil Mill Co., which is absolute proof of this charge. All of this has been going on for some time, but especially during 1929.

We are going to have these hearings printed, and those of you who are interested should get copies and read them. These three companies had surveys made in several of the Southern States. Especially were surveys made in Alabama, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia, as will be shown by the hearings. They listed all mills to be bought, and by so doing the number of tons of seed that would be available for these three mills per press per year, as well as the amount of money needed in each State, to carry through their high-handed scheme.

LISTEN TO MR. ASBURY'S TESTIMONY

Mr. Asbury was asked this question by Mr. Wooden:

With whom did you discuss these plans and surveys?

Mr. ASBURY. I discussed the matter with Mr. Geohagan. He is the man who is most interested in working out these plans from a financial point of view and otherwise in our company. I also discussed these plans with Mr. Phil Lamar, who runs an oil mill at Rome, Ga., and with Mr. Palmer Brown, of the National Cottonseed Products Co., in Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. WOODEN. Have you discussed it with the Buckeye and Procter & Gamble interests?

Mr. ASBURY. Yes; I have discussed it with them; yes, sir.

Mr. WOODEN. Have you discussed it with Swift & Co.?

Mr. ASBURY. Yes; I was in Chicago last year and talked with the Swift people.

SOUTHERN COTTON OIL CO. AS A LEADER

Mr. Asbury stated that these surveys and plans were drafted in the office of the Southern Cotton Oil Co. at New Orleans, and that Buckeye had made drafts and surveys also. The statements showed that in South Carolina they would have about 205,000 tons of seed to crush if they could get rid of the independent mills which would give these three companies 3,300 tons per press per year and the amount that would be needed to take over the independent mills in South Carolina would be \$2,990,000.

In the case of Georgia, in taking over the independent mills it would give these three companies 2,600 tons per press per year and to purchase the mills in that State it would take \$3,050,000.

It was understood in Alabama that the Kidd Cotton Oil Mill interests were to join with the Southern, Swift, and Buckeye Co., because, as stated by Mr. Asbury, they could not buy out this company. These four companies would have 3,500 tons per press per year and it would cost \$1,660,000 to take over the Alabama independent mills.

LISTEN TO THIS QUESTION

Mr. WOODEN. Why did you plan to take over the Allen and Dothan Mills and not the Kidd Mill?

Mr. ASBURY. Well, I think it would have been easier to have bought them out than it would have been to get the Kidd one. Kidd has a hull plant; therefore, it would not have been easy to get his hull plant.

You will find Mr. Kidd was at the head of the Alabama division of the association at the time he was to be made a part and parcel of the price-fixing scheme.

THE TESTIMONY SHOWS THAT THEY HAD OPTIONS

Mr. WOODEN. Did you talk to Mr. Lamar about these plans?

Mr. ASBURY. I think Mr. Lamar got some options on mills in Georgia. (This was in 1929.)

Mr. WOODEN. Did you have options, obtain options on mills, besides the ones Mr. Lamar obtained?

Mr. ASBURY. Yes; there were options obtained on a number of mills.

Mr. WOODEN. In other States?

Mr. ASBURY. Yes.

Mr. WOODEN. By whom were they obtained?

Mr. ASBURY. I do not know. Mr. Geohagan handled that part of the matter.

Mr. WOODEN. Did they get options on mills in South Carolina?

Mr. ASBURY. I think; yes.

Mr. WOODEN. Do you know who obtained these?

Mr. ASBURY. My impression is that perhaps Mr. John Stephens did, but I am not sure.

Mr. WOODEN. How was this whole matter to be financed?

Mr. ASBURY. You are asking me a big question.

Mr. WOODEN. You had your plans made, did you not?

Mr. ASBURY. We were trying. We did not get that far. First we had to find out or wanted to get some light on the financial side; that is, how much it would take to finance it.

CORPORATIONS WERE PLANNED

Mr. Asbury further stated that plans were formulated to form a corporation in each State to take over the independent mills.

ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY FROM THE HEARINGS

Mr. WOODEN. The new corporations were to take over the mills that they would acquire?

Mr. ASBURY. I think it was discussed to take over the mills and to organize the industry in the States on a basis that would enable them (the Southern, Buckeye, and Swift) to crush the seed in an economic way at a reasonable cost and on a basis that we could make money.

MR. ASBURY LETS THE CAT OUT OF THE BAG

Mr. WOODEN. Are you familiar with anything relating to the taking over of the Marion Harper Cotton Oil Co.?

Mr. ASBURY. I think Mr. Lamar, who later bought the Rome (Ga.) mill, had the Marion Harper Mill. We were satisfied with Mr. Lamar. He used to belong to our company.

Mr. WOODEN. There were certain specific reasons for involving in the proposed plans the taking over of the Marion Harper Mill?

Mr. ASBURY. I hardly know how to say this if it is going in the record.

Mr. WOODEN. Can I help you out?

Mr. ASBURY. Well, one reason is that Mr. Harper is a leading intermittent type of seed operator. I am telling you what I know, or rather what I think about it. When Georgia adopted the "Code of trade practices," Mr. Harper attended the conference. He remained and indicated his willingness to operate under the code. Mr. Harper says, "I am for the code of trade practices." He did not oppose it, yet he did not work under it and proposed to operate as he saw fit and in whatever way he could, buying seed at whatever price he could.

THE HARPER MILL WAS AN INDEPENDENT MILL

My friends, that is the attitude of all independent mills like Mr. Harper's. These mills are the ones that make the three large groups or mills pay a fair price for seed on a competitive basis. You will note also that Mr. Harper did not do what was intended in the code; that is, follow a set or fixed price by the State associations operating under the National association. Mr. Asbury further states: "Because of this I personally would prefer to have some one else run Mr. Harper's mills." Yes, Mr. Asbury and the three large mill operators mentioned in this deal would prefer that they take over all of the independent mills so that they would know that they would not have Mr. Harper's type to interfere with their plan of price fixing and highway robbery.

MR. ASBURY FURTHER TESTIFIES

Mr. WOODEN. In other words, Mr. Harper was not disposed to cooperate with the remainder of the industry?

Mr. ASBURY. I do not think it was a question of cooperation but a question of discrimination. My view is that I wanted to be able to look a man in the face and tell him that I am giving him the best price I can; also, telling him that I am dealing with him on the same basis that I am dealing with others (a fixed price).

Mr. WOODEN. And you would also like to be able to say that he could not do any better at any other place?

Mr. ASBURY. No.

But that is the position Mr. Asbury would aspire to. In fact, under the code indorsed by the Federal Trade Commission at Memphis last summer, Mr. Asbury and his outfit is just about in that position. They wanted to complete the job by buying the independent mills.

THIS COMBINATION PREFERRED TO PUT HARPER OUT

Mr. WOODEN. But you would like to be sure of that?

Mr. ASBURY. It is extremely difficult to do business in cottonseed or cottonseed oil for what the seed are worth. If I am buying cottonseed for \$30 per ton and somebody else is buying for \$31, the producer will naturally sell his seed to the man who pays the \$31. I may be able to get along for a while. I will either have to pay \$31 in order to get seed to run my mills or get out of the business.

Therefore, to keep the independent mills and independent buyers from making a competitive market by bidding up seed, they proposed to buy them out.

THIS WILL APPLY TO ALL INDEPENDENT MILLS

Mr. WOODEN. Isn't it a fact that this Marion Harper Oil Co. consistently tops the price of other mills?

Mr. ASBURY. Yes.

Mr. WOODEN. Is that not one of the reasons that the leaders in your groups in the business wanted to put them out?

Mr. ASBURY. Yes. Personally, I would like to have somebody else running their mills.

SOUTH CAROLINA ALREADY REDUCED FROM 102 TO 40 MILLS

A number of us started this fight last fall, and especially this spring, otherwise it is my belief that to-day these three giant cottonseed-oil mill operators would have carried out their plans and would have taken over these independent mills. South Carolina mills have already been reduced, scrapped, and junked, or closed up during the past 20 years from 102 mills in 1909 to 40 mills to-day. These concerns practically own all of the mills now.

It may interest you to know that there are two kinds of mills that are interested in crushing cottonseed. The first group is the independent oil mill that is owned by local people usually, and is not engaged in the business of refining the crude oil that it crushes from the cottonseed, but sells the crude oil to re-

fineries. These are the mills that are gradually being bought up and scrapped or forced out of business. These mills being locally owned are interested in a fair price for cottonseed as well as a fair price for oil and other cottonseed products. The farmers are their best customers.

The second group is the refinery group, owned by Procter & Gamble Co., at Cincinnati; Southern Cotton Oil Co., at New Orleans; and Swift & Co., of Chicago, and a few other concerns. They own a large number of cottonseed-oil mills in the South, and they crush the seed for the oil, not to sell to some one else but for the purpose of using it in their own refineries. Each one of these refineries buys a great deal more oil than it produces. So it is to their interest that cottonseed oil remain cheap. The cheaper cottonseed oil is the more profit they will make on the finished product.

The Southern Cotton Oil Co., Buckeye, and Swift Cotton Oil Mills will tell you to-day that they are losing money. Perhaps if you could check the books of the crushing mills located in the South owned by the Southern, Buckeye, and Swift you would find this true, but these mills in the last analysis are owned by the Wesson Oil & Snowdrift Co., New Orleans; Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati; and Swift & Co., Chicago. Two of these are also large meat packers and fertilizer people.

The place to find the profits of these birds is on the books in their main offices—New Orleans, Cincinnati, and Chicago. Mr. PATMAN, of Texas, who has given more time and hard work to this matter than any other Congressman, gives us the following figures: The common-stock holders of Procter & Gamble Co. have invested \$25,000,000 and their profits annually are averaging from \$15,000,000 to \$19,000,000. Another interesting phase in connection with this subject is the independent group of cotton-oil mill men want a tariff on foreign oils as they are deeply interested in a better price for cottonseed oil, which would mean a better price for cottonseed, to be helpful to the farmers. However, the refiners—Procter & Gamble Co., Wesson Oil & Snowdrift Co., and Swift & Co.—oppose a tariff because they do not care how cheap cottonseed oil sells for. The cheaper the price of cottonseed oil the more money they can make in the refining business and other lines.

I am assured that the examiners who are conducting these hearings will visit my State, South Carolina, later; at which time I propose to have some startling facts presented for the record by my people, who are being hog tied and robbed.

The hearings are now going on in Atlanta and will be conducted in other Southern States. I hope that you Members representing cotton States will inform your people and have them go before these examiners to present the facts that exist in your State, which is equally as bad as it is in South Carolina. I know of no better work you can do as a Representative in Congress than to help break up this giant octopus that is reaching out, taking over, and freezing out every vestige of competition in the marketing of this very important southern product.

AIR-MAIL FLYERS' MEDAL OF HONOR

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 101) for the award of the air-mail flyers' medal of honor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to inquire whether this is to be a substitute for the regular medal given by Congress for distinguished service?

Mr. KELLY. Not in the slightest.

Mr. GREENWOOD. It does not conflict with the regular congressional medal?

Mr. KELLY. There is no conflict whatever. This applies to air mail flyers and is based, rather, on the bill passed in 1905, which provides for medals for those who save lives on railroads.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman acquainted himself with the phraseology of the act under which the President awards congressional medals of honor to those who distinguish themselves on fields of battle?

Mr. KELLY. Yes; that was taken into consideration.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice that the phraseology is slightly different from that of existing law. Under existing law the language is that the President is authorized to confer, and so forth. In the pending bill the language is:

That under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, the President is hereby authorized to present—

In this bill you put in some qualifying clauses to the effect that under such regulations as he may prescribe he may do so and so. I think it is better form to use the language used in the present law.

Mr. KELLY. I have no objection to the gentleman offering such an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, the President is hereby authorized to present, but not in the name of Congress, an air-mail flyer's medal of honor, of appropriate design, with accompanying ribbon, to any person who, while serving as a pilot in the air mail service since May 15, 1918, has distinguished, or who, after the approval of this act, distinguishes himself by heroism or extraordinary achievement while participating in such service: *Provided,* That no more than one distinguished flying cross shall be issued to any one person, but for each succeeding act or achievement sufficient to justify the award of an air-mail flyer's medal the President may award a suitable bar or other suitable device to be worn as he shall direct. In case an individual who distinguishes himself shall have died before the making of the award to which he may be entitled, the award may nevertheless be made and the cross or the bar or other device presented to such representative of the deceased as the President may designate, but no cross, bar, or other device hereinbefore authorized shall be awarded or presented to any individual whose entire service subsequent to the time he distinguishes himself has not been honorable.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the words "distinguished-flying cross" and insert "air-mail flyer's medal of honor."

Page 2, line 9, strike out the word "cross" and insert the word "medal."

Page 2, line 11, strike out the word "cross" and insert the word "medal."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 1, line 3, after the word "that," insert the words "the President is hereby authorized" and strike out on page 1, line 4, the words "the President is hereby authorized."

The amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SURVEY OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, in order to ask some questions about this bill. It seems to be, from a casual reading, an attempt to give back some survey fees to the railroad companies.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow this to pass over until the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON], chairman of the Public Lands Committee, comes back, I think he can get the information he wants. I ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STAFFORD. With the understanding that it may be returned to to-day.

Mr. COLLINS. I do not like to agree to that. I am not going to be on the floor after 3 o'clock.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I have some questions I desire to ask, too.

Mr. ARENTZ. I assure the gentleman that the gentleman from Utah will be here within a very few minutes.

COMPILATION OF LAWS RELATING TO COMMON CARRIERS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, to print and bind additional copies of Senate Document No. 166, Seventieth Congress, entitled "Interstate Commerce Act, Annotated."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to inquire whether it is the intention that the copies for the use of the House shall be distributed through the folding room.

Mr. PARKER. I am not the author of the resolution. This is a Senate resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the resolution should be made explicit, because this publication will be of value to the Members of the House and I think each Member of the House would

want to have his full quota of the publication. I shall offer an amendment to provide for that.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The trouble with the resolution is that you are not providing for a sufficient number of copies in view of the amount of money that has already been spent to compile these documents. As I understand from the Joint Committee on Printing, the plates are ready and the presses are ready to move just as soon as the Congress decides how many copies should be printed. It is a valuable document.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is a good starter, and the plates will be retained so that if additional copies are needed hereafter the plates will be in readiness for further copies.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman that the amendment he suggests should be added to the bill. What we do receive should come through the folding room.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed and bound 4,700 additional copies of Senate Document No. 166, Seventieth Congress, entitled "Compilation of Federal Laws Relating to the Regulation of Carriers Subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, with Digest of Pertinent Decisions of the Federal Courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission and Text or References to General Rules and Regulations," of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; 2,500 copies for the use of the House of Representatives; 100 copies for the use of the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate; 100 copies for the use of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives; and 500 copies for each of the Printing Committees of Congress.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "4,700" and insert "2,200."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "1,000" and insert "500."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "2,500" and insert "1,500."

Page 2, line 2, after the semicolon, following the word "Senate," insert the word "and."

Page 2, line 4, after the word "Representatives," strike out the comma and the words "and 500 copies for each of the Printing Committees of Congress."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 1, line 12, after the word "Representatives," insert "to be distributed through the folding room."

The amendment was agreed to; and as amended the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 355 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3068) to amend section 355 of the Revised Statutes.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this seems to be rather an important bill, which will permit the Government to accept a certificate of title issued by a title company in lieu of an abstract of title, which has been the former practice in passing upon titles of property purchased by the Government.

Only on Sunday last I was reading in the Sunday issue of the New York Times, in the real-estate section, where a writer pointed out the many instances of defects in title arising after the transaction had been completed and the purchaser had made valuable improvements on the assumption he had a good title, but learned later that he had not.

The Attorney General sets out in his report that there is considerable delay occasioned by the present method of securing abstracts of title. Now, we are going to accept certificates in lieu thereof, only to find out later that the title was not as the title company had stated it to be in the certificate.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Would not the gentleman, as a lawyer, prefer a certificate of title of a title company to an abstract of title by the Attorney General?

Mr. STAFFORD. I would prefer an abstract of title, which will be acceptable to the law officers of the Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I am quite sure most lawyers would not advise their clients to accept title on a mere opinion of the Attorney General, whoever he might be. Furthermore, the title to the property ought to be insured by the title company as well as certified.

Mr. HICKEY. That was objected to by a distinguished Representative from the State of New York.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Title companies are undoubtedly better equipped to pass upon titles than the Attorney General or any lawyer. The title companies have probably complained that they have not been getting any business from the Government, and therefore this bill. But if the Government is going to have a "certificate of title," it ought also to have the most valuable part of the title service, the insurance feature.

Mr. HICKEY. In many cities over the country there are no title-insurance companies. The only purpose of the bill is to expedite action in certain cases. The hearings show that in order to expedite action in acquiring titles this bill would be of service.

I wish also to say that it does not change the present law except in the proviso. The law is precisely as it is now except the proviso, and the essence of the proviso is in lines from 21 to 24. It will simply enable the Attorney General in certain cases to take a certificate of a title company and thus enable the Government to proceed with the construction of buildings.

My distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has referred to opinions of the Attorney General. In fact, the Attorney General and the Attorney General's office are often unable to give an opinion on titles in far distant States, in California and other States. They must go to competent attorneys residing in those places in order to get an opinion, not being familiar with the laws of certain States as they affect titles to real estate.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I do not object to that. I think that is the thing to do if there is no title company. If, however, the Attorney General is given the power to refer the question of a title, we will say to a piece of New York property, to a title company, and instead of that has a New York lawyer pass on it, he ought to be removed. Of course, in some places they do not have title companies. But the additional point I make is that the insurance feature is more important.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The matter came up in committee. That would be the function of the title company, opening up a title for the claimant. It would not benefit anybody. The Government is in possession.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. You mean if the Government takes a defective title?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. He gets the perfect title.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I am talking about the Government getting a defective title. If it had title insurance it would be protected.

Mr. MICHENER. The Government would not take the title unless it is perfect.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I am talking about defects that show up later. The Government takes title from an individual, for instance, and later on—30 years after—we will say a defect turns up. The Government should have title insurance whereby the title company guarantees any losses up to the amount of the insurance paid for.

Mr. MICHENER. The point which the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] is making is that the Government is in possession and suit can not be brought against the Government to put it out.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. The Government would be the one to bring suit in the supposed case I mentioned.

Mr. MICHENER. Why should they?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They hold the property.

Mr. MICHENER. They are in possession.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Suppose they have received something less than it was agreed they were to get.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They are in possession. Nobody can attack them.

Mr. MICHENER. I agreed with the gentleman in the beginning, but I was satisfied before we had finished that it was not necessary.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I am not satisfied.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Do not the title companies guarantee title when they issue a certificate certifying that the title is in the grantor?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I do not know what this "certificate of title" means. A title company does two things. It certifies the title or makes an abstract of title or gives an opinion on the title. Then they have the insurance feature. I do not know that this language "certificate of title" is known generally.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Is not a certificate equivalent to an insurance policy?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I do not know. There is no such language known in New York as "a certificate of title." The insurance feature is a "title policy."

Mr. WILLIAMSON. In most States such people are licensed and they give bond, and their title is equivalent to an insurance policy.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. That may be in some States, but I do not think it is true in New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will say that the insurance would run up to a very large item. The gentleman is familiar with the premiums in New York. Since the Government takes title, it would never have to be a plaintiff. Some one would have to attack its title, and the insurance company would simply hide behind the Government. As the gentleman knows, they resort to every defense, so that we would be paying the premiums for no insurance.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I am not so sure of that.

Mr. STAFFORD. What have the members of the Committee on the Judiciary to say on the proposition of a certificate of title from one of these companies who did not have anything back of it? If there was a defective title, what is the recourse of the Government?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Government can go and take, as the gentleman knows. No one can take the title of the Government once it is in possession. The purpose of using the title company was to have the machinery there to search the title, and, as the gentleman knows, many times an assistant district attorney has no experience to make the proper search while these title companies have the machinery to make the search.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know specifically the practice of all the leading insurance companies of the country when placing loans on properties in distant States, but I am under the impression that the practice of that company which is known throughout the country and perhaps throughout the world, which has its home office in my city, the Northwestern Life Insurance Co., does not accept certificates of title, but examines the abstracts as furnished by the mortgagor.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I know of no State in the Union where a company is permitted to issue either abstracts of title or title certificates without operating under the law and having certain liabilities fixed by law, which is usually a very heavy bond put up to guarantee that their certificate is good.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. There is no such system as that in New York.

Mr. STAFFORD. Our practice is to have abstracts of title, which individual lawyers examine and determine whether the title is a good marketable title.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. As far as the city of New York is concerned, in the so-called metropolitan region, taking in all of New Jersey, the business is entirely in the hands of title companies. Nobody ever dreams to-day of having a title searched by a lawyer.

Mr. STAFFORD. I shall not interpose objections, although I question whether the Government should go ahead and erect expensive public buildings simply upon a certificate of title of some so-and-so company.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Is there any reason why the Government should not be put in exactly the same position as any prudent purchaser of real estate?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Surely not. Suppose the title policy does cost something. Most prudent purchasers consider the small cost a good investment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am receding because in the discussion I have learned that this is the practice in other States, different from that in my own State. I am trying to conform my views to that which prevails in other States.

Mr. MICHENER. This is simply modernizing the law. That is all it does.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 733; title 34, sec. 520; title 40, sec. 255; and title 50, sec. 175) be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 355. No public money shall be expended upon any site or land purchased by the United States for the purposes of erecting thereon any armory, arsenal, fort, fortification, navy yard, customhouse, lighthouse, or other public building of any kind whatever, until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title, nor until the consent of the legislature of the State in which the land or site may be, to such purchase, has been given. The district attorneys of the United States, upon the application of the Attorney General, shall furnish any assistance or information in their power in relation to the titles of the public property lying within their respective districts. And the secretaries of the departments, upon the application of the Attorney General, shall procure any additional evidence of title which he may deem necessary, and which may not be

in the possession of the officers of the Government, and the expense of procuring it shall be paid out of the appropriations made for the contingencies of the departments, respectively: *Provided, however,* That in all cases of the acquisition of land or any interest therein by the United States for the purposes herein specified or for other purposes, wherein the written opinion of the Attorney General in favor of the validity of the title of such land is or may be required or authorized by law, the Attorney General may, in his discretion, base such opinion upon a certificate of title and/or policy of title insurance, in such amount as the purchasing authority may require."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, beginning in line 22, after the word "title," strike out the remainder of the section and insert the words "of a title company."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RAINY RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12233) authorizing the Robertson & Janin Co., of Montreal, Canada, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rainy River at Baudette, Minn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice this is an international toll bridge. Section 3 makes the laws of Minnesota in reference to the rate of tolls applicable, but strikes out Canada. Will the gentleman explain why the laws of Canada are not made applicable as well as the laws of Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I really could not give the gentleman that information, I am sorry to say.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. What is the situation with reference to this bridge? Who is to build it? Is the bridge necessary?

Mr. KNUTSON. There is dire need for it, I may say to my good friend from Missouri. At the present time there is being operated a ferry which makes hourly trips. In the tourist season much inconvenience is caused by reason of the fact that the capacity of the ferry is very limited. As I recall, its capacity is about four cars, and there are times when there will be a long string of cars that can not be accommodated, and they are obliged to wait for another hour.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. My objection to the bill is that this is an international bridge and it provides for a private toll bridge, with no conditions at all imposed. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota to an ideal international bridge bill, a bill which provides a satisfactory arrangement and is perfectly just to the traveling public. I refer to the bridge bill proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton], which protects both countries and the traveling public. Here you have a private toll bridge with no limitations at all.

Mr. PATTERSON. I will say to my good friend from Minnesota—

Mr. KNUTSON. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. PATTERSON. As much as I think of my good friend from Minnesota, if this is a private toll bridge, I must object.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. PATTERSON. I withhold it.

Mr. KNUTSON. The Dominion of Canada has already granted the necessary permission for this bridge to be constructed. There is need for it and there is not another bridge within 75 miles.

Mr. PATTERSON. Let us have it modeled on the plan of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton], and I will not object, but if it is an ordinary private toll bridge from its inception, and with no limitation on the amount of tolls to be charged, I must object.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why should the gentleman object? There is no idea of issuing bonds. It is a wealthy Canadian concern that wants to put a bridge at this place.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is all the more reason why it is objectionable. There is a bill on the calendar providing for the construction of a bridge between Texas and Mexico, to which I am going to object, and this bill is in the same category.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I must object for the present.

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

Mr. PATTERSON. I will yield that much to the gentleman. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROHIBITION

Mr. SPARKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of prohibition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of prohibition. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, one of the outstanding problems that has confronted the people of this country, from the time when the sturdy pioneers undertook to carve from the wilderness a home for themselves and loved ones down through the successive steps of our national development, has been the liquor problem which has engrafted its debauching and degrading influences into the social and economic life of our country.

The crystallized wisdom of American statesmen could not evolve a successful plan for the orderly distribution of intoxicating liquor whereby its debasing influences might not pollute the fabric of Government and leave a slimy trail of corruption, crime, and poverty along our national pathway. A justly indignant people arose in their might and declared that intoxicating liquor should no more receive, in its making and distribution, the sanction of the law, but from thenceforth it should be an outlaw.

After the adoption of the eighteenth amendment and its enforcing provisions many of its sympathizers and State enforcing agencies that were favorable thereto relaxed their efforts and thereby thrust upon the Federal Government the task of enforcement. A huge responsibility so suddenly thrown upon an already heavily burdened department of the Government became a task of great magnitude. Such department could rightfully expect, after the passage of said amendment and its enforcing provisions, that the States would fulfill their proportionate responsibility, and that Federal intervention constituted only an additional assistance to the States to make more effective their heretofore ineffectual attempts to prevent the making and distribution of intoxicating liquor, for adjoining wet States could materially affect a dry State to such an extent that absolute prohibition was impossible. A national prohibition law to unify the States so that intoxicating liquor might not find refuge and protection within the confines of our national domain was enacted.

The vendor of liquor can no longer find shelter under the folds of Old Glory.

Handicapped by inadequate facilities and in some localities by unsympathetic feeling toward it on the part of the people and the officers it has not during the period of its existence attained the perfection that some of its most ardent supporters predicted, which fact has occasioned a boisterous criticism by those favoring repeal of the eighteenth amendment and its enforcing provisions. They point to its ineffectiveness in States which have withdrawn their enforcing provisions and thrown entirely upon the Federal Government the responsibility of making prohibition effective.

Any subdivision of the Government, whether local or State, that refuses to assume its proportionate responsibility in sustaining any and all of the provisions of our National Constitution, is thereby dictating to the National Government what laws it will uphold and what it will disobey, thereby making less secure the very purpose and object of the union of States. If one State has the right to so elect, then another has the same right, and in the end we would have a confusion of beliefs, that would seriously threaten the stability of our national existence.

If the State has the right to exercise such a privilege, then why not the individual have the same right? If the State and the individuals are each to be privileged to exercise such a discretion then we will be in a state of anarchy where government does not control, but is subservient to the individual discretion.

"America can not go on a debauch in spots without injury to the whole Nation," said S. E. Nicholson before the Judiciary Committee in the recent hearings upon certain resolutions proposing to repeal the eighteenth amendment.

Disobedience to a constitutional command is nullification, and such attitude is not justified by the claimed superior judgment of a minority in determining that legislative restrictions imposed by a majority is a denial of individual rights, which the Government through its provided channels can not take away. If the majority feel that such authority should be exercised by the Federal Government for the proper protection of society,

Government, and the individual, and such feeling is embodied in the fundamental law of the land, then the wisdom of the majority has found expression therein.

Hon. J. Weston Allen said before the Judiciary Committee:

Every nation has the right to maintain the efficient status of its man power, that upon which the nation and its life exists, up to the highest standard.

To protect our defenders from the physical deterioration resulting from the use of alcoholic liquors, we designate as unlawful that which is destructive of maintaining the physical fitness of our manhood to meet their country's obligations should a crisis ensue requiring their cooperation.

That the general distribution of liquor through saloons is a menace to society and government is acknowledged, for there was an unanimity of opinion by those advocating repeal before the Judiciary Committee that the saloon should not be reestablished. The advocates of repeal were not in accord as to the remedy for the claimed unsatisfactory conditions prevailing now. The plan most generally advocated was that the Government should dispense the same under strict regulations. The fact that it is conceded that liquor should not be sold without being under very strict regulations is a concession of its dangerous character.

Mrs. Henry M. Kendrick, in testifying before the committee, said:

The thing needed more than the repeal of any law is an awakening of conscience applying equally to the lawmaker, the law enforcer, and the law observer. We can never be a really great Nation with a vitiated conscience; and with the revival of conscience will come a lessening of the problems confronting us to-day.

Various plans of regulation governing the distribution of liquor in the different States met with dismal failure. The people of the United States turned to the only alternative, that of prohibition. Since its adoption it has contributed to the social, economic, and civic life of the Nation in a very appreciable degree.

The saloon, the rendezvous for the social outcasts, the criminals, and the incubators of the vile and corrupt intrigues of the enemies of good government and law and order, have been eliminated.

Samuel Crowther, one of the foremost economists in the United States, testified before the Judiciary Committee as to the financial benefits obtained by prohibition since its enactment. He said:

At the lowest estimate the country was paying nearly 4 per cent of the national income for drink in 1914 to 1916, and may have been paying as much as 8 per cent. At the very highest estimate, \$1,000,000,000, the country is now paying 1 and a fraction per cent of its income for drink and may be paying less than one-half of 1 per cent. This means a net diversion of spending due to prohibition amounting to somewhere between two and six billions of dollars.

In the days before prohibition many homes were examples of the dreadful toll exacted by liquor, for that which should have supplied the comforts and necessities of the home was spent in the debauchery of a faithless husband, and innocent children, poorly clad and undernourished, were its unfortunate victims. These scenes have been transformed quite generally into contented homes, well-fed children, and saving accounts are rapidly growing.

The statistics for deaths by alcoholism from and including 1911 to and including 1917 shows an average death rate per 100,000 people of 5.2. For 1918, to and including 1928, an average of 2.8. A calculation upon the basis of 100,000,000 people, there has been a saving each year in the United States on account of prohibition of 2,400 lives, or a total during the 11 years of 26,400. The use of intoxicating liquor by those affected by cirrhosis of the liver and Bright's disease makes their ailment more fatal, and prohibition has saved approximately 166,500 lives from those affected with such a dreadful malady.

The tabulated mortality experience of 77 leading life-insurance companies in the United States shows that from 1914 to 1919, inclusive, before prohibition, the death rate was from 61 to 63 per cent, except during the "flu" year, when it ran up to 95 per cent. The averages after prohibition, from 1921 to 1927, inclusive, were 50, 51, 52, and 53 per cent.

A summary of the experiences of Canada with its various plans for the regulation of liquor, including government dispensation, is vividly set forth in a statement sent to the Judiciary Committee by Sir George Foster, former Finance Minister of the Dominion. He said:

You may take it, however, as my considerate opinion, based upon a long experience and wide observation, that the present government sale system in force in the Canadian Provinces is only a temporary

phase in the long series of experiments dealing with acknowledged evils of the liquor traffic in Canada and is by no means a finality.

It has not cured the abuses alleged to have existed under preceding prohibitory systems. It has increased rather than diminished the sale and consumption of alcoholic liquors. It has made easy and respectable to all classes the initiatory facilities for the formation of the drinking habit and has established an active partnership and participation in large and increasing profits between governments, and the traffic under which the latter is rapidly digging itself into a position which it shrewdly hopes to make permanent and unexpungeable. It is my firm conviction that only under complete prohibition can the liquor traffic be successfully combated and that Canada will, in due course, establish that system.

If our prohibition law is repealed, and a Government dispensation system is established, how will it be handled? Who will make it? Who will sell it? Shall our Government be the agency through which it is made? Will it sell to automobile drivers, to engineers on our railroads, to those who are handling dangerous machinery, to the aviators, to those who are dependent on their daily toil in the great industrial centers of the country? It is estimated that there are 40,000,000 drivers of automobiles. There are over 50,000,000 boys and girls in the United States. Shall liquor be easier for the boys and girls to secure? What person is anxious to ride on a train with a drunken engineer, in an automobile with a whisky-influenced driver, or to work with dangerous machinery, with a drinking stationary engineer?

The patriotic American does not retreat when facing great responsibilities, and will not compromise with crime and the enemies of law and order, but will sustain and uphold the eighteenth amendment, the greatest contribution to the moral uplift of the Nation during its existence.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3873) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Carondelet, Mo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Carondelet, Mo., authorized to be built by the Dupon Bridge Co., a Missouri corporation, its successors and assigns, by an act of Congress approved May 14, 1928, heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved February 26, 1929, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from May 14, 1930.

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

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PAYMENTS FOR THE OPERATION OF MOTOR CYCLES AND AUTOMOBILES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12014) to permit payments for the operation of motor cycles and automobiles used for necessary travel on official business, on a mileage basis in lieu of actual operating expenses.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman who reported this bill why he places this burden upon the President rather than upon the executive heads.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The reason for that is that, under the present practice, the Appropriations Committee has been in the habit of putting legislative provisions similar to this bill in the annual appropriation bills. Such provisions are not uniform and, of course, not permanent law. Under this practice, in most instances, the department head effected has been allowed to make his own regulations, with the result that one department will prescribe certain regulations and another department will impose different regulations. This has resulted in confusion and much additional work for the comptroller in getting the accounts adjusted.

Now, by making the President responsible for the rules and regulations, the rules and regulations will be uniform throughout the different departments of the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, are the conditions existing in the various services in the respective

departments variable so that different regulations should be prescribed according to the service of the department?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. In most cases, I think, it would be wholly unnecessary to prescribe different regulations, but if they are necessary, they will, of course, be made. In some cases now the President must approve the regulations before they go into effect, but the department heads do not follow any uniform practice as to the regulations. It would be better practice to require all employees to operate under like or similar regulations and requirements and to make uniform reports.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. What is troubling me is this: Should there not be a provision that this is applicable where the Government would pay the transportation otherwise? Does this in any way extend or broaden the present provisions with respect to the payment of transportation?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No; it does not extend or broaden them in any way at all. It simply makes the practice uniform throughout all the departments, so that the same regulations will apply to all of them.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I would like to inquire whether, in addition to providing for uniformity, it is also anticipated that this will save the Government any money?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Employees can only use their own vehicles under the law now where it does save money.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I mean, will this system save the Government money in comparison with the present system?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I think there is no doubt about that. The reports submitted by the departments at my request indicate that it is cheaper to allow employees to use their own machines than it is for them to hire commercial vehicles.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, as I understand by placing this matter in the hands of the President it will probably be carried out by the Budget Office, who have contact with this very problem always in connection with the estimates, and that machinery will relieve the President of any burden.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I do not think there is any doubt about that. In actual practice the Budget will undoubtedly prepare the necessary regulations in conjunction with department heads for submission to the President.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the executive head of any department, independent bureau, office, or other executive establishment shall find that the expenses of travel, including travel at official stations, can be reduced thereby, he may authorize, under such regulations as he may prescribe and the President approves, in lieu of actual operating expenses, the payment of not to exceed 3 cents per mile for motor cycles or 7 cents per mile for automobiles used for necessary travel on official business.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That a civilian officer or employee engaged in necessary travel on official business away from his designated post of duty may be paid, in lieu of actual expenses of transportation, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, not to exceed 3 cents per mile for the use of his own motor cycle or 7 cents per mile for the use of his own automobile for such transportation, whenever such mode of travel has been previously authorized and payment on such mileage basis is more economical and advantageous to the United States. This act shall take effect July, 1930, and all laws or parts of laws are hereby modified or repealed to the extent same may be in conflict herewith."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, inserting the figure "1" after July, so that it will read "July 1, 1930."

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the language, "this act shall take effect July 1, 1930, and" should be stricken out because it is apparent that this bill is not likely to pass the Senate before that time.

Mr. STAFFORD. My amendment has not been reported and I will withdraw the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMSON: On page 2, in line 12, amend the committee amendment by striking out "this act shall take effect July, 1930, and," and capitalize the word "all."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman believe there should be some definite time stated when this proposed law shall go into effect? It should not go into effect on

the date of enactment, because that might result in confusion; but perhaps we should provide that it shall go into effect so many days after its enactment.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. It would be better, of course, if it went into effect at the beginning of a fiscal year, but that would throw it ahead to 1931.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why not make some provision with respect to a certain stated time after the enactment of the law?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. If we fix a stated time, I think it would be best to fix it July 1, 1931; and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment just offered. If permitted, I would offer in lieu thereof an amendment striking out "July, 1930," and inserting "July 1, 1931."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Dakota offers an amendment to the committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMSON: Page 2, line 12, strike out "July, 1930," and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1931."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFENSES AGAINST THE CURRENCY OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12397) to amend certain sections of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, as amended, so as to modify the penalties for offenses against the currency of foreign countries to conform to the penalties provided for offenses against the currency of the United States.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 156 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 270) is amended by striking out "five years" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen years."

SEC. 2. Section 157 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 271) is amended by striking out "three years" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen years," and by striking out "\$3,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,000."

SEC. 3. Section 158 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 272) is amended by striking out "two years" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen years," and by striking out "\$2,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,000."

SEC. 4. Section 159 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 273) is amended by striking out "one year" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen years."

SEC. 5. Section 160 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 274) is amended by striking out "one year" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen years," and by striking out "\$1,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,000."

SEC. 6. Section 161 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 275) is amended by striking out "five years" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen years."

SEC. 7. Section 170 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 284) is amended by striking out "shall be fined not more than \$2,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both," and inserting in lieu thereof "shall be fined not more than \$5,000 and imprisoned not more than ten years."

SEC. 8. As used in this act, the term "Criminal Code" means the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, as amended.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That sections 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, and 170 of the Criminal Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, and 284), respectively, be, and the same are hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 156 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 270). Whoever, within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, with intent to defraud, shall falsely make, alter, forge, or counterfeit any bond, certificate, obligation, or other security in imitation of, or purporting to be an imitation of, any bond, certificate, obligation, or other security of any foreign government, issued or put forth under the authority of such foreign government, or any treasury note, bill, or promise to pay issued by such foreign government, and intended to circulate as money, either by law, order, or decree of such foreign government; or whoever shall cause or procure to be so falsely made, altered, forged, or counterfeited, or shall knowingly aid or assist in making, altering, forging, or counterfeiting, any such bond, certificate, obligation, or other security, or any such treasury note, bill, or promise to pay, intended as aforesaid to

circulate as money, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 and imprisoned not more than 15 years.

"SEC. 157 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 271). Whoever, within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, knowingly and with intent to defraud, shall utter, pass, or put off, in payment or negotiation, any false, forged, or counterfeited bond, certificate, obligation, security, Treasury note, bill, or promise to pay, mentioned in section 270 of this title, whether the same was made, altered, forged, or counterfeited within the United States or not, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 and imprisoned not more than 15 years.

"SEC. 158 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 272). Whoever, within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, with intent to defraud, shall falsely make, alter, forge, or counterfeit, or cause or procure to be so falsely made, altered, forged, or counterfeited, or shall knowingly aid and assist in the false making, altering, forging, or counterfeiting of any bank note or bill issued by a bank or corporation of any foreign country, and intended by the law or usage of such foreign country to circulate as money, such bank or corporation being authorized by the laws of such country, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 and imprisoned not more than 15 years.

"SEC. 159 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 273). Whoever, within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, shall utter, pass, put off, or tender in payment, with intent to defraud, any such false, forged, altered, or counterfeited bank note or bill, mentioned in section 272 of this title, knowing the same to be so false, forged, altered, and counterfeited, whether the same was made, forged, altered, or counterfeited within the United States or not, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 and imprisoned not more than 15 years.

"SEC. 160 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 274). Whoever, within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, shall have in his possession any false, forged, or counterfeit bond, certificate, obligation, security, Treasury note, bill, promise to pay, bank note, or bill issued by a bank or corporation of any foreign country, with intent to utter, pass, or put off the same, or to deliver the same to any other person with intent that the same may thereafter be uttered, passed, or put off as true, or shall knowingly deliver the same to any other person with such intent, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 and imprisoned not more than 15 years.

"SEC. 161 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 275). Whoever, within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, except by lawful authority, shall have control, custody, or possession of any plate, stone, or other thing, or any part thereof, from which has been printed or may be printed any counterfeit note, bond, obligation, or other security, in whole or in part, of any foreign government, bank, or corporation, or shall use such plate, stone, or other thing, or knowingly permit or suffer the same to be used in counterfeiting such foreign obligations, or any part thereof; or whoever shall make or engrave, or cause or procure to be made or engraved, or shall assist in making or engraving, any plate, stone, or other thing in the likeness or similitude of any plate, stone, or other thing designated for the printing of the genuine issues of the obligations of any foreign government, bank, or corporation; or whoever shall print, photograph, or in any other manner make, execute, or sell, or cause to be printed, photographed, made, executed, or sold, or shall aid in printing, photographing, making, executing, or selling, any engraving, photograph, print, or impression in the likeness of any genuine note, bond, obligation, or other security, or any part thereof, of any foreign government, bank, or corporation; or whoever shall bring into the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof any counterfeit plate, stone, or other thing, or engraving, photograph, print, or other impressions of the notes, bonds, obligations, or other securities of any foreign government, bank, or corporation, shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

"SEC. 170 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 284). Whoever, within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, without lawful authority, shall make, or cause or procure to be made, or shall willingly aid or assist in making, any die, hub, or mold, or any part thereof, either of steel or of plaster, or of any other substance whatsoever, in the likeness or similitude, as to the design or the inscription thereon, of any die, hub, or mold designated for the coining of the genuine coin of any foreign government; or whoever, without lawful authority, shall have in his possession any such die, hub, or mold, or any part thereof, or shall conceal, or knowingly suffer the same to be used for the counterfeiting of any foreign coin, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 and imprisoned not more than 10 years.

"SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term 'Criminal Code' means the act entitled 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States,' approved March 4, 1909, as amended."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend sections 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, and 170 of the Criminal Code, as amended."

AMENDING THE ACT FOR THE SURVEY OF PUBLIC LANDS WITHIN THE LIMITS OF LAND GRANTS

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 649 (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.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Subject to objection for consideration.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS. Reserving the right to object, after a cursory reading of the bill it seems to me that we are here giving back to the railroads something that they are not entitled to. In other words, it strikes me that the railroads making these surveys make them as much for themselves as for anyone else, and we ought not to be solicitous of making the refund.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. The gentleman will recognize that there are two laws—one provides for land certificates and one does not. In case of the lands surveyed that were not within certain qualifications, the money has been deposited with the Treasurer and can only be used for the purpose of surveying certain lands. For various reasons some lands could not be surveyed, and the money is left in the Treasury. The Government can not use it and, of course, they can not return it. The money was deposited for a certain purpose.

Mr. JENKINS. And the money belongs to the railroad company?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Yes; it was put there for the survey of certain lands that can not be granted to the railroads.

Mr. JENKINS. Was not the money deposited in a lump sum for the survey of a vast territory, and that did not contain as much land as they thought and now they seek for a refund of what is left.

Mr. COLTON. No; the deposit was made for surveys of specific tracts and afterwards it was found that the land, for one cause or another does not come within the provisions of the grant. It might be discovered for instance that they were mineral lands, and if they have made a survey of mineral lands they are not entitled to them and the Government can not pass title to such lands to the railroad. In such cases, having put up the money and done the work they are entitled to receive the money back.

Mr. JENKINS. How much money is involved in this bill?

Mr. COLTON. I do not think that was disclosed before the committee.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it a large sum?

Mr. COLTON. No; I think it is only a few thousand dollars at the outside, perhaps not a hundred thousand. However, that is merely a guess; I do not know.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield? My thought about the bill is this, that the surveys were made exclusively for the benefit of the railroad companies, and the expense ought to be borne by the railroads.

Mr. COLTON. That would be true if they could receive the land.

Mr. COLLINS. But they received a part of the lands sought by them.

Mr. COLTON. No; unless they receive the lands.

Mr. COLLINS. The surveys were made for the benefit of the railroad companies because they believed they would get the lands and get them without cost, and therefore the railroads ought not to be whining now.

Mr. COLTON. That would be true if they could get the lands, but failing in that through no fault of theirs they are entitled to their money back.

Mr. COLLINS. They got their lands.

Mr. COLTON. They did not get these lands.

Mr. COLLINS. They got some of them.

Mr. COLTON. They did not get the lands for which this money was deposited to cover the expense of survey.

Mr. COLLINS. But they secured some of them.

Mr. GREENWOOD. At whose request were the surveys made? For the benefit of the railroad, was it not?

Mr. COLTON. The railroad, yes; but the Government might take the initiative.

Mr. GREENWOOD. If the railroad companies asked for these surveys in order to determine whether there was land there they could receive, and if expense was incurred in order to make that discovery and it was determined against them in the end, then they ought to bear the expense.

Mr. COLLINS. The situation is just the same as if railroads had filed a suit for land, and had lost the suit and then asked the court to require the United States to pay the costs.

Mr. JENKINS. How did they determine how much should be put up?

Mr. COLTON. It was, of course, an estimate.

Mr. JENKINS. The railroad companies and the Government were in contractual relations. Both parties assumed that there should be so much land, and the railroad company put up so much money, assuming there was that much land. It turned out that there was not much land, but they got some land. Is not that a fulfillment of the contract on the part of the parties?

Mr. COLTON. But that is not the fact. These grants are made by statutes. The law designates in a general way the land. The land can not be used, however, by the grantee, the railroad, until the lands are surveyed. The grantee puts up the money, that is, the railroad puts it up and surveys the land, and after the survey it is discovered that they are mineral lands, for instance, and the railroad is not entitled to take that class of lands at all. The result is, therefore, that they have been required to survey certain definite lands which they could not take, not because of their own fault, but because of the fault of the law, which would not permit the passing of mineral lands. Therefore, they have put up their money and have done the work for nothing.

Mr. COLLINS. It is just a case of the railroads betting their luck against the Government's money.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Will some one permit me to inquire why the alert and diligent gentleman in charge of that desk would return to a matter so controversial as this when there are so many other bills on the calendar?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman from Louisiana can easily stop it.

Is not section 2 of the bill rather unusual under our financial arrangement? It is provided there that money shall be paid out of the Treasury on the simple certificate of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. COLTON. The first act passed, which authorized this deposit for a survey, expressly provided for that but the second act did not.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman will concede that that is bad legislation.

Mr. COLTON. In numerous other cases we provide for the repayment of funds that can not be properly applied by the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNALS TO ADMINISTER OATHS, ETC.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2828) authorizing commissioners or members of international tribunals to administer oaths, to subpoena witnesses and records, and to punish for contempt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether this is not a clear departure and innovation?

Mr. HICKEY. No; this is for the purpose of taking testimony before a foreign commission in cases like the case of Blackmer, who left the country and went to France. There is a tax case pending in the District here, where a law passed by Congress in 1926 was sustained that authorized imposing a fine upon him notwithstanding the fact that the man is in a foreign country, because he refused to appear and testify and submit to a summons from one of the consular officers.

Mr. JENKINS. What I object to primarily is this: The language of this bill provides, or would admit of the interpretation that any tribunal or commission engaged in an international conference would have the right any place to invoke contempt proceedings.

Mr. HICKEY. Oh, no.

Mr. JENKINS. The language admits of that interpretation, and it strikes me that that would be a great departure.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course, it has to be a tribunal in which the United States is a party, and also a question in which a citizen of the United States has an interest.

Mr. JENKINS. The language is:

And every person knowingly and willfully swearing or affirming falsely in any such proceeding, whether held within or without the United States, its Territories or possessions.

Anywhere in the world, and any party in any kind of an international controversy, could invoke contempt proceedings. This would give any such commission in session anywhere in the world authority to demand testimony and to punish as for contempt anyone who might refuse to testify, regardless of how far they were invading the rights of the party. And, again, suppose this contempt proceeding were commenced in a foreign country, what officers would be employed to make the arrest for contempt and carry out the punishment? It is going too far.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I think I can shorten this discussion very much, because I am going to object to the bill anyway.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the objection of the gentleman go to the extraterritorial powers that would be vested in these clerks in administering oaths?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. No; my objection goes to the contempt proceedings. One of the most vicious things in the world is the power to punish for contempt. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection has been heard and the Clerk will call the next bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings be vacated for two minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the bill was objected to be vacated. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I object.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TENNESSEE RIVER, TENN.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12554) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Knoxville, Tenn.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Henley Street, in Knoxville, Knox County, Tenn., authorized to be built by the city of Knoxville, Tenn., by an act of Congress approved February 13, 1929, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from February 13, 1930.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRADE CROSSINGS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 4223) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the elimination of grade crossings of steam railroads in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1927.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. SIMMONS. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and reserve the right to object.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say in regard to this legislation, so that the record will show, that three years ago the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House and Senate, considering the danger of grade crossings in the District of Columbia, and appalled by the casualties which had occurred just prior to that time, passed authoritative legislation for the elimination of those crossings. Some of the most dangerous of the grade crossings have been eliminated, and at this crossing in question, four lives were lost in the last 18 months.

This bill, changing the original authorization from a viaduct bridge to an underpass, has been recommended by the engineering department of the District of Columbia, and the appropriation for the actual work has been approved by the Director of the Budget, and has been inserted in the District appropriation bill which is now pending in a deadlocked conference. So far as I know, every Member of the House and of the Senate who is interested in District legislation, as well as the municipal authorities, and the Director of the Budget are in favor of this improvement and the elimination of this dangerous crossing, with the possible exception of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

I contend that when a matter has been considered for three years and has been recommended by the recognized administrative authorities of the District, has been recommended by the Director of the Budget, and in accordance with that recom-

mentation has been inserted in the bill by the Senate that such legislation should pass. I am unable to understand the persistent opposition of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on the District of Columbia to legislation of this kind.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to make this statement: The highway department has stated that this grade crossing is third in importance in construction work of grade crossings at this time. The gentleman says the Budget recommended this bill. That is an error. The Budget recommended a different type of crossing at this point, and this is an attempt to change that plan.

The whole set-up of this present scheme is to tax the District of Columbia the entire cost of the project when it is in the interest of the people of Maryland instead of the people of the District of Columbia.

You had a plan here once before to put a part of this over into Maryland. It was changed so that Maryland did not have to pay a cent on it, and it is not for the benefit of the people of the District of Columbia, but for the benefit of the people of Maryland. It will be three years before they want to build this viaduct, and there is no need to authorize it now.

I have another objection.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I would like to know what the real objection of the gentleman is.

Mr. SIMMONS. Immediately after these authorization bills go through the District Committee takes the position that Congress is absolutely bound to make the appropriation at once no matter what the facts are. I am going to object to such authorizations until there is an opportunity to carry them out.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. This was to change it from a viaduct to a subway, on the recommendation of the District authorities instead of the people of Maryland, who are willing to spend \$150,000 for connecting roads leading up to this viaduct.

Mr. SIMMONS. Not one dollar of this project will be paid for by the people of Maryland.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The gentleman knows that in that immediate vicinity Maryland has built two subways on Maryland soil, to which the District does not contribute a cent, and yet it is used by hundreds of thousands of people in the District of Columbia. The gentleman wants to set up an imaginary line when he sets up this line. He manifests a hallucination that it is going to confer some benefit on the people of Maryland.

I will say further that the gentleman, in taking this item, recommended by the District Commissioners and by the Director of the Budget, out of the District bill, advised me that he took it out to widen H street from Thirteenth Street to Seventh Street, and when I called the gentleman's attention to the fact that he was creating a bottle neck for traffic by not continuing that widening to Massachusetts Avenue, the gentleman said that this could be done later. So the situation is that here is a grade crossing on which four people have lost their lives during the last 18 months, and the gentleman takes it out of the bill for the benefit of the widening of H Street and casually says he thinks it is more important and necessary than this.

Mr. SIMMONS. What I said to the gentleman—and I will say it again—is that, in my judgment, the people of the District of Columbia are entitled to have their tax money spent for their own benefit, and that it was better for the people of the District of Columbia to spend this \$200,000 in widening streets in the business section of Washington than it was to build a viaduct that is not needed on the border of the District. There is a subway in the District within 200 yards of this point, and still the gentleman wants this one. There is an overhead bridge within a half mile of it in Maryland. It is a little residential community in Maryland which is interested and nobody else.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman that I hope every Member of the House will read the gentleman's remarks in the RECORD, that legislation passed by a legislative committee of the House is in no way binding up the members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the gentleman had wanted to raise that issue, he had an opportunity when the appropriation bill was before the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SIMMONS. I object.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF ARKANSAS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9590) to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, I find a very meager committee report, and I ask that some

Member from Arkansas or some member of the Committee on the Judiciary advise the House whether the Attorney General has recommended the creation of this new judgeship?

Mr. McKEOWN. I will state to the gentleman that we investigated that matter very thoroughly and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN] can answer as to the condition down there. We found it was necessary on account of the fact that one of the judges at this time is not at all able to carry on his work.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. How long has he been disabled?

Mr. PARKS. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PARKS. The judge who is now ill, I think, is one of the most efficient and able judges of the South. His illness is due to the fact that he has worked almost every single day on the bench and in his office at night on account of the enormous amount of business in his district. The oil fields of Arkansas are within his district. There is an enormous amount of civil and criminal business, because of the fact that all of the oil cases are carried into the Federal court. The State has almost 2,000,000 people and only has two judges. It is utterly impossible for those two judges, working every day, to discharge their duties and carry on the business of those courts.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman has given the House information with reference to the extraordinary number of oil cases which are clogging the court calendars in Arkansas. Does the gentleman also find that part of the clogging is due to an increase in prohibition cases?

Mr. PARKS. That is true; and I will say that this does not create a new district, but provides for a new judge, whose jurisdiction will be coextensive within the State, and I assume the present two judges will turn over the liquor cases to the new judge, and they can handle all the other cases.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. This bill is another example of the added cost to the taxpayers of the country by reason of the sumptuary Federal prohibition laws. However, I shall not interpose an objection to its consideration.

Mr. PARKS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the United States District Court for the Eastern and Western Districts of Arkansas, who shall, at the time of his appointment be a resident and a citizen of the State of Arkansas.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "judge," strike out the words "for the United States District Court."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS RAINY RIVER AT BAUDETTE, MINN.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill (H. R. 12233) authorizing the Robertson & Janin Co., of Montreal, Canada, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rainy River at Baudette, Minn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no objection to returning, subject to a reservation of objection to consideration.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if I am assured that my colleague has withdrawn his objection, then I will allow the bill to pass; but if it is taken up in his absence, without his consent, I shall have to object.

Mr. KNUTSON. My purpose in taking it up is that I expect to leave the Chamber in a few minutes. Otherwise I would be glad to wait for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATTERSON] to return. I told the gentleman what I had in mind, and he suggested that I take the matter up with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] and iron out whatever differences there were. I have taken the matter up with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Did the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] interpose an objection at the time?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I have stated personally I think it is a bad bill.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Is the gentleman willing to allow it to pass the objection stage and allow it to be taken up out of order?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. At the end of a session like this, I do not like to be the only one to object.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is not a bridge for 75 miles up and down the river.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I understand; but the gentleman is attempting to take it up out of order, and my colleague has objected to it.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is not a bridge for 75 miles up and down the river.

Mr. GREENWOOD. That does not make any difference. If the gentleman objected he has the right to have that objection honored and not to have it taken up out of order unless he withdraws his objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the request for the time being.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS PROPOSING TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Concurrent Resolution 31, to print 10,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the House Committee on the Judiciary on joint resolutions proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States relating to the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors within the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the printing act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, empowered to procure the printing of 10,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the Seventy-first Congress, second session, on joint resolutions proposing to amend the eighteenth article of the Constitution of the United States relating to the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors within the United States, and of this number the committee shall cause to be delivered to the folding rooms of Congress not to exceed 8,200 copies, of which 1,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and not more than 6,700 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire of some member of the Committee on Printing as to the expense that will be occasioned by the printing of this large number of copies of the hearings on prohibition before the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Seven thousand dollars according to the report.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the estimated cost of the printing of the hearings that were held before the Committee on the Judiciary on the modification of the prohibition law?

Mr. BEERS. About \$160,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman informs the House in a rather low tone, which is his natural tone, that 10,000 copies will cost \$160,000. I think I made a mistake in not being on my feet to reserve the right to object to the consideration of this resolution and for more than one reason, not only because of the estimated cost, \$160,000, but I question very much whether very many of the 15 copies assigned to the Members of the House will be utilized. Like many such voluminous documents they will smolder, smolder, and smolder in the catacombs of the Capitol without ever being called for by the Members of the House.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There must be some mistake. The report shows the cost to be \$7,311.18.

Mr. KIESS. That is correct.

Mr. BEERS. I had some other matter in mind.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will acquit the chairman of the Committee on Printing, who is burdened in the closing days of the session with so many requests for publications, diseases of cattle, diseases of the horse, and all kinds of proceedings, for the printing of proceedings of the G. A. R. and other veterans' associations. But even if it only cost \$7,000, does the gentleman think that all the Members will utilize the copies assigned to them? I know that the alert Members who have been on the firing line from the beginning of the session, working not only days but nights in an effort to keep the liquid fumes burning, will utilize their 15 volumes; but will that be general of the membership of the House? Does the gentleman think that the dry Members will have occasion to distribute the 15 volumes that are accorded to them?

Mr. BEERS. There has been a great demand for the books.

Mr. BACHMANN. I can say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that there is a great demand for copies of these hearings. Being a member of the Judiciary Committee I have had a number of requests myself, but I do not know whether that is true of other Members of the House or not.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can understand that there might be a demand for copies of the hearings from those Representatives who come from dry districts. Up to the present time I have not received one request, but perhaps in my district, where there is a great deal of fluidity, I may have occasion to distribute the 15 at my disposal.

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

The resolution was concurred in.

CONTROL OF THE DESTRUCTIVE FLOOD WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12129) for the control of the destructive flood waters of the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is anyone here from the Flood Control Committee?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would suggest that a law is no place in which to put a speech. The first nine lines mean nothing in law but are simply a speech. For instance, the bill reads:

That due to the widespread cause and effect of the destructive flood waters of the various streams of the United States, flood control has ceased to be exclusively a local problem, and on such streams as are subject to periodic destructive floods, a Federal interest is declared to exist; that wherever flood control is feasible and economically justifiable, as shown by surveys authorized by Congress, the United States will—

And so on. Gentlemen, that is not law.

Mr. BARBOUR. Would it not have been more enlightening if, instead of putting in that language, they had stated what this is going to cost?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That would have been helpful. Then I want to call the gentleman's attention to page 3, from lines 9 to 15; also I would like to call his attention to page 3, lines 19 to 23. I really believe the bill is not well drawn and I think it ought to go over in order to receive more study.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Can the gentleman tell from a reading of the bill what it means or what it is expected to do?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is what I am trying to say in polite terms.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. This is the only bill reported by the Flood Committee at this session and is only reported because it is an emergency measure.

Mr. CRAMTON. Where did the bill come from which we passed the other day for Tittabawassee and a few others?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. That was from Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; that was from the Committee on Flood Control and related to various creeks and streams in various States.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MILITARY STATUS FOR CERTAIN AMERICAN CITIZENS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9893) to provide a military status for certain American citizens. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the military status of soldiers of the United States forces during the period of the World War, April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918, shall be extended to American citizens who fulfill the requirements set forth in paragraph 1 of this act.

1. American citizens of American birth who volunteered in the French military forces without surrendering their American citizenship, and who, while serving in flying status in the Lafayette Escadrille or Lafayette Flying Corps, received injuries of a permanent nature of more than a 10 per cent degree in line of duty between the dates of April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, as shown by the official records of the French War Department.

2. The benefits extended under this act shall be limited to those persons who were disabled in the manner described in paragraph 1, after they had evidenced an intention of seeking transfer to the American forces in France, and whose transfer was subsequently prevented because of such injuries. Such evidence of the intention to seek transfer

shall be presumed, upon the affirmative oral or written statement of a commissioned officer or former commissioned officer of the Army of the United States.

3. Any such persons, who fulfill the requirements set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this act, and who, in the opinion of the Director of the Veterans' Bureau are in need of hospitalization and compensation, shall, upon application, either in person or through their guardians, be entitled to the same benefits and privileges under this act as if the said injuries had been received while members of the American military forces.

4. The benefits provided under this act shall be limited to those persons who have been heretofore, or may hereafter be, rated by the Veterans' Bureau as permanently disabled to a degree of not less than 50 per cent.

5. The provisions of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, are hereby waived under this act in so far as the limiting dates of proof of service connection of disability and time limit of application are concerned.

6. That in order to receive benefits under this act any French pension to which the beneficiaries hereunder may be entitled shall be surrendered.

7. That no payment of compensation awarded under this act shall be retroactive in effect.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the military status of a soldier of the United States forces during the period of the World War, April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918, shall be extended to Herman Lincoln Chatkoff, an American citizen, who was permanently injured in line of duty on June 15, 1917, while serving with the Lafayette Escadrille or Lafayette Flying Corps in France, and from date of application to the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau he shall be entitled to the same hospital treatment and compensation as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulations for soldiers of the United States who served with the American expeditionary forces who have become physically disabled in line of duty.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, are hereby waived, under this act, in so far as the limiting dates of proof of service connection of disability and time limit of application are concerned.

"SEC. 3. That in order to receive benefits under this act any French pension to which the beneficiary hereunder may be entitled shall be surrendered following the approval of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

AMENDMENT OF LOCOMOTIVE BOILER INSPECTION ACT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3845) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911, as amended March 4, 1915, June 26, 1918, and June 7, 1924.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take occasion under reservation of objection to point out the successive increases of salary that the Congress has voted to the inspectors of boilers under the Federal inspection law. Originally, in the Mann-Elkins Act, or in whatever act they were originally provided for, their salary was \$1,800 a year, or perhaps less. Then an amendment was brought to the House increasing the salary of the inspectors to \$3,000. There are a great number of these inspectors throughout the country. I notice that since then the salary has been increased to \$3,600, and now it is proposed to increase the salary of these inspectors to \$4,000.

I would like to ask the gentleman, who has always been alert in matters pertaining to the locomotive inspection service, and particularly the personnel connected with that service, whether their duties are very onerous, and whether there has been a large turnover in the service by reason of the fact they now receive \$3,600.

I see my colleague from the fourth Wisconsin district, with his eagle eye, as if he were ready to pounce upon me; and, if the gentleman from Ohio has not the information, I am sure my colleague has information as to whether their duties have increased and the occasion for this proposed increase of \$400.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The duties of these inspectors are highly technical. I personally know many experienced locomotive engineers who have taken the civil-service examinations, and although they appeared to be exceptionally well qualified they have not been able to qualify.

Furthermore, since the present salary scale has been enacted for the inspectors, the men in the railroad service from which the inspectors have been recruited have had their salaries or wages raised on various occasions. I have received many communications from the representatives of the railway labor organizations in favor of this legislation. They believe the caliber of men employed and the technical nature of their services warrant this increase. I may frankly state that from my own personal experience I believe this inspection law is one of the best laws ever enacted by the Congress to protect men employed on the railroads as well as to protect the interests of the railroads.

I sincerely hope the gentleman will let this bill come before the House and help in its enactment into law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio, who may have more informative facts in answer to my query.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I would like to state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this is one of the most important Government services we have to-day. It is true the salaries of the chief inspector and his two assistants and the field men have been increased from time to time, but the increases they have received have not been any greater than the increases that have been given all along the line to other Government employees.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Does this bill include boiler inspectors and locomotive inspectors, or is there any difference between the two grades?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. No; locomotive boiler inspection includes the inspection of the boiler, the locomotive, the tender, and all the appurtenances connected with the locomotive.

Mr. JENKINS. Then a person designated here as a boiler inspector is a locomotive inspector?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. In line with what the gentleman has said, is it not true that it has been the policy of the Department of Commerce and all the departments that have transportation facilities in charge to get the best men possible to fill these positions?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. The very best men; and right on that point I will say that Mr. McManamy, the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, appeared before our committee a few days ago and stated they are now holding examinations for new inspectors. This examination is country wide, and he stated that not 3 per cent of those who take the examination qualify under the specifications which the Interstate Commerce Commission lays down for this position.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the House when the Congress last increased the salary of these inspectors?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. In 1924, I believe, and the reason we are asking for this increase now is that the boiler-inspection bureau of the Interstate Commerce Commission did not come under the classification of the Welch Act of 1923 or 1924, and the Reclassification Board therefore could not consider an increase in salary for the employees of this bureau. The Interstate Commerce Commission has recommended that those in charge of the locomotive boiler inspection bureau shall have their salaries increased for the reason that they do not come under the provisions of the Welch Act. The increases asked for, in a great many instances, do not provide as large a salary as has been granted under the Welch Act for the chiefs of some of the other bureaus in our Government service.

Mr. STAFFORD. What will be the total amount of these increases?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. About \$16,000 will be the total amount for all the increases provided in this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911, as amended March 4, 1915, June 26, 1918, and June 7, 1924, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. That section 3 of said act is hereby amended so as to provide that the salary of the chief inspector shall be \$7,500 per year, and the salary of each assistant chief inspector shall be \$6,000 per year.

"SEC. 4. That section 4 of said act is hereby amended so as to provide that the salary of each district inspector appointed under said act shall be \$4,000 per year."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the words "to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That section 3 of said act is hereby amended."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "Sec. 4" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 2," and after the word "act" insert "as amended."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "year" and insert in lieu thereof "year."

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word of the committee amendment. I make this conventional motion for the purpose of having read, during probably two minutes, a paper which I think is most appropriate at this time for the information of Members of the House with reference to the Couzens bill. I ask the Clerk to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RAILROAD LABOR DEMANDS SQUARE DEAL FOR PUBLIC

E. J. Manion, of St. Louis, Mo., is president of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, with 60,000 members in the United States and Canada. Members of this organization are to be found in every railroad station in this country, however small.

Mr. Manion is also secretary of the Association of Railroad Labor Executives, the organization which represents all the standard railroad labor organizations, with a membership of more than 1,000,000 in the United States and Canada. Mr. Manion is therefore in a position to speak for the railroad workers.

In a telegram to Congressman O'CONNOR of Louisiana, Mr. Manion has the following to say about the Couzens resolution:

"Thanks for your letter and interest displayed. May I point out that Couzens resolution adequately protects all involved—the public, labor, and real business—while the substitute does not, and is a crude attempt to make it appear that labor is entirely selfish and only desirous of securing unfair advantage?"

"The cause of the whole people is the cause of labor, and we have no desire to be made a special class to be pampered and subsidized as is 'big business.' For that reason we are unalterably for the Couzens resolution and against the substitute.

"E. J. MANION,

"President Order of Railroad Telegraphers."

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHOSE PROBLEM IS UNEMPLOYMENT?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two unemployment bills, and insert therein a short statement by the New York Federation of Labor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, on May 22 I introduced in this House three bills known as H. R. 12550, H. R. 12551, and H. R. 12552. These three bills have been referred to as the unemployment bills and are identical to those introduced in the Senate by Senator WAGNER, of New York. The reference is, indeed, significant of the intent and purpose of these bills because they suggest methods which, if adopted, will help solve the terrible unemployment conditions existing throughout the United States.

I was elected to represent the eighteenth congressional district of New York at a special election held on March 11 and I was sworn in as a Member of this House on April 16. While my membership in this House has been of short duration, it was my great privilege to have represented the eighteenth Senatorial district, in the State of New York, for seven years at the State Capitol in Albany. As a State Senator, I gave particular attention to labor and welfare legislation and I intend to continue that interest as a Member of this House. Therefore, as the youngest Member of the House, in the point of service, I respectfully ask your special attention and consideration of my remarks on the three unemployment bills.

The following is a brief description of the three bills that I have introduced:

H. R. 12550 provides for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes.

H. R. 12551 provides for the advance planning and regulated construction of certain public works, for the stabilization of in-

dustry, and for the prevention of unemployment during periods of business depression.

H. R. 12552 provides for the establishment within the Department of Labor of the bureau of labor statistics. This bureau shall collect, collate, report, and publish at least once each month full and complete statistics of the volume of and changes in employment, as indicated by the number of persons employed, the total wages paid, and the total hours of employment, in the service of the Federal Government, the States, and political subdivisions thereof, and in the following industries and their principal branches: (1) Manufacturing; (2) mining, quarrying, and crude petroleum production; (3) building construction; (4) agricultural and lumbering; (5) transportation, communication, and other public utilities; (6) the retail and wholesale trades; and such other industries as the Secretary of Labor may deem it in the public interest to include.

I feel certain that these unemployment bills when enacted into law will be a valuable and substantial contribution to the happiness and welfare of the people of our country.

Entirely too much valuable time has been consumed by idle theorizing over the question, Whose problem is unemployment?

I have listened to all sorts of reasons and explanations regarding the best method of solving the unemployment problem. Regardless of the merit of the arguments on this subject, I respectfully insist that this is the proper forum in which constructive action should be initiated as an example for the entire country. The responsibility of the Federal Government must not be shirked, for the prevention of unemployment is a distinctly national obligation.

Unemployment to-day is not produced by local causes. The forces which make for the shutdown of factories, the curtailment of activity in the mines and on the railroads are forces which operate on a national and world-wide scale. The individual workman, the individual business, the State, are helpless when an economic storm breaks upon the country. Only the coordinated strength of the entire Nation is competent to deal with such powerful economic forces.

Unemployment has nation-wide effects. The shutdown of a factory in Boston directly affects the business of an orange grower in Florida. Purchasing power destroyed in one place is at once translated into unemployment in some other place. No scourge known to man spreads as quickly as unemployment. When it begins to spread there is no immunity which the individual workman, farmer, or business man can secure for himself. Quarantine can not stop it. State boundary lines can not stop it. Only the cooperatively organized effort of the entire Nation can prevent it. To me the evidence is overwhelmingly conclusive that the problem of unemployment is so big, so important and so complex that it will take the full and wholehearted cooperation of individuals, of business, of municipalities, of States, and the Federal Government to solve it.

The bills which have passed the Senate, due to the untiring efforts of Senator WAGNER, would have the Federal Government undertake so much of the job of preventing unemployment as it can most effectively accomplish. The sooner the Federal Government does its share, the sooner will States, municipalities, and private industries be in a position to contribute theirs. The prevention of unemployment is a national task to which the entire Nation must devote itself. Theories will not discharge the Government of the responsibility to do its part.

What portion of that task properly belongs to the Federal Government?

First. The Federal Government should collect accurate information of employment, unemployment, and part-time employment. Such information is fundamental. No intelligent effort to control unemployment can be exerted without it. To-day we have no such information. The Federal Government is the agency best equipped to secure it.

Second. The Federal Government is always engaged in constructing highways, developing rivers and harbors, erecting flood-control structures, and public buildings. It should plan these projects in advance and time them so as to make available opportunities for employment when private business slackens.

Third. The Federal Government should join with the States in the establishment of a nation-wide system of public employment offices, so as to assist workers to find jobs and to assist employers to find workers with the least amount of delay and with the least amount of friction. Such a system will establish cooperative channels for the free flow of labor between States and between markets.

This is but a bare outline of what the Federal Government can do toward the prevention of unemployment. It is such a plan which is written into the three bills which have been passed by the Senate.

If the Federal Government should begin to exercise these functions, certain definite results may be expected. We shall know where we stand from month to month. We shall no longer grope in the dark. The information will be useful to the Federal Government, to the States, and municipalities, and to each and every intelligent farmer and business man in the country, who will be enabled to guide production by prospective consumption.

Public construction will be concentrated in periods of depression. If the Federal Government will set the example the States and municipalities will do likewise. A public-works program which costs the Nation about \$3,000,000,000 a year will be turned into a balance wheel to keep employment steady. We shall begin to know something about the unemployed. We shall learn what happens to the men displaced by machines and mergers; what is the fate of men who lost their employment after 40? If we know the facts, I believe we shall find solutions.

We can not help but think of the terrors of unemployment. Poverty, penury, hunger, want, disease, and misery are still the great worry of the average man and woman from the cradle to the grave.

If we should be mindful of the anxiety and the heart-breaking scenes which are being enacted daily in the homes of the unfortunate victims of our unemployment conditions, if we should visualize the long lines of men and women applying to the various charitable organizations for a mere crust of bread to feed their children, I am sure that not one Member of this House could conscientiously refuse to vote for the passage of these bills.

The long range plan bill authorizes an appropriation of \$150,000,000; the employment exchange bill, \$4,000,000. These are big sums of money even for a country as large as the United States. But when you stop to compare these figures with the costs of unemployment, then you become competent to judge which way lies true economy. In one single month last winter factory workers alone lost in wages \$200,000,000. In the first three months of 1930 it has been estimated that wage earners alone lost no less than a billion dollars in wages. If by a little expenditure of money and a big expenditure of thought and plan we can build a dam to shut off this Niagara of money losses arising out of unemployment, is it not sound economy to do so? Consider what it would have meant to the farmer, to the manufacturer, and in turn to the worker if this vast amount of purchasing power had not been withdrawn from the markets.

If the only arguments that can be offered against the passage of these bills is the one relating to the cost to carry out the provisions of the bills, then I insist upon immediate favorable consideration, because no man with a drop of red blood in his veins can stand idly by and permit these measures to be pushed aside when he knows of the hardships and privations being suffered by so many of our best citizens for reasons beyond their control.

Are you going to permit the insistent and pathetic appeals for help to go unanswered?

If there were political advantage to be gained by championing the cause of the unemployed, this problem would have been tackled long ago. The unemployed never make campaign contributions. They do not control any portion of the press through which to bring their plight home to the American people. They maintain no lobby in Washington to tell their depressing story to their Representative in Congress. Their only spokesmen are those who have responded to the common call of humanity; the only advocates of their cause are those who pursue the welfare of our country irrespective of party advantage.

Ladies and gentlemen, I earnestly and sincerely urge you to help me have the Wagner bills, which are identical to mine and which have been passed by the Senate, reported by the Judiciary Committee of this House, so that we may have a vote before this week goes by. Please remember that no problem before this Congress is deserving of attention until we have settled this important question. Let me remind you that although the vast army of unemployed is not organized so as to conduct a vigorous campaign for the passage of these bills, that army of unemployed is anxiously watching your actions, hopeful of some relief and assistance.

There is a wide public interest in this subject, and if you will but do your duty you will have the great personal satisfaction of knowing that you have helped in a worthy cause. What greater reward could any statesman expect than the following tribute:

[New York State Federation of Labor Bulletin, June 14, 1930]

Congressman MARTIN J. KENNEDY, of New York City, who was elected to Congress while serving here as State senator this year, has intro-

duced the Wagner employment relief bills in the House of Representatives. He is a sincere and effective supporter of genuine labor legislation, as his 7-year record in the legislature of this State amply proves.

I hope that my remarks have aroused your interest in the subject of unemployment, and that the question, Whose problem is unemployment? shall not remain unanswered. My answer is that it is our problem, and I shall do everything possible to bring about the passage of this indispensable legislation. Ladies and gentlemen, will you not please accept my answer to this problem and act promptly and favorably?

COLORADO REGIMENTS AT GLORIETA PASS, 1862

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, on Glorieta Pass, and to include therein certain historical citations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I appear in support of H. R. 11049, which was recently introduced by me in order to have study made for the purpose of commemorating Glorieta Pass, Pigeon Ranch, and Apache Canyon, battle fields in the State of New Mexico, in which battles the First Regiment of Colorado Volunteers, sent to New Mexico by Governor Gilpin, the first Territorial governor of Colorado, played the most active part in settling the Confederate activities in the Rocky Mountain country.

The part that Colorado played in the Civil War was an exceedingly creditable one. Between four and five thousand men enlisted, and they were a superb body of citizen soldiers. The Colorado regiments were in more than a score of battles and skirmishes. They especially distinguished themselves in the hard-fought engagements in Glorieta Pass between Fort Union and Santa Fe. Eugene Parsons, in his History of Colorado, states: "This has been called the bloodiest battle of the war."

In Prince's History of New Mexico it is stated:

During the winter of 1861-62 the Confederate leaders arranged a comprehensive program of campaign for the far West, which was intended to have the very important result of separating the Pacific States from the rest of the country, and finally taking possession of them with their long line of sea coast and wealth of gold. The plan was to send an army northerly from Texas to conquer New Mexico and to take possession of the great stores of Government arms and munitions at Fort Union, and then to proceed into Colorado, thus cutting all the lines of communication between the East and the far West; and afterwards making a junction with the Mormons of Utah, whom they hoped to have as allies, and with them march to California. The importance of this campaign can hardly be overestimated, for it was intended not only to secure to the Confederacy the long unguarded coast line, which it so much needed, but by greatly extending its territory to give it vastly increased prestige in the eyes of the nations of Europe. * * *

During the fall of 1861 the Texan forces were gathered at El Paso, and by New Year included 2,300 men, commanded by Gen. H. H. Sibley. * * *

In February the southern army under General Sibley, about 2,500 strong, appeared in the valley of the Rio Grande. Sibley attempted to gain a position which commanded the fort and Canby endeavored to cut off the enemy from a water supply, the various skirmishes culminating in the Battle of Valverde on the east side of the Rio Grande on February 21, when Canby's army failed in its object, and he was forced to recross the river to Fort Craig. Sibley then marched up the valley and occupied Albuquerque, and there being no means of resistance at hand the United States officials evacuated Santa Fe on March 3 and retired to Fort Union, Sibley's army occupying the capital a week later.

Meanwhile Governor Gilpin had sent the First Regiment of Colorado Volunteers, under Col. John P. Slough, southward from Denver to the aid of the threatened territory, and after a hard march they arrived at Fort Union on March 11, where they were thoroughly armed and equipped, and whence they marched with very little delay along the old trail toward Santa Fe. They were joined by a few companies of Regular troops that had been in the north of the territory, and by a considerable number of volunteers, and on the 20th of March met the advancing Confederate Army at Apache Canon, or Glorieta. The battle fought here, though hardly known to history, was the decisive conflict which settled the result of the war in the Rocky Mountain country. On the first day only a part of each army was engaged, and the contest, though stubborn and long continued, was indecisive.

Early in the next morning Capt. Manuel Chavez led 400 men under Maj. J. M. Chivington by a circuitous and difficult path to the rear of the Confederate position. In the main battle, which was fiercely contested and which lasted for five hours, Sibley succeeded in driving the Union soldiers back some distance to Koslowsky's ranch; but at this moment Chivington fell upon the rear of the Confederate force and destroyed its wagons and supplies. The news of this loss demoralized

the Texan Army, the fate of the day was changed, and Sibley commenced a retreat southerly, evacuating Santa Fe on April 8 and proceeding down the valley. He was closely followed and was greatly embarrassed by want of supplies. On April 15, at Peralta, he was attacked by the Union forces and suffered considerable loss, and was forced to retreat as rapidly as possible to El Paso to avoid capture. * * *

This ended the campaign, and indeed was the end of the war in New Mexico so far as organized enemies were concerned. In July, the first detachments of the "California column," which had marched across the deserts of Arizona, reached Fort Thorne. * * * Its remarkable march across the desert from the Pacific to the Rio Grande is one of the most gallant achievements of the entire war.

The historian, Hubert Howe Bancroft, in the seventeenth volume of his works, states:

Colorado, under energetic Union management, not only was able to control the strong secession element within her borders but to send a regiment which struck the decisive blow in ridding her southern neighbor of invaders (p. 686).

The regiment was composed largely of "Pikes Peakers," the best of fighting material. * * * (p. 693).

The troops left Denver in February, 1862; the battle at Apache Canyon was fought March 26, when Major Chivington advanced with all of his forces to a mile beyond the rancho, at the mouth of the Apache Canyon proper, found a Texan battery posted, which opened fire. * * * After a sharp fight on the flanks the battery yielded. * * * Chivington before night fell back to Pigeon's rancho, to bury his dead, care for the wounded, and send back the prisoners (p. 694).

The Frenchman, Alex. Vallé, known as "Pigeon"—whence the name "Pigeon's rancho"—described Chivington's operations as follows: "H poot 'is 'ead down and foight loike mahd bull" (p. 695).

On the 28th, 370 Colorado Volunteers and 120 Regulars had been guided by Lieut. Col. Manuel Chavez over the mountains to the rear of the enemy, where they arrived about noon. Descending the precipitous cliffs in single file, they drove off the Texan guard, capturing several of their number, spiked the cannon, killed the mules, burned 64 wagons, and destroyed all the enemy's supplies, thus rendering it impossible for the Confederates to continue their offensive operations. This virtually ended the campaign; the "Pikes Peakers" had proved more than a match for the "Texan Rangers," saving New Mexico for the Union; and Chivington had made himself the hero of the war (p. 697).

A letter from a Texan to his wife, found at Mesilla, gives a very vivid description of the fight and of their surprise when, "instead of Mexicans and regulars," they saw "they were regular demons that iron and lead had no effect upon, in the shape of 'Pikes Peakers' from the Denver gold mines." * * * "They had no sooner got within shooting distance than up came a company of Cavalry at full charge, with swords and revolvers drawn, looking like so many flying devils. On they came to what I supposed certain destruction, but nothing like lead or iron seemed to stop them, for we were pouring it into them from every side like hail. In a moment these devils had run the gantlet for half a mile and were fighting hand to hand with our men in the road." (P. 695.)

Bancroft closes his chapter with a reference to the act of the Legislature of the Territory of New Mexico at its 1862-63 session, which passed resolutions thanking the brave California and Colorado troops for their timely aid, with one paragraph especially complimentary to the Californians, and concludes as follows:

This paragraph brought out a letter from Governor Evans, of Colorado, who, in view of the fact that the Californians had not arrived until the campaign was over, complained of injustice done to the Coloradans, who had really expelled the invader. Accordingly at the next session the legislature attempted to set the matter right, solemnly affirming, in a resolution respecting the Colorado troops, that "it is not the intention to place these brave soldiers second to none."

Some time ago I communicated with Maj. Gen. William D. Connor, commandant of the Army War College, in regard to a monument to commemorate this site, and received from him a letter under date of March 20, 1930, in which he stated:

With reference to the several questions contained in the last paragraph of your letter concerning the classification of these engagements, they all pertain to the Class II, b group mentioned in Report No. 1071 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, upon H. R. 11613.

It is noted that the skirmish at Apache Canon, in the State of New Mexico, occurred on the 26th of March, and the engagement at Glorieta, or Pigeon's Ranch, on the 28th of March, 1862; also that the commanding officers of the Federal forces were from Colorado.

No study has been made of the New Mexico campaign for the purpose of commemoration, as no request has been made for such study. Under authority of Public, No. 372, Sixty-ninth Congress, approved June 11, 1926, the Secretary of War is directed to have made studies and investigations of battle fields in the United States, but as there are several

thousand of these places, only such are considered as have been brought to the attention of the Secretary of War by a Member of Congress.

Pursuant to the suggestion in General Connor's letter, I now take the liberty of directing your attention to this campaign in the West, so that the same may be studied for the purpose of commemoration.

MEMORIAL TABLET TO OFFICERS AND MEN LOST ON THE U. S. SUBMARINE "S-4."

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. J. Res. 140), a joint resolution to provide for the erection of a memorial tablet at the United States Naval Academy to commemorate the officers and men lost in the U. S. submarine S-4.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to provide for the placing of a memorial tablet in Memorial Hall at the United States Naval Academy in commemoration of the officers and men who lost their lives in the U. S. submarine S-4 on December 17, 1927.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$400, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOAN OF SILVER SERVICE TO THE STATE MUSEUM, NEW ORLEANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 525), an act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Louisiana State Museum, of the city of New Orleans, La., the silver service in use on the cruiser *New Orleans*.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Louisiana to the fact that it is customary to provide for loaning these silver services. Would the gentleman have any objection to make an amendment?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I have not.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Louisiana State Museum, of the city of New Orleans, La., for preservation and exhibition the silver service which was in use on the cruiser *New Orleans*: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for the delivery of such silver service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the words "deliver to the custody of" and insert in lieu thereof the words "loaned to."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

VACATING AN ORDER FOR THE RETURN OF A BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, as reported on page 11544 of the RECORD, I asked for the adoption of a request to the Senate for the return of S. 4722 to the House. I now ask unanimous consent to have that order vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to vacate the order requesting the Senate to return a certain bill. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLIGAN. I object.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will withhold his objection, it is immaterial except to clean up the records of the House. The order has not gone through the Senate, and whether it does or not does not matter a great deal. Does the gentleman insist on his objection?

Mr. MILLIGAN. Yes.

SILVER SERVICE OF CRUISER SOUTH DAKOTA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3893) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the State of South Dakota the

silver service presented to the United States for the cruiser *South Dakota*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to loan to the Department of History of the State of South Dakota, for preservation and exhibition, the silver service which was presented to the United States for the cruiser *South Dakota*, which vessel afterwards was renamed the *Huron*, by the citizens of that State: *Provided,* That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for the delivery of such silver service.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

REGULATION OF TOLLS OVER CERTAIN BRIDGES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12488) to provide for the regulation of tolls over certain bridges.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to ask one or two questions. As I understand it this bill provides that the saving clauses of certain bridge bills passed before May 23, 1906, should be amended so that they might come within the purview of the bill passed at that time. Is there anything in this bill anywhere that would control or seek to control the rights of any of the bridges that were constructed from 1901 on down to the time when we commenced to put in the recapture clause five years ago?

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, no. The general bridge law of March 23, 1906, authorized the Chief of Engineers or the Secretary of War in proper cases to regulate tolls. Bridge bills passed prior to that time contain no such regulation. Therefore, there is no authority now to regulate tolls on such bridges. This bill is to give the Secretary the same right to regulate tolls on bridges built prior to that time that he has on bridges built since that time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman inform the House to what extent the Secretary of War exercises the privilege of regulating tolls under the act referred to?

Mr. DENISON. He exercises that authority whenever complaint is made to him showing excessive tolls are being charged.

Mr. STAFFORD. In how many instances has he exercised that authority?

Mr. DENISON. I am unable to tell that, but in quite a great many.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. When complaint is made upon whom is the burden of showing that the rate is excessive?

Mr. DENISON. When complaint is made that tolls are too high and unreasonable, the Secretary of War refers the matter to the district engineer of the district in which the bill is located. He advertises or announces the fact that he will have a public hearing and anyone who wishes to be heard can appear before him and be heard. The evidence is taken down and is transcribed, and the engineer renders his decision and forwards it to the Chief of Engineers who reexamines it and either approves or disapproves his findings.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the War Department any prescribed rule that it follows as to the basis of valuations to be followed in determining the reasonable charges of toll?

Mr. DENISON. I do not know of any such prescribed rule.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Interstate Commerce Commission has a prescribed rule so far as the valuation of interstate carriers is concerned. I am wondering whether the War Department is as meticulous in such matters and whether they have a rule as to the valuation of bridges, because the valuation is the main, primary starting point in determining whether the tolls are reasonable or not.

Mr. DENISON. As to all bridges that were built before 1906 the Secretary of War would of course have to take into consideration any legitimate elements of value that may be shown, because we can not retroactively change the general rule as to valuation in condemnation proceedings.

Mr. STAFFORD. We could under the reserved power of the right to repeal, contained from time immemorial, in all these bridge acts. We could set down the basis on which valuation should be determined. Congress can determine the yardstick.

Mr. DENISON. Of course there is no question that we can do so with reference to all bridges built hereafter, but there is a very serious doubt in my mind as to whether Congress can retroactively change the recognized rule of valuation, and

deny to the owners of a bridge every element of value to which he is entitled under the Constitution.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. We did with the railroads.

Mr. DENISON. I do not think we did. Some people claim that we did, but the Supreme Court took a different view.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. As the gentleman knows, in each separate bill, we reserve the right to alter, repeal, or amend.

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Does the gentleman think he can apply certain rules as to those bridges authorized by separate bills prior to 1906 in a general bill to-day?

Mr. DENISON. That is the view of our committee. We think that we can do that. It is not entirely free from doubt, but I think that Congress has the right under its general power under the commerce laws of the Constitution to regulate tolls charged on interstate commerce going over the bridges.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I think so, too; but as the gentleman pointed out a moment ago, these bridges were built under authority contained in several specific acts, and whether we can now bring in a general law and apply it to them is not free from doubt.

Mr. DENISON. It is not entirely free from doubt, but my own judgment is we can do that.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. A few days ago the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURNETT] told me that it had been definitely stated that hearings would be held on the question of amendments to the general bridge act at the December session of Congress. Will the gentleman confirm that?

Mr. DENISON. Yes. I submitted that matter to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recently. I told the chairman and members of the committee that I had been working on this proposition for several years, and that unless the committee would assure me the bill would be taken up at the beginning of the next session of Congress I myself would drop the question; but that if they would grant a hearing I would perfect the bill this summer and have it ready for their consideration, and they have agreed to do that.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read the bill S. 4517, a similar bill, on the Speaker's desk, and the bill H. R. 12488 will lie on the table.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That any bridge authorized prior to March 23, 1906, by act of Congress specifically reserving to Congress the right to alter, amend, or repeal such act, shall, in respect of the regulation of all tolls, be subject to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire to take this opportunity to call the attention of the House to the muddled and hopeless situation that exists concerning toll bridges. While this bill, in a measure, will bring a color of control, gentlemen should just stop to consider the antiquated system under which we are operating. Think of submitting the question of the reasonableness of tolls on public bridges to the Secretary of War!

Of course, in the old days of sailing ships and horses, before the day of automobiles, or even of railroads, the Secretary of War had jurisdiction over the navigable waters in order that those waters might not be encumbered and the use of them prevented for navigable purposes. But we have outlived that condition. Even by bringing in bridges heretofore authorized under the act of 1906 is not sufficient to remedy existing evils and will bring little or no relief. All that it will do, when complaint is made to the Secretary of War, will be that the Secretary of War will refer the matter to the district engineer, an Army officer, and he will have some sort of a hearing. There is nothing in the law limiting rates or furnishing the basis and factors for rate-making purposes.

Gentlemen, soon or or later—and I hope it will be very soon—we must give this whole question of bridges thought and study and revamp and rewrite all the law on toll bridges entirely and provide first for the permit, and then put the matter of tolls under the jurisdiction of a proper department having experience and facilities for rate-making purposes.

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

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Why does not the gentleman offer an amendment to the bill to do that? I think the gentleman is entirely right.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think every Member of the House will agree with me that the matter should be carefully thought out and considered. The matter requires careful consideration. A bill of this kind can not be written on the spur of the moment or by amendments from the floor. I do hope that the House will soon give the subject serious consideration, write an entirely new law on bridges, and end the abuses and exploitation possible and existing under the present law and practice.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, simply to make this suggestion in the matter of toll bridges. Probably it is not an easy problem simply because the conditions in the different places where different bridges are to be constructed are so different. I have had some feeling that some different policy should be followed in some respects, but I want to suggest that that responsibility is up to the House and to the individual Members rather than just on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or the subcommittee and its chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am speaking of the general conditions, and am not criticizing the gentleman from Illinois or his committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am sure the House understands that. In the case of some bills affecting a proposed bridge in my district, I have tried to work out plans that seemed to me to more fully protect the public interest.

I want to say that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and especially the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON], have been very receptive as to any suggestions, even though they have been contrary to their ordinary practice. The committee can not work out individual problems as I have attempted to work out mine, but if the Members having these bills from their districts and better acquainted with conditions will take the lead to better protect the public interest, I am sure they will have a fair hearing from that committee, and meet with very sympathetic consideration.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to state, in response to what has been said, that this subject has been given careful consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for some two or three years. As stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], it does seem at first thought that this matter ought not to be left to the Secretary of War or to the Chief of Engineers. But Congress adopted that policy when it enacted the general bridge act of March 23, 1906. I have maintained for several years that the general bridge law ought to be revised and codified. It is a very serious problem as to where we are going to lodge the power of regulating tolls on bridges. These bridges are scattered all over the United States. It is a question whether it is wise to put that duty on the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has no facilities for making such investigations. The investigations must, of necessity, be local, because the bridges are local. We must hesitate before we delegate that power to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Congress in 1926 said that inasmuch as the Secretary of War had division engineers or other officials all over the United States looking after the interests of navigation, we could impose that duty on the Chief of Engineers. It may be that Congress ought to change that policy and delegate the duty of regulating tolls on bridges to the Interstate Commerce Commission or some other Government agency. We expect to give this whole question further consideration and prepare a general bridge bill for the approval of Congress during the next session.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, in 1906 the question was not as important as it is to-day. The increased importance has arisen from the introduction of the automobile and the construction of bridges, many crossing interstate streams. That commission would naturally be the one to do it because it is work akin to its work. But the fact that the toll bridges are scattered all over the country is no more opposing than that short-line railroads are scattered all over the country and that the traffic over railroads pertains to the entire country.

Mr. GREENWOOD. When a local community is anxious for a bridge, they are willing to have a toll bridge, where, if it is interstate in its nature, the travelling public that will go over it would have consideration, and I think some tribunal should look into the interstate features of the situation.

Mr. DENISON. That is true, but the gentleman must understand that we are not a regulating body, except to investigate the question of the cost of the bridge.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

I agree with what has been said with reference to the regulation of tolls and the necessity of the committee considering the question of general revision of the bridge act of 1906, but only a small part of this bridge controversy has been touched upon to-day. I am interested in tolls, but I am also interested in the inflation of securities in connection with these projects. Congress has provided for and there have been constructed on the Mississippi River about seven bridges. Four of the seven bridges have defaulted in the payment of the interest on the bonds. The bonds were sold at par, and the bonds can now be bought at \$25 or \$30. Many of the bonds were sold in St. Louis, my home. The bridge in the gentleman's city, Cairo, has not yet had a chance to default. It has not been there long enough.

Mr. DENISON. And I may say to the gentleman it is not going to default.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I hope it will not, because many of the bonds were also sold in my city. Many of the bonds for the construction of other bridges have been sold to my constituents. I want to protect their interests. I also want to say the time has arrived when the State should have some voice as to whether a bridge should be built within its boundaries. Under present conditions Congress can pass a law providing that a bridge, an intrastate bridge, can be constructed, and, despite the fact that the State does not want a private toll bridge constructed within its boundaries, it has no voice whatsoever under existing law. There are a great many questions that have arisen since the automobile has come into use. I have been trying to get a hearing upon this question before the committee for several years, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] knows.

I have introduced a bill. It was prepared by the American Association of State Highway Officials. It was approved by the United States Bureau of Public Roads. Last year we were promised a hearing at this session of Congress. We did not get the hearing. Now, we are promised a hearing in December, and I sincerely hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] will see to it that we get a hearing in December.

Something must be done to stop the building of toll bridges. We must prepare proper safeguards so as to prevent promoters from inflating toll-bridge projects as they have in the past. In some instances I realize that toll bridges must be constructed by private capital, but public convenience alone should not be sufficient to enable one to secure permission to construct a bridge. The promoters should be required to show that the project is a necessity and further that it is feasible from a financial standpoint. Not one-fourth of the bridges authorized by the Congress since I started to oppose the passage of these bills have been constructed or will be constructed. The papers and magazines throughout the country have had sufficient to say regarding toll-bridge projects and toll-bridge promoters that it is practically impossible to finance a new project to-day. Toll bridges when necessary should be constructed by the States and municipalities and not by private individuals.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

PARRIS ISLAND, S. C.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11367) to provide for certain public works at Parris Island, S. C.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1792) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of California.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a member of the Judiciary Committee or the sponsor of the bill why it is necessary to provide for an additional judge for the southern district of California, when California now has two Federal judicial districts with three judges in each district?

Mr. BACHMANN. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that California needs a judge as badly as any other district in this country, especially southern California. The judicial council, meeting last October, found that the southern district of California was greatly in need of some assistance.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will this additional judge be needed if the court commissioners bill which was sponsored on the floor of the House by the gentleman a few weeks ago becomes law? The gentleman told us that if the commissioners bill was enacted there would be no need for these additional judges.

Mr. BACHMANN. The gentleman must take into consideration the fact that only prohibition and petty criminal cases will come before the commissioners, but the need of an extra judge in southern California is on account of the congestion caused by private and civil litigation.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Are we to infer that there is no congestion by reason of the sumptuary Federal prohibition law? Does the gentleman have the figures before him indicating how many prohibition cases are pending in the California Federal courts?

Mr. BACHMANN. There is no question but what the enforcement of the prohibition law has caused congestion in the Federal courts.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. And many of the cases now pending are due to the Federal prohibition law?

Mr. BACHMANN. That is not true in the southern district of California.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. But in California?

Mr. BACHMANN. In the northern district of California that is true, but in the southern district of California the congestion is because of civil and private cases.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. These bills are coming before the House day after day, causing an added drain on the Treasury and expense to the taxpayers as a result of the sumptuary Federal prohibition laws.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. No; by reason of violations of the law.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Because we have such laws on our statute books our court calendars are becoming congested, and we have to provide more judges and appropriate many additional thousands of dollars each year. However, I shall not object, sincerely hoping that the American people will realize the fallacy and cost of prohibition in the near future and force a repeal of the eighteenth amendment and the Federal laws enacted thereunder.

Mr. PATTERSON. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I want to make this statement: We are getting near the end of these Federal judge recommendations.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; we are not.

Mr. PATTERSON. I mean on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. New York has to be taken care of yet.

Mr. PATTERSON. I do not say that we are at the end, but we are nearing it. I want to say in commendation of the fairness of the gentleman from West Virginia who introduces these bills, that when he made this investigation wherever he found necessity for an additional Federal judge, in his judgment, he introduced a bill. There was no bill introduced where it was not shown, according to his best judgment, that a Federal judge was needed. I wish to commend him for that spirit. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman from West Virginia has been very industrious. He has introduced bills providing for not less than 17 additional judges throughout the United States.

In addition to that he helped to have judicial powers conferred upon one thousand three hundred and odd United States commissioners. Now, what I want to call to the attention of the House is this: If the district in California needs this judge, all right; but another condition exists, and that is this—if the efforts of the gentleman from West Virginia are crowned with success, I am fearful that half the population of the United States will be put in jail. That may be the result of the appointment of 17 new judges and the conferring of judicial powers upon one thousand three hundred and odd United States commissioners. We are away behind in our jail accommodations.

While the House has passed an appropriation in the deficiency bill amounting to over \$7,000,000 for new penitentiaries and jails, it will take us at least five years to catch up; so I think we should hold in abeyance the further commitment of prisoners, if possible, until we catch up with our building program.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is aware, from his experience in or observation of many cases in Greater New York, that many of these prisoners are committed and are awaiting trial, and that the crowded conditions existing in the jails are because there are not enough trial judges to give them an opportunity of a trial.

Mr. BOYLAN. I believe we can handle them as expeditiously as they are handled in Wisconsin. I do not think there is any special delay in New York.

Mr. STAFFORD. I say that generally throughout the country the difficulty has been that United States commissioners have committed them for trial and there are not enough trial courts to hear and dispose of the cases.

Mr. BOYLAN. You have given judicial powers to one thousand three hundred and odd commissioners.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the gentleman must remember that is dangling in the air.

Mr. BOYLAN. That is true. As I have stated, the industry of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN] will add 17 more judges and also give judicial powers to 1,300 commissioners, so I feel sure that if this program prevails, we who are out of jail can consider ourselves extremely fortunate.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is still hope.

Mr. STAFFORD. Especially if they have the immunity of Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BOYLAN. We are not going to hide behind our immunity.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course, the gentleman knows the commissioners' bill is not a law as yet.

Mr. BOYLAN. I do. However, I do not want to impede the progress of the bill or to have the industry of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN] slowed up in his efforts to have more judges appointed. For that reason, and also for the reason that the people of California want this additional judge imposed upon them by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN], I will withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to appoint by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California. The judge so appointed shall reside in said district and his compensation and powers shall be the same as now provided by law for the judges of said district. A vacancy occurring at any time in the office of the district judge herein provided for is authorized to be filled.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12232) authorizing P. D. Anderson and W. B. Johnson, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande River between Presidio, Tex., and Ojinaga, Mexico.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be stricken from the Calendar. I do that at the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] and the gentleman who introduced the bill, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WURZBACH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE CHOCTAWHATCHEE RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12617) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Florida, through its highway department, to construct a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River, east of Freeport, Fla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Florida, through its highway department, and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Choctawhatchee River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, east of Freeport, Fla., connecting the counties of Washington and Walton, Fla., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out the words "and its successors and assigns."

In line 5, after the word "a" insert the words "free highway."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

SPECIAL REPORT ON THE DISEASES OF CATTLE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Joint Resolution 323, to authorize the printing with illustrations and binding in cloth of 120,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I suggest that owing to the number of books available now the number be reduced from 120,000 to 80,000 and the appropriation reduced accordingly.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I think there will be no particular objection to the reduction, but I do want to make this observation. There is a great demand in my district and in other congressional districts for these books, and I think so far as the information that is dispensed by the Agricultural Department is concerned there is nothing more valuable or more eagerly sought than these publications.

Something has been said in the past, perhaps by the gentleman from New York, about there being undisposed of copies in the folding room, but I have not been able to get any of them. If there are any city Representatives who have any they would like to transfer to my account I would be pleased to use them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This is what I have in mind, and I am sure my colleague from New York City, who is sitting here, will bear me out in the statement that we have not any very great demand in Manhattan for books on the disease of cattle.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Certainly not.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I thought if we provided for 80,000 copies that would cover the need, or I would suggest that we let this bill go through and kill the book on the horses. Is there any demand for the horse book?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Oh, yes; the demand is just as great for those books.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Did some legislation providing for prints of these books go through on Calendar Wednesday when the Committee on Agriculture had the call?

Mr. GREENWOOD. No; but it has been up before on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I may answer the gentleman by stating that a resolution went through providing for the printing of 320,000 books, but I held the matter up so the chairman of the Committee on Printing could put through this resolution in lieu of the one that had already passed the House.

Mr. CRAMTON. What has become of that bill providing for 320,000?

Mr. ANDRESEN. It is lying dormant in the Senate, not being pressed, waiting for action upon this resolution.

Mr. CRAMTON. And that was for the horse books and the cattle books?

Mr. ANDRESEN. Just the cattle books.

Mr. CRAMTON. And if this resolution goes through, then we have the gentleman's assurance that the other one will be permitted to die in the Senate?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I will not press it.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman will assure us it will not go through?

Mr. ANDRESEN. So far as I know it will not go through. I have no control over the Senate, but I have not pressed it since

sometime in February, when it originally passed the House, and I do not intend to press it now.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. May I say that we are in this position: If we pass this bill to-day, the House already having passed, by default or otherwise, a bill providing for 300,000 books, there is quite a possibility of the Senate acting on both of the bills without any amendment, and we would then have 450,000 copies.

Mr. PATTERSON. My own personal feeling would be that we would not want anything like that to happen.

Mr. CRAMTON. It being the gentleman's own bill, I could hardly think that even the Senate would pass it in opposition to his wishes, although I admit it is hard to prophesy what they may do.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I have no intention of pressing it for action.

Mr. CRAMTON. That satisfies me.

Mr. GREENWOOD. In further reply to the gentleman from New York, 120,000 would give each district about 250 or 260 copies, and when we distribute that number over 8 or 10 agricultural counties, that means about 25 to the county, which is a very small allotment, and I hope the gentleman will not insist upon his proposed amendment.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield to my colleague from Manhattan.

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman said the New York City Members would not require so many copies of these books.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. On diseases of the cow; yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Let me say to the gentleman that it has been suggested by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency that we may need it for the diseases of the bulls and bears. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; we may need it badly before long.

I will say that the gentleman from Minnesota holds the whip hand here, having passed a resolution providing for 320,000 copies.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Five hundred for each Member.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. May we have the assurance of the gentleman from Minnesota, in whom we have the utmost confidence, if this bill passes the House to-day he will ask that no action be taken on his bill in the Senate?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I have already made that request in the Senate, pending action upon this bill.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I assume then the gentleman from New York will not ask for a reduction in the number.

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

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and is hereby, authorized to have printed with illustrations and bound in cloth 120,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle, the same to be revised and brought to date, of which 90,000 shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 25,000 for the use of the Senate, and 5,000 for the use of the Department of Agriculture; and to carry out the provisions of this resolution there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$60,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table to-morrow morning, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISEASES OF THE HORSE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) to authorize the printing with illustrations and binding in cloth of 62,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEHLBACH). Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have just noticed in this joint resolution and also in the prior one that there is no provision that these publications, the Diseases of Cattle and Diseases of the Horse, shall be distributed through the folding room. I think some provision should be made so that these publications will be within the control of the membership of the House, and I would suggest an amendment that so far as those available to the House are concerned they be distributed through the

folding room. Has the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] considered the propriety of such an amendment?

Mr. ANDRESEN. The understanding we have with the chairman of the Committee on Printing is that they will be distributed through the folding room and each Member will receive his quota.

Mr. GREENWOOD. There would be no objection then to an amendment that they be so distributed?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall offer the amendment in due course.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and is hereby, authorized to have printed with illustrations and bound in cloth 62,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, the same to be revised and brought to date, of which 45,000 shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 12,000 for the use of the Senate, and 5,000 for the use of the Department of Agriculture, and to carry out the provisions of this resolution there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "date," insert "to be distributed through the folding rooms of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: On page 1, line 7, after the word "date," insert "to be distributed through the folding rooms of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING SPECIAL REPORT ON THE DISEASES OF CATTLE

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings whereby House Joint Resolution 323 for printing Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle be vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was again reported.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, on page 1, line 7, after the word "date," insert the words "to be distributed through the folding rooms of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTIMATES FOR MAINTENANCE OF FLOOD-CONTROL WORKS, LOWELL CREEK, SEWARD, ALASKA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5708) for estimates necessary for the proper maintenance of the flood-control works at Lowell Creek, Seward, Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized to submit for the consideration of Congress such estimates as are, in his judgment, necessary for the proper maintenance of the flood-control work at Lowell Creek, Seward, Alaska, constructed under authority contained in Public Resolution No. 52, Sixty-ninth Congress, approved February 9, 1927.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 3, after the word "submit," insert the words "from time to time."

Line 8, after the figures "1927," strike out the period, insert a comma, and the following words: "and appropriations are hereby authorized to be made for such estimates as may be found necessary."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GAME REFUGE WITHIN Ocala NATIONAL FOREST, FLA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1959) to authorize the creation of game sanctuaries or

refuges within the Ocala National Forest in the State of Florida.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I can not approve of a bill creating a bird sanctuary and then in a proviso destroying the very purpose of the sanctuary. Of course, if there is consent given to strike out the proviso on page 2, commencing at line 16 I will not object.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I want to concur in the gentleman's position. I do not believe in legislating for some department to fix regulations so that the sanctuary may be destroyed. I want to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Under the guise of destroying surplus animals and birds the whole purpose of the sanctuary is destroyed.

Mr. YON. This is not my bill, but the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] is unavoidably absent, and under the circumstances the bill better be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I spoke to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN], or he consulted me, and I told him my objections to it. I think he understands my objection and I think he would sooner have the bill passed with the proviso stricken out.

Mr. YON. If the gentleman does not mind, I would like to have the bill passed over without prejudice.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN TRIBES OF INDIANS IN MONTANA, IDAHO, AND WASHINGTON

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11753) to amend an act for the relief of certain tribes of Indians in Montana, Idaho, and Washington.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

Mr. STAFFORD and Mr. LAGUARDIA also objected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three objections having been heard the bill is stricken from the calendar.

GRANTING OIL AND GAS PROSPECTING PERMITS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 317) an act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant certain oil and gas prospecting permits and leases.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I am waiting to learn the difference between what is granted in these bills and the relief desired.

Mr. CARTER of Wyoming. Let me say that the original claims were filed under the placer mining law, and when they applied for a patent the Commissioner of the General Land Office told them that they had had sufficient discovery and they paid their money. On review they said there was not sufficient discovery to grant a patent. In the meantime the leasing law went into effect and under section 19 of this law they were given six months to do assessment work, but while going for a patent the six months expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. See if I get this right. They filed claims under the placer law and if they had been given the patent they could mine without paying any royalty. But under the leasing law they had to pay a royalty? They failed in that?

Mr. CARTER of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And in the meantime the time had expired?

Mr. CARTER of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. During this period of six months the Department of the Interior had determined that their application was good and valid, and the money had been paid, and as far as they knew it was simply a matter of doing the clerical work of writing the patent. At a later time the Department of the Interior changed its mind, but this preferential right had expired while the papers were held in the department.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. So that if this bill becomes a law they will be enabled to obtain oil?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And pay royalty?

Mr. CARTER of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Under the leasing bill they had in 1920.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And if this bill fails, what is the condition of this company?

Mr. CARTER of Wyoming. They have a lawsuit on their hands. In a letter from the Secretary of the Interior ad-

dressed to me, dated May 24, 1930, he says among other things:

The danger of drainage mentioned in your letter is believed to be such as to make it a matter of concern to this department that early action be taken by Congress, to the end that the royalty interests of the Government may be fully protected, and the controversy be terminated fairly for both the Government and the company.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And if this bill fails, how does this company stand in relation to all other applicants who desire to go on that land for oil?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. If this bill fails, then the Government must permit the leasing to go at a lower rate per barrel of oil under other provisions of the bill than it can obtain under this particular provision of the bill, under which they want to lease these lands.

Mr. LEAVITT. The situation as it has been presented to me by the Department of the Interior is that this bill must be passed in behalf of the Government or a long litigation will result while the land is being drained.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then is there danger that this land is being drained?

Mr. LEAVITT. At the time these claims were presumably being perfected drilling went on, and it was only a matter of 1,500 or 1,600 feet, but much deeper wells are now being drilled on three sides of these lands.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And these other wells are on private property?

Mr. CARTER of Wyoming. The lands are all under royalty of about 5 per cent, and the minimum of this is 12½ per cent, and it may be 33 per cent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to grant either prospecting permits or leases under the terms and conditions of section 19 of the act approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. L. p. 437, title 30, sec. 227, U. S. C.), to any claimant of title under the placer mining laws, to the southeast quarter of section 30, the east half of section 31, and the northwest quarter and southeast quarter of section 32, in township 51 north, range 100 west of the sixth principal meridian, in the State of Wyoming: *Provided,* That satisfactory evidence be submitted of entire good faith of such claimant under the mining laws, although without such evidence of discovery as to satisfy said Secretary of the claimant's right to a patent; also, that said lands were not reserved or withdrawn at date of initiation of mining claims thereto; also, that applications for such permits or leases be filed within six months from date of this enactment, and that at date of such filing the area covered thereby be free from any valid adverse claim of any third person.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

QUARANTINE AGAINST INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF LIVESTOCK

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Joint Resolution 326, for the amendment of the acts of February 2, 1903, and March 3, 1905, as amended, to allow the States to quarantine against the shipment thereto or therein of livestock, including poultry, from a State or Territory or portion thereof where a livestock or poultry disease is found to exist, which is not covered by regulatory action of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. JENKINS. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object.

BRIDGE ACROSS FOX RIVER, AURORA, ILL.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12614) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Aurora, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge from Stolps Island in the Fox River at Aurora, Ill., to connect with the existing highway bridge across the Fox River north of Stolps Island.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of Aurora, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge from Stolps Island in the Fox River at Aurora, Ill., to connect with the existing highway bridge across the Fox River north of Stolps Island, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SATURDAY HALF HOLIDAY FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 471) providing for a 44-hour week for certain Government employees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN POSITIONS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 215) to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1923, entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services," as amended by the act of May 28, 1928.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. As I understand this bill, it seeks to increase the salaries to be paid in the highest grade by a general average of \$100. It is to create further promotion so that the salaries of all of the clerks shall be increased \$100?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Not at all. Under the Welch Act, which was passed in 1928, it was intended to revise the schedules carried in the compensation schedules of the classification act so as to bring about an increase of \$120 a year by dropping the two lower salary rates within a grade and adding two higher salary rates at the top of the range of the grade. As a matter of compromise in some instances there was only one salary rate added to the top and that resulted in having not the same number of rates within a grade as heretofore. The act provided that employees should retain the same respective rates in the grades as heretofore, but a construction by the Comptroller General brought about the result that about 60 per cent of the employees received an increase of \$120, and about 40 per cent in the same offices throughout the services received only \$60. This is to restore the original plan and have the same number of salary steps within a grade, so that uniformity may be carried to the employees. I have a letter before me from Col. J. Clawson Roop, the Director of the Budget, which I shall read:

JUNE 24, 1930.

DEAR MR. LEHLBACH: I have your inquiry of even date regarding the relation of S. 215, "An act to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1923, entitled 'An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services,' as amended by the act of May 28, 1928," to the financial program of the President.

I beg to advise you that the expenditures contemplated by the bill S. 215, as reported in the House of Representatives, with amendments, would not be in conflict with the financial program of the President.

Yours very truly,

J. CLAWSON ROOP, Director.

Mr. STAFFORD. Did I understand that in the operation of the Welch Act the clerks receive automatic promotions to higher grades if their work is proficient and satisfactory?

Mr. LEHLBACH. It is not a promotion to a higher grade. It is a higher salary for the position in the grade in which it is allocated; and in some instances, as I say, that resulted in a salary carrying an additional \$60 being provided, while employees in like circumstances and like grades received an increase of \$120. This is to equalize that.

I have explained the full purport and the scope of the original bill. But the House committee reported it out with an amendment, which at the same time restores the authority of the Personnel Classification Board in reviewing and revising allocations that heretofore existed, but of which the board was stripped by a ruling of the Comptroller General. That destroys the uniformity of salaries throughout the service, because to insure it you must have one central agency that has the last say. This restores that part of the law as it was before the opinion of the Comptroller General changed it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do the employees receive the same salaries while in the departments as in the field service?

Mr. LEHLBACH. So far as possible they do. A survey has been made, and a full report will be available at the next session of Congress, so that a revision and classification can be made, making the field and District services uniform. The present classification provides only for the District of Columbia; but in so far as it is administratively possible, it has been

extended by authority carried in appropriation bills to the field services.

Mr. PATTERSON. Does this add to the higher salaries?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Absolutely not. It only applies to the ordinary run of clerks.

Mr. PATTERSON. To the lower class?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not true that the clerks' organization opposes this?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Not at all. The bill has the most hearty approval of the general officers of the National Federation of Federal Employees. This is the only organization to which the ordinary run of clerks in the departments belong. There is no rival organization.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. What is the attitude of the Comptroller General?

Mr. LEHLBACH. The Comptroller General and the Budget Bureau have no objection to the administrative provisions of this bill.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Does this apply to the clerks in the field service?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I have an amendment here which makes it specifically applicable.

Mr. PATTERSON. It does extend to the field service?

Mr. LEHLBACH. It does in so far as the rates carried in the District of Columbia are applicable. This bill to that extent will apply to the field service as well as to the District service.

Mr. JENKINS. Does it apply to the Immigration Service?

Mr. LEHLBACH. To the best of my information, it does.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman said a moment ago that a survey begun a couple of years ago will be able to report at the next session of Congress.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not true that the report made a few months ago was voluminous, but only a preliminary report?

Mr. LEHLBACH. That was a report of schedules without the schedules being finally approved by the departments. If it were not for the fact that this session of Congress is drawing to a close, inside of three or four weeks we would have that final report. It is almost ready.

Mr. JENKINS. We have a bill pending in our committee for an increase of salaries in the Immigration Service. I am informed that there is nothing anywhere that contemplates an increase of salary for those people.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Surely, because the survey is made for the express purpose of making a complete classification of the field services throughout the Government, including the Immigration Service.

Mr. JENKINS. It may be that it does not cover every activity. Does the gentleman contemplate that at the next session of Congress we shall have another report coming forward if this bill does not cover the entire service?

Mr. LEHLBACH. This bill only seeks to correct the inequalities of the Welsh bill. It is not intended to be a complete measure covering the entire situation in the governmental service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the act of March 4, 1923, entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services," as amended by the act of May 28, 1928, be amended to change the salary rates under certain grades therein to read as follows:

"PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC SERVICE

"Grade 1: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$2,000, \$2,100, \$2,200, \$2,300, \$2,400, \$2,500, and \$2,600.

"Grade 2: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$2,600, \$2,700, \$2,800, \$2,900, \$3,000, \$3,100, and \$3,200.

"Grade 3: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$3,200, \$3,300, \$3,400, \$3,500, \$3,600, \$3,700, and \$3,800.

"Grade 4: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$3,800, \$4,000, \$4,200, \$4,400, and \$4,600.

"Grade 5: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$4,600, \$4,800, \$5,000, \$5,200, and \$5,400, unless a higher rate is specifically authorized by law.

"SUBPROFESSIONAL SERVICE

"Grade 1: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$1,020, \$1,080, \$1,140, \$1,200, \$1,260, \$1,320, and \$1,380.

"Grade 2: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$1,260, \$1,320, \$1,380, \$1,440, \$1,500, \$1,560, and \$1,620.

"Grade 3: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$1,440, \$1,500, \$1,560, \$1,620, \$1,680, \$1,740, and \$1,800.

"Grade 4: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$1,620, \$1,680, \$1,740, \$1,800, \$1,860, \$1,920, and \$1,980.

"Grade 5: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$1,800, \$1,860, \$1,920, \$1,980, \$2,040, \$2,100, and \$2,160.

"Grade 6: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$2,000, \$2,100, \$2,200, \$2,300, \$2,400, \$2,500, and \$2,600.

"Grade 7: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$2,300, \$2,400, \$2,500, \$2,600, \$2,700, \$2,800, and \$2,900.

"Grade 8: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$2,600, \$2,700, \$2,800, \$2,900, \$3,000, \$3,100, and \$3,200.

"CLERICAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND FISCAL SERVICE

"Grade 1: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$1,260, \$1,320, \$1,380, \$1,440, \$1,500, \$1,560, and \$1,620.

"Grade 2: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$1,440, \$1,500, \$1,560, \$1,620, \$1,680, \$1,740, and \$1,800.

"Grade 3: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$1,620, \$1,680, \$1,740, \$1,800, \$1,860, \$1,920, and \$1,980.

"Grade 4: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$1,800, \$1,860, \$1,920, \$1,980, \$2,040, \$2,100, and \$2,160.

"Grade 5: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$2,000, \$2,100, \$2,200, \$2,300, \$2,400, \$2,500, and \$2,600.

"Grade 6: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$2,300, \$2,400, \$2,500, \$2,600, \$2,700, \$2,800, and \$2,900.

"Grade 7: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$2,600, \$2,700, \$2,800, \$2,900, \$3,000, \$3,100, and \$3,200.

"Grade 8: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$2,900, \$3,000, \$3,100, \$3,200, \$3,300, \$3,400, and \$3,500.

"Grade 9: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$3,200, \$3,300, \$3,400, \$3,500, \$3,600, \$3,700, and \$3,800.

"Grade 10: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$3,500, \$3,600, \$3,700, \$3,800, \$3,900, \$4,000, and \$4,100.

"Grade 11: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$3,800, \$4,000, \$4,200, \$4,400, and \$4,600.

"Grade 12: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$4,600, \$4,800, \$5,000, \$5,200, and \$5,400, unless a higher rate is specifically authorized by law.

"CUSTODIAL SERVICE

"Grade 2: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$1,080, \$1,140, \$1,200, \$1,260, \$1,320, and \$1,380: *Provided*, That charwomen working part time be paid at the rate of 50 cents an hour and head charwomen at the rate of 55 cents an hour.

"Grade 4: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$1,320, \$1,380, \$1,440, \$1,500, \$1,560, \$1,620, and \$1,680.

"Grade 5: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$1,500, \$1,560, \$1,620, \$1,680, \$1,740, \$1,800, and \$1,860.

"Grade 6: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$1,680, \$1,740, \$1,800, \$1,860, \$1,920, \$1,980, and \$2,040.

"Grade 7: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$1,860, \$1,920, \$1,980, \$2,040, \$2,100, \$2,200, and \$2,300.

"Grade 8: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$2,000, \$2,100, \$2,200, \$2,300, \$2,400, \$2,500, and \$2,600.

"Grade 9: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$2,300, \$2,400, \$2,500, \$2,600, \$2,700, \$2,800, and \$2,900.

"Grade 10: The annual rates of compensation for positions in this grade shall be \$2,600, \$2,700, \$2,800, \$2,900, \$3,000, \$3,100, and \$3,200.

"CLERICAL-MECHANICAL SERVICE

"Grade 1: The rates of compensation for classes of positions in this grade shall be 55 to 60 cents an hour.

"Grade 2: The rates of compensation for classes of positions in this grade shall be 65 to 70 cents an hour.

"Grade 3: The rates of compensation for classes of positions in this grade shall be 75 to 80 cents an hour.

"The heads of the several executive departments and independent establishments of the Government whose duty it is to carry into effect the provisions of this act are hereby directed to so administer the same that employees whose positions are in the grades affected hereby, who were in said positions on June 30, 1928, and who, under the act of May 28, 1928, did not receive an increase in salary the equivalent of two steps or salary rates in their respective grades shall be given such additional step or steps or salary rates or rates, within the grade, effective from July 1, 1928, as may be necessary to equal such increase: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent or operate to revoke the promotion or allocation for an employee to a higher salary rate or grade: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall operate to decrease the pay of any present employee, nor deprive any employee of any advancement authorized by law and for which funds are available."

SEC. 2. The heads of the several executive departments and independent establishments are authorized and directed to adjust, effective as of July 1, 1928, the compensation of certain civilian positions in the field services, the compensation of which was adjusted by the act of December 6, 1924, to correspond, so far as may be practicable, to the

rates established by the act of May 28, 1928, and by this act for positions in the departmental services in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. Except as amended by this act the provisions of the act of May 28, 1928, shall remain in full force and effect.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 7, line 1, after the word "grade," strike out the words "effective from July 1, 1928."

Page 7, line 12, after the word "adjust," strike out the words "effective as of July 1, 1928."

Page 7, line 23, add new sections, sections 4, 5, and 6, as follows:

"SEC. 4. The Personnel Classification Board shall have sole jurisdiction to determine finally the grade, or subdivision thereof, to which all positions which are subject to the compensation schedules of the classification act of 1923, and amendments thereto, shall be allocated, and it shall have authority to ascertain currently the facts as to the duties and responsibilities of any such position and to review and change the allocation thereof whenever, in its opinion, the facts warrant: *Provided*, That such review and change shall be made only after consultation with the heads of the departments concerned and after affording all incumbents of positions affected an opportunity to be heard, of which hearing a permanent written record shall be made and kept, including all testimony taken: *Provided further*, That in all cases where the board shall change the allocation of a position to a lower grade the rate of pay fixed for such position prior to such change may be continued so long as the position is held by the incumbent then occupying it.

"SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for salaries and expenses of the Personnel Classification Board such sums as may be necessary to enable them to carry into effect the provisions of the classification act of 1923 and amendments thereto: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall be interpreted to preclude the temporary detail to the board of officers or employees of the several departments possessed of special knowledge, ability, or experience required in the classification of positions as now authorized by law.

"SEC. 6. There is hereby created a position of director of classification, who shall be appointed by the board, and who, under the general direction of the board, shall exercise and perform all powers and duties which the board is authorized to exercise and perform."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LEHLBACH: In section 2, page 7, line 19, strike out the period and insert a colon and the words "*Provided*, That the terms of this act shall apply to employees carried under Group 4-B in the schedule of wages for civil employees under the Naval Establishment, notwithstanding the fact that the compensation of such employees was not adjusted by the act of December 6, 1924 (43 Stat. 604), or the act of May 28, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. 3, title 5, sec. 673).

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment for the purpose of inquiring whether the amendment has any retroactive character?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Not at all. I may say to the gentleman that the bill, as it passed the Senate, made the pay adjustment retroactive to May, 1928, but our committee struck out every retroactive feature before we reported it out.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS RAINY RIVER AT BAUDETTE, MINN.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to No. 654 on the calendar, H. R. 12233, authorizing the Robertson & Janin Co., of Montreal, Canada, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rainy River at Baudette, Minn.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. PATTERSON. Reserving the right to object, this is the bill which I objected to a few minutes ago. I do not like this bill, but since it is across an international boundary and it has been explained to me not only by the gentleman from Minnesota but by several other gentlemen who think it should pass, I will not object at this time; but I want to make the statement before withdrawing my objection that I am opposed to these private toll bridges. I serve notice now that unless there is some very specific reason shown why they should be passed I shall object to any private bridge bills in the future. It does not matter whether it is in my State, or where it is, I am

opposed to these private toll bridges, where national highways are built and people cross on them.

I withdraw the reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes Robertson & Janin Co., its successors and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Rainy River, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at Baudette, Minn., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject to the approval of the proper authorities in Canada.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon Robertson & Janin Co., its successors and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Minnesota needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State of Minnesota upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The said Robertson & Janin Co., its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with any laws of Canada applicable thereto, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to Robertson & Janin Co., its successors and assigns; and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 24, strike out the word "Canada" and insert the word "Minnesota."

Page 3, line 6, strike out the word "assigns" and the semicolon and insert the word "assigns" and a comma.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OCALA NATIONAL FOREST, FLA.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 692, the bill (S. 1959) to authorize the creation of game sanctuaries or refuges within the Ocala National Forest in the State of Florida, and I ask that it be considered at this time.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I asked that this bill be passed over a little while ago in the absence of the gentleman from Florida, who was for the moment in the cloak room. My objection is to the proviso in the bill on page 2, commencing on line 16, which could destroy the very purpose of the sanctuary, by rules or regulations, permitting hunting under the guise of the surplus animal or birds' act. If the gentleman will accept an amendment which I shall later offer striking out the last proviso, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GREEN. Of course, I do not believe the department would issue any regulation which would be detrimental to the purposes of the bill, and the Legislature of the State of Florida has, by special act, ceded the game in that preserve to the Federal Government. Of course, I would rather not have the gentleman's amendment, but if the gentleman insists on it, I would prefer to have the amendment rather than to have the bill not passed.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. What kind of game is on this sanctuary?

Mr. GREEN. Deer, turkey, and quail.

Mr. LEAVITT. If this provision is not left in the bill, such a situation might arise as existed on the Kaibab sanctuary, and there might be an excess of game without feed for them.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. I never agreed with the department on the Kaibab situation.

Mr. LEAVITT. Of course; but I did. I am not presenting my views except for the consideration of the gentleman. I do not know anything about the merits of this bill.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman is not going to accept the amendment suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] I shall object to the bill.

Mr. GREEN. I said that while I did not like the amendment, I would acquiesce in it rather than not have the bill passed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. With that understanding I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to designate as game refuges such lands of the United States within the Ocala National Forest, in the State of Florida, as in his judgment should be set aside for the protection of game animals and birds, but it is not intended that the lands so designated shall cease to be parts of the national forest within which they are located, and the establishment of such game sanctuaries or refuges shall not prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from permitting other uses of the lands under and in conformity with the laws and regulations applicable thereto so far as such uses may be consistent with the purposes for which such game sanctuaries or refuges are established.

SEC. 2. That when such game sanctuaries or refuges have been established as provided in section 1 hereof, the hunting, pursuing, poisoning, killing, or capturing by trapping, netting, or any other means, or attempting to hunt, pursue, kill, or capture any game animals or birds upon the lands of the United States within the limits of such game sanctuaries or refuges, except as herein provided, shall be unlawful, and any person violating any of the provisions of this act, or any of the rules and regulations made thereunder, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction in any United States court, be fined in a sum not exceeding \$500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both; *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for the administration of such game sanctuaries or refuges in accordance with the purposes of this act, including regulations not in contravention of State laws, for disposing of any surplus animals or birds which he finds to be within the limits of said game sanctuaries or refuges.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LAGUARDIA: On page 2, line 16, after the word "both," strike out the colon and insert a period and strike out the balance of the section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENECA NATION OF INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11203) to ratify certain leases with the Seneca Nation of Indians.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I would like an explanation of this bill. Is somebody stealing some land of the Indians, or what is it?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, this bill ratifies certain leases negotiated by the town of Brant with the Seneca Nation of Indians. The Seneca Reservation is located adjacent to the town of Brant. The leases embrace 2 parcels of property, 1 comprising 32 acres of property on the shore of Lake Erie and the other a sufficient amount of land to permit a public highway to be constructed from the Lake Shore Road to the park. This is a public park. The park is for the use of the Indians and the residents of the township of Brant. The township has already expended \$20,000 in improvements on this property. They provide life guards and other accommodations which the

Indians could not provide for themselves. There is no profit made on this park; it is just as free for the Indians to use it as it is for the residents of the township.

Mr. CRAMTON. Do the Indians get the use of it?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; the Indians get the use of it as much as the residents of the township of Brant; they live closer to it and it is a part of their reservation.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield, as far as appears I have no objection, but it does not seem to be an urgent matter because one of these leases was dated in 1917 and the other in 1923.

Mr. MEAD. Well, I will say to the gentleman that heretofore the Bureau of Indian Affairs has rather hesitated to take any part in activities concerning the Indians of New York. The officials of the town came here a few years ago and they were advised to take the matter up with the Attorney General of the State of New York, which was done. Later on, the officials of the town of Brant, desirous of having the matter definitely and properly settled, again renewed their activities and insisted on having the leases considered here in Washington.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not criticizing the delay, but I am just stating there has been this delay and, I take it, nobody has suffered from the delay. My suggestion is this: Either the Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs has something to do with the lands of these Indians or it does not. This bill is on the theory that it has something to do with them, and yet the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs shows that—

No copy of either of the leases is in the file.

I feel that before the Bureau of Indian Affairs makes a report upon certain leases affecting Indian lands it ought to have at hand a copy of the leases in question.

Mr. LEAVITT. The committee required that the leases be shown, and the supervisor of the town of Brant appeared before the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. The responsibility is in the hands of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and before they make any report upon a matter affecting the lands of these Indians they should have before them the leases in question. I am going to be obliged to ask that the bill go over until the Bureau of Indian Affairs has in its files a copy of each of the leases in question and then makes a report. So far as I know now, I would not then object to the bill, but it seems to me extraordinary that the Bureau of Indian Affairs should make a report upon certain leases without having the leases before them.

Mr. MEAD. I will say that the representatives of the town called on the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and explained to him the exact nature of the leases.

Mr. CRAMTON. Why were they not filed? Why did they not leave copies of the leases with the Bureau of Indian Affairs?

Mr. MEAD. I really can not answer that question.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not want to embarrass the situation, and it does not seem to me I do, because they are getting along very nicely without Government approval.

Mr. MEAD. The point is that the town of Brant has already invested \$20,000 in this park and contemplates further improvements, but they have been advised they have no legal right to the property unless a lease is ratified by the Government of the United States.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have enough interest in Indian matters that I can not see the Bureau of Indian Affairs getting into the loose habit of sending a report on a lease they have never seen. They could say they have nothing to do with it, if that is the situation.

Mr. MEAD. They say they have very little to do with the Indians in New York.

Mr. CRAMTON. Suppose we let it go over, so that copies of the leases may be furnished to the bureau, and then, if they say it is all right, I presume there will be no difficulty.

Mr. MEAD. That is agreeable as far as I am concerned.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 4028) to amend the Federal farm loan act as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman permit an explanation?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; and it will have to be a good one to remove my objection to the bill.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of this measure I desire to make a statement about it.

This bill would amend the Federal farm loan act so that effective with the appropriation for expenditures of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1930, the assessments to be made against the Federal land banks, joint-stock land banks, and Federal intermediate credit banks under section 3 of the Federal farm loan act would be limited to the salaries and expenses of the employees of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau engaged in the work of its division of examinations, such expenses and salaries, together with all other expenses and salaries of the board, to be disbursed on appropriations made by the Congress.

The subject is one of direct concern to the Federal land banks, the joint-stock land bank, and the Federal intermediate credit banks of the farm loan system, as well as the Treasury, because, under the Federal farm loan act as it now stands, section 3 provides that "the salaries and expenses of the Federal Farm Loan Board, its officers and employees, farm-loan registrars, deputy registrars, examiners, and reviewing appraisers, authorized under this act, or any subsequent amendments thereto, shall be paid by the Federal land banks, joint-stock land banks, and the Federal intermediate credit banks" by assessments made on such equitable basis as the Federal Farm Loan Board shall determine, giving due consideration to time and expense necessarily incident to the supervision of the operation of each type of bank. The act as originally passed in 1916, however, provided in section 3 that "the salaries and expenses of the Federal Farm Loan Board, and of farm-loan registrars and examiners authorized under this section, shall be paid by the United States," and remained in this form until 1923. The law was amended on March 4, 1923, so as to require that after June 30, 1923, all salaries and expenses incurred by the board be assessed against the Federal land banks, joint-stock land banks, and Federal intermediate credit banks, and the act of March 4, 1925, amended the law to read as it now stands.

The Federal Farm Loan Board was reorganized in May, 1927. Unsatisfactory conditions had appeared in some of the banks during the rapid growth of the system in recent years and the administration of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau had not been developed to cope with such conditions adequately. When the Federal Farm Loan Board was reorganized, one joint-stock land bank was in the hands of a receiver and receivers for two other joint-stock land banks, the failures of which were impending, were appointed on July 1 and September 1, 1927. These three receiverships were the first since the establishment of the system and included one of the largest joint-stock land banks. Some of the other banks, both Federal and joint stock, were faced with difficult problems. All of these conditions contributed to impair public confidence. It was the task of the reorganized board not only to prevent other receiverships, if possible, but also to correct unsatisfactory conditions wherever they existed. Necessarily, a very large increase in the expenses of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau has resulted from the endeavors of the Federal Farm Loan Board to bring about as rapidly as possible a restoration of proper conditions in the farm-loan system.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is this a lengthy address on the finance system of the country, generally?

Mr. McFADDEN. No; it is information I felt the membership of the House were entitled to have in connection with this measure. If the gentleman wishes, I will extend my remarks in the RECORD. It is merely an explanation of what the bill provides. I am not particularly anxious to make a speech.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am listening very attentively to the gentleman's explanation, as I always do.

Mr. McFADDEN. If the gentleman from Michigan has any objection, I certainly do not want to continue; but I think it is well for the House to have this information.

Officers of many of the banks have expressed informally the feeling that the Congress should provide for the assumption by the United States of the expenses of the Farm Loan Bureau, or at least that only the expenses directly attributable to the examination work of the bureau should be assessed against the banks. An analysis of the expenses of the bureau indicates that the work of the division of examinations consumes nearly 42 per cent of the amounts assessed against the banks.

It has been pointed out that the Federal farm loan act, as stated in its caption, was designed "to provide capital for agri-

cultural development, to create standard forms of investment based upon farm mortgages, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to create Government depositories and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes," and that to a large extent the provisions of the farm loan act were drawn and detailed supervision by the Government was provided for in the interest not only of the prospective individual borrowers but of the welfare of agriculture generally, together with that of the investing public, as well as, incidentally, the protection of the Government itself to the extent that it might have financial relations with the banks.

Consequently it would seem to be reasonable in the public interest to limit the assessments made against the banks under section 3 of the Federal farm loan act to the salaries and expenses of the employees of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau engaged in the work of its division of examinations.

The act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, approved May 15, 1930, includes an appropriation of \$1,020,000 to cover salaries and expenses of the Federal Farm Loan Board for the fiscal year 1931 payable from assessments against the Federal land banks, joint-stock land banks, and Federal intermediate credit banks in accordance with the present law.

It has been estimated by the Federal Farm Loan Bureau that if S. 4028 should be enacted the amount of the appropriation for 1931 to be assessed against the banks would be reduced to approximately \$425,000, leaving about \$595,000 to be assumed by the Government.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In other words, if this bill is enacted into law, 58 per cent of the operating expenses will be borne by the Treasury and 42 per cent by the banks themselves.

Mr. McFADDEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Was that the original plan?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes; that is practically the original law. This puts the law back where it was before the act was changed in 1923 and 1925.

Mr. COLLINS. This is in compliance with the original law.

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. As I understand, this merely puts the expense of all the field operations in the service of the land banks on the land banks and leaves the expense of the bureau and the board here in Washington on the Government, whereas at first all that was put on the Government and then all of it was put on the banks, and now we want to equitably apportion it.

Mr. CRAMTON. And there is nothing here with reference to the relation between the land banks and irrigation projects?

Mr. McFADDEN. No.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And there is nothing here about Federal farm advisers?

Mr. McFADDEN. No; that is extraneous to the purpose of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal farm loan act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12), be, and it is hereby, amended so that effective as to appropriations for and expenditures of the Federal Farm Loan Board for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1930, and thereafter, the assessments to be made under section 3 of said act (U. S. C., title 12, ch. 7, sec. 857) by said board against the Federal land banks, joint-stock land banks, and Federal intermediate credit banks shall be the amount of the expenses and salaries of the employees engaged in the work of the division of examinations of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau as estimated by the said board, such expenses and salaries, together with all other expenses and salaries of the said board, to be disbursed on appropriations duly made by the Congress.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 4287) to amend section 202 of Title II of the Federal farm loan act, by providing for loans by Federal intermediate credit banks to financing institutions on bills payable, and by eliminating the requirement that loans, advances, or discounts, shall have a minimum maturity of six months.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think some brief explanation should be made of this bill by some member of the committee before the objection stage is passed.

Mr. McFADDEN. I will say to the gentleman, in explanation of this bill, that when the intermediate credits part of the Federal farm loan act was passed, it was limited in the rediscount of paper to six months. In other words, these intermediate credit banks could not rediscount paper for member banks or for cooperative organizations that had less than six months' maturity. It is found in the operation of the system that this does not properly serve and hence this amendment is suggested.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. In other words, if a cooperative wanted to borrow money to carry cotton or wheat for three months, it could not borrow it from an intermediate credit bank because the limitation was not less than six months, and we are proposing to strike that out.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is primarily to meet that condition, and also, as I see from the report, to make loans and advances direct to these cooperative organizations.

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 202 (a) of Title II of the Federal farm loan act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, ch. 8, sec. 1031), be amended by substituting a semicolon for the period at the end of paragraph (1) thereof and adding thereafter the following new matter: "and to make loans or advances direct to any such organization, secured by such obligations."

SEC. 2. That section 202 (c) of Title II of the Federal farm loan act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, ch. 8, sec. 1033), be amended by striking out the words "less than six months nor," so that said section will read as follows:

"Loans, advances, or discounts made under this section shall have a maturity at the time they are made or discounted by the Federal intermediate credit bank of not more than three years. Any Federal intermediate credit bank may in its discretion sell loans or discounts made under this section, with or without its indorsement."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE PATUXENT RIVER, CALVERT COUNTY, MD.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3422) to authorize the Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Patuxent River, south of Burch, Calvert County, Md.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. PATTERSON. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This requires three objections. Only one objection is heard, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), a corporation incorporated under the laws of Maryland, its legal representatives and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Patuxent River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Hallowing Point, approximately one-eighth mile south of Burch, Calvert County, Md., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. After the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Maryland, any political subdivision thereof within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches, and any interest in real property necessary therefor, by purchase or by condemnation or expropriation, in accordance with the laws of such State governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation. If at any time after the expiration of five years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation or expropriation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value; (2) the actual cost of acquir-

ing such interests in real property; (3) actual financing and promotion cost, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interests in real property; and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

SEC. 3. If such bridge shall at any time be taken over or acquired by the State of Maryland, or by any municipality or other political subdivision or public agency thereof, under the provisions of section 2 of this act, and if tolls are thereafter charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 4. The Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, shall, within 90 days after the completion of such bridge, file with the Secretary of War and with the Highway Department of the State of Maryland a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may, and at the request of the Highway Department of the State of Maryland, shall, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement of costs so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable costs of constructing, financing, and promoting such bridge. For the purpose of such investigation the said Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, shall make available all of its records in connection with the construction, financing, and promotion thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction, financing, and promotion of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 2 of this act, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 5. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

SEC. 6. All contracts made in connection with the construction of the bridge authorized by this act and which shall involve the expenditure of more than \$5,000 shall be let by competitive bidding. Such contracts shall be advertised for a reasonable time in some newspaper of general circulation published in the State in which the bridge is located and in the vicinity thereof; sealed bids shall be required, and the contracts shall be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder. Verified copies or abstracts of all bids received and of the bid or bids accepted shall be promptly furnished to the highway department of the State in which such bridge is located. A failure to comply in good faith with the provisions of this section shall render null and void any contract made in violation thereof, and the Secretary of War may, after hearings, order the suspension of all work upon such bridge until the provisions of this section shall have been fully complied with.

SEC. 7. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLLECTION OF ADDITIONAL COTTON STATISTICS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2323) authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish certain additional cotton statistics.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter in collecting and publishing statistics of cotton on hand in warehouses and other storage establishments, and of cotton known as the "carry-over" in the United States, the Director of the Census is hereby directed to ascertain and publish as a separate item in the report of cotton statistics the number of bales of linters as distinguished from the number of bales of cotton.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12063) to amend section 16 of the Federal farm loan act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, there is much more need for an explanation in this case than there was in the former bill. This increases the scope of authority under which these joint-stock land banks may operate.

Mr. McFADDEN. I will say in explanation that you all are aware that the Kansas City Joint Stock Land Bank has been in the hands of a receiver for three years. The stockholders and the Federal Farm Loan Board and the bondholders have been trying to bring about a settlement of this matter. The bill is the direct result of an agreement which has been arrived at between all the interested parties. It is my understanding that an agreement has been consented to by all parties and the bank is about to be reorganized. This bill comes as a direct result of the negotiations which are on. This is what is to happen:

The Joint Stock Land Bank of California is to take over the Kansas City Joint Stock Land Bank on a basis which apparently is agreeable to all the parties concerned. If they take the bank over they want the right to continue its operation in the territory where it has already operated. In addition to that I have been informed that if they succeed in reorganizing and taking over the Kansas City bank it will probably mean the taking over of the other two failed joint-stock land banks now in receivership.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I have received a number of telegrams in reference to this matter when it was before the committee. Does the gentleman know whether this is satisfactory to Mr. Cross?

Mr. McFADDEN. The gentleman refers, I think, to the Letts bill. This is not that bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman state the situation about the Letts bill? If this bill goes through we forget the Letts bill?

Mr. McFADDEN. For the moment.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would like to have it a very long moment.

Mr. McFADDEN. I think the gentleman can have that assurance.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, we have talked a great deal about these land banks. A great many people in the cities have bought the stock of these banks, perhaps from a high-pressure salesman—that I don't know; but they have purchased the stock under the impression that they were Government banks. I have offered amendments on one or two occasions, to which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] objects, to have printed on the face of every stock certificate the fact that it is not a Government bank. There have been misrepresentations made, and I have quite a file from people in my city who purchased stock in these banks—land banks of the United States Government. The people were under the impression that the Government was back of the stock. Something ought to be said at all times to make it clear that buying this stock is just like buying the stock in any private bank, and that the Government does not guarantee the stock.

Mr. McFADDEN. I agree with what the gentleman has said, but this bill will do more for the Federal farm land banks, and particularly the joint-stock land banks, than anything that Congress could do.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It should be made clear so that there will not be a campaign of stock selling, that all this bill is to seek to provide the machinery to rehabilitate these banks, but that it does not put a single cent into the banks.

Mr. McFADDEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAMTON. As has been suggested it opens the way for the taking over of those banks and their rejuvenation, and in the event that this program is carried out, then no legislation such as the Letts bill is necessary, as I understand it?

Mr. McFADDEN. The thought to which the gentleman refers deals with the method of collecting the double liability of stockholders.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; and it would not have to be resorted to if the program is successful that this bill proposes?

Mr. McFADDEN. A modification of that bill, if it was finally passed could be made to meet the objections that the gentleman

refers to. In other words, we could take away the retroactive features. Under this plan of reorganization contemplated here, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD] is familiar with this, the double liability referred to here by stockholders, which has resulted in the introduction and consideration of the Letts bill, has been provided for. In other words, under the reorganization plan those stockholders of the Kansas City Joint Stock Land Bank who have put in their money covering the double liability will have their money returned to them, and the other stockholders who have not put up or paid any will be relieved of the obligation of having to pay.

Mr. CRAMTON. The retroactive feature of the Letts bill would not be necessary if this legislation is successful in accomplishing its object?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. CRAMTON. In view of that, if this goes through I would not anticipate that the gentleman would press the Letts bill for passage at this session.

Mr. McFADDEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. How will the Federal land banks, which are owned by farmers, be helped by giving authority for a Federal land bank, with the approval of the Farm Loan Board, to buy and take over the business of a joint-stock land bank?

Mr. McFADDEN. This applies particularly to the Kansas City Joint Stock Land Bank, which is now in the hands of a receiver. It has been in the hands of a receiver for three years, and this authority permits another joint-stock land bank to take over and operate this bank and to continue the business in the territory where they are authorized to do business.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There is no reason why there should be any joint interest between the Federal land bank and a joint-stock land bank. They are organized entirely differently, and the stock is held in an entirely different way, and I felt at the time the act was passed that we should never have permitted a joint-stock land bank to be organized.

Mr. McFADDEN. A good many people feel that way, and our experience would seem to indicate that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. What good purpose is to be served on the part of the banks owned by the farmers if you give what this bill undertakes to do—full authority for a Federal land bank to take over the business of a failing joint-stock land bank?

Mr. McFADDEN. The gentleman mentions a situation which in all probability never would occur. No one of the Federal land banks would take over bad assets of a joint-stock land bank. They are, however, given that right in the present law to do that for the purpose of liquidating.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The real danger about it is that the real owners of the stock in the Federal land bank would never be consulted, and the language of the gentleman's bill is so broad it seems to me that it might invite some very bad business transactions on the part of those representing the Federal land banks.

Mr. McFADDEN. The language the gentleman refers to is a repetition of the present law. We are not changing that in this instance.

Mr. STEVENSON. The Federal land banks, by act passed years ago, have the right to take over and liquidate any joint-stock land bank.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Why is it essential to have an existing joint-stock land bank take over for liquidation a defunct joint-stock land bank and increase the authority of the parent bank so that it can operate in more States than two, which was the original provision of the law?

Mr. McFADDEN. These are failed banks, and in order to rehabilitate an institution if another bank sees fit to take over its assets, it should be given the right to continue business in the territory where the failed bank did business. Without that authority it could not do it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the determination by the solvent joint-land bank that they take over the assets of the defunct bank passed on by the stockholders of the existing solvent bank?

Mr. McFADDEN. In this particular case the stockholders and the bondholders and the Federal Farm Loan Board have all agreed, and on any future acquisition it would have to be the same way.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is difficult for me to appreciate how a bank away out on the coast can find it advantageous to take over the assets of a defunct bank which was attempting to function in Missouri or Wisconsin.

Mr. McFADDEN. To my mind I think it is a very magnanimous thing for them to do.

Mr. STAFFORD. For that reason I become skeptical as to whether it is just to the stockholders of the solvent company to do so.

Mr. McFADDEN. The failure of the Kansas City and Milwaukee banks and others that have failed has seriously impaired the sale of joint-stock land bank bonds. This bill is intended to enable them to reorganize and function properly and improve the bond market. It is necessary that additional loans be made. Undoubtedly it will make a considerable saving in operation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he does not understand that in order to effect this rehabilitation and the salvage of the Kansas City bank, all stockholders must be wiped out, must surrender and lose their stock in the Kansas City bank, and in addition there must be at least \$10,000,000 paid for at least \$20,000,000 of the Kansas City bank bonds, to be canceled and destroyed, in the attempt to rehabilitate this Kansas City bank?

In reply to what my friend from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] said about the sale of these securities, is not the trouble in the fact that the law itself states that the "purpose of this act is to create standard forms of investment"? Does not the law itself refer to the securities of these joint-stock land banks as "instrumentalities of the Government"? Under the law itself they are now enabled to put in the bonds the statement that they are the instrumentalities of the United States Government, and the Supreme Court of the United States has said in a formal decision that the securities of these banks are "instrumentalities of the Government." That was the reason for much misunderstanding. When bonds and stocks are sold as "instrumentalities of the Government" as "standard forms of investment" created by law, there is apt to be an assumption by the investing public that in some measure the Government is behind the system and will support it, and that the securities are more than ordinarily safe forms of investment.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Is the gentleman arguing that the Government should make good on the bonds?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. I am replying to the gentleman from New York and indicating the provisions of the law itself, which justified the impressions given out to purchasers of joint-stock land bank securities, that in some way the Government was interested and might be expected to support them.

Many innocent people have been deceived to their loss and among the victims seems to be national banks and brokers of integrity and ability.

Mr. LaGuardia. My fear now is that when the old stockholders are wiped out we shall give the new stockholders a chance to lose their money in the belief that they are investing in a Government security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CLOSING STREETS IN THE RENO SECTION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 4243) to provide for the closing of certain streets and alleys in the Reno section of the District of Columbia.

The title of the bill was read.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LaGuardia. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the acquisition by either the United States or the District of Columbia, or by both, of all the land in the subdivision of Reno lying within the territory bounded by Thirty-eighth Place, Fessenden Street, Howard Street, and the alley running east and west through squares 1762 and 1846 from the east line of Thirty-eighth Place extended to Howard Street, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized to close Emery Place, Vincent Street, Donaldson Place, McPherson Street, and the public alleys, lying within the above-described limits, or any portion or portions thereof: *Provided,* That upon the closing of said streets or alleys, or any part thereof, the title to the land lying within the portion of the streets or alleys so closed shall revert to the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

STATUS OF RESERVE OFFICERS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3592) to further amend section 37 of the national defense act of June 4, 1920, as amended by section 2 of the act of September 22, 1922, so as to more clearly define the status of reserve officers not on active duty or on active duty for training only.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman give some reasons for the passage of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. From my acquaintance with the situation, hundreds or even thousands of reserve officers may withdraw from commission as reserve officers in case this legislation is not passed, so as to permit them, if they happen to be practicing attorneys, to practice before the departments.

I feel obliged to have this bill brought out at the earliest possible moment. I may say to my friend from Mississippi that this bill was introduced away back, a year ago, at the request of the War Department, when the former incumbent was Secretary of War. It was called up in the early part of the year, but no action was taken on it because of a certain minor objection.

Mr. COLLINS. I do not believe in the idea of making civil authorities subservient to the military.

Mr. LaGuardia. This only applies to officers in the reserve and removes the disqualification that now exists and prevents them from practicing before the departments.

Mr. COLLINS. It goes further than that.

Mr. LaGuardia. No. I do not think it does.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the reserve officers' law the reserve officer is understood to be an officer of the Government. Then there is a law which forbids officers of the Government practicing before the departments. There are many reserve officers that are attorneys at law. Why should reserve officers in an active state be deprived of the privilege of practicing before the departments? It is their bread and butter. If you do not give them relief, it will result in the withdrawal of, perhaps, 111,000 reserve officers who are now in the Reserve Officers' Corps of the United States Army.

Mr. COLLINS. Some of them ought to be dropped. The War Department recognizes this fact and have divided them into active and nonactive officers instead of dropping them as they should do. They are placed in a nonactive status. A large number of these officers could not and would not be used in case of war, and certainly these are useless and there is no justification for keeping them on the rolls as reserve officers. About 40 per cent of the reserve officers are in the noncombat units. There are too many of this class.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not think that is the way to get rid of them.

Mr. COLLINS. The departments are honeycombed with reserve officers. They are even in the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CRAMTON. This is a bill which was introduced by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. James], who is ill and unable to be here. I have had some contact with him as it relates to the reserve officers of my State, who, at the present time, under a recent construction of the law, are prevented from handling cases before the departments. They are lawyers. This bill is to prevent doing that very thing.

Mr. COLLINS. No. This bill reads:

Reserve officers while not on active duty shall not, by reason solely of their appointments, oaths, commissions, or status as reserve officers, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowances received as reserve officers, be held or deemed to be officers or employees of the United States, or persons holding any office of trust or profit or discharging any official function under or in connection with any department of the Government of the United States.

Which is far beyond what the gentleman contends.

Mr. LaGuardia. If the gentleman can cite any one instance other than the example given by the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Michigan—

Mr. COLLINS. I want the bill to go over so that I can study it more carefully and find out if there is any good excuse for its enactment.

Mr. LaGuardia. Here is a letter from the Attorney General to Senator Brookhart with reference to a lawyer in his State, and it refers to this qualification referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin. It would bar those men who happened to be lawyers on the reserve list from practicing before the department. It was never intended to do that.

Mr. Wainwright. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman always tries to be fair. Does it seem fair to the gentleman that a proportion of the 100,000 officers who happen to be lawyers and who are rendering this patriotic service to the Government without compensation should be handicapped in this way? Is there any public reason why they should be?

Mr. COLLINS. I think there are many reasons why the bill should not be passed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But this bill has nothing to do with that. Mr. STAFFORD. The phraseology of this bill could not be construed in the manner in which the gentleman from Mississippi has construed it.

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. SPEAKS. Let us take the cases of thousands of men throughout the United States as they are affected by existing law. Being of military age and liable for service in time of emergency they accept commissions in the Reserve Corps, undergo training, and through a systematic course of study and practice prepare themselves to properly perform their duties when called upon for national defense purposes. They comprise business men, professional men, experts, and skilled workmen in various lines. But under the law as it now stands they are barred from transacting business with any governmental department and thus deprived of a right accorded all other citizens other than members of the regular service establishments. The law was never intended to operate in this manner, and the bill under consideration is intended to correct the discrimination against reserve officers. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will withdraw his objection and permit the bill to be passed at this time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I hope the gentleman will not object. The gentleman knows I will go a long way with him in stopping some of these military bills.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 37 of the national defense act of June 4, 1920, as amended by section 2 of the act of September 22, 1922 (42 Stat. 1033; sec. 356, title 10, U. S. C.), be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto another sentence as follows: "Reserve officers while not on active duty, or while on active duty for instruction or training only, shall not, by reason solely of their appointments, oaths, commissions, or status as reserve officers, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowances received as reserve officers, be held or deemed to be officers or employees of the United States, or persons holding any office of trust or profit or discharging any official function under or in connection with any department of the Government of the United States."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Section 356" and insert "Sections 351, 352, 353, 356, and 360."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "duty," strike out the comma and the words "while on active duty for instruction or training only."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 707 (H. R. 12063), to amend section 16 of the Federal farm loan act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the Federal farm loan act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, ch. 7, secs. 811-823), be amended by substituting in the eighth paragraph thereof (U. S. C., title 12, ch. 7, sec. 818) a comma for the period at the end of the first sentence and adding the following new matter: "except as hereinafter provided."

Sec. 2. That section 16 of the Federal farm loan act, as amended, be further amended by inserting after the last paragraph thereof (U. S. C., title 12, ch. 7, sec. 823) the following new paragraph:

"Any joint-stock land bank which, in accordance with the preceding paragraph, acquires the assets and assumes the liabilities of another

joint-stock land bank may, if authorized by the Federal Farm Loan Board, make loans secured by first mortgages on farm lands within the States in which the other joint-stock land bank was authorized to make loans at the time of its liquidation."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out all of lines 1 to 7, inclusive, and insert the following:

"In any case where a joint-stock land bank has been, or may be, within a period of seven months after the date of the passage of this act, declared insolvent and placed in the hands of a receiver by the Federal Farm Loan Board, any Federal land bank or joint-stock land bank may, in the manner as may be prescribed by the Federal Farm Loan Board and with the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, acquire the assets and assume the liabilities of said joint-stock land bank in the hands of a receiver. Any joint-stock land bank which has acquired or may hereafter acquire the assets and which has assumed or may hereafter assume the liabilities of another joint-stock land bank may, if authorized by the Federal Farm Loan Board, make loans secured by first mortgages on farm lands within the States in which the other joint-stock land bank was authorized to make loans at the time of such acquisition, and the purchasing bank may, with the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, continue to make loans in the States where it was authorized to make loans at the time of such acquisition."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE GREEN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech of my colleague Mr. GREEN, of Florida, on the 4-H Club of America.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I herewith include a speech made last night by my distinguished colleague from Florida, Congressman R. A. GREEN. It is a splendid tribute to the work which is being accomplished by the 4-H boys' and girls' clubs of America.

The speech is as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE 4-H BOYS' AND GIRLS' CLUB OF AMERICA

Mr. Chairman, State directors, and members of the 4-H Clubs, it gives me much pleasure to meet with you this evening and give my approval to the great work which is being accomplished through your united and intelligent effort.

Your visit to the Nation's Capital and the special training and instruction received by you here by our Agricultural Department experts and officials will give you a better understanding and good information concerning the problems which face the agriculturalists of our Nation to-day. You young ladies and young gentlemen are representative of the highest attainment in the 4-H Club work of each of the 40 States of the Union here represented. Champions, as you are, of your respective States, you will best be able to attain the information and general knowledge which can and will be so well carried by you back to your respective States and clubs. Through your efforts the acre production of your respective localities has been in many cases doubled, trebled, and even in some instances multiplied by four or five. Great is your influence upon the future production, preparation, and marketing of American agricultural products.

I am glad that my State, Florida, has its representatives here in the persons of Miss Mary Efta Bradley, of Leon County, Miss Gilda Yates, of Orange County, Mr. Hugh Dukes, of Union County, and Mr. Wilson Roberts, of Holmes County. They are Florida's champions.

During the pioneer days in the development of American agriculture when diseases, insect pests, or depletion of the soil dwindled the production of crops, then the American farmers would move to new land and virgin soil. But to-day, we find a large percentage of America's best agricultural soils utilized to production, and instead of the farmers and growers moving away from their adversities, they are, through scientific methods and intelligent application, meeting and conquering the insect pests and other adversities.

We are living in a highly developed mechanical and industrial age. Machinery is in America rapidly supplanting the labor of man. This is true also in the agricultural life of our country. Improved methods of planting, cultivating, gathering, curing, and processing have in many cases almost supplanted the manual labor of the farmers. In the case of wheat, oats, and even other of our great American crops, the commodity is scarcely touched by the hand of man from the time the seeds go into the planter until the finished product is ready for use. Almost every step is accomplished by machinery, the result of the invention and skill of the age.

To-day we find America leading in the production of many of the great agricultural commodities. I am glad to see America eating from

her own wheat fields; eating the meat products of her own farms, prairies and plains; smoking from her own tobacco fields; wearing cotton and woolen clothing produced from the raw products within her own confines; and, in fact, producing here in America almost every necessity and luxury which is used by the American people. I do not share the view of many that the entire world is in danger of the overproduction of agricultural products. Why, even during the present year some 2,000,000 people have perished in China alone for the want of food. Throughout the world we find disseminated sections where agricultural products are not produced, and which are dependent upon the other parts of the world for their daily bread. Frankly, I believe that there will always be found in the world a hungry mouth for every grain of wheat; feet to wear shoes from all hides we are able to produce; and backs to wear the cotton and woolen goods which may be grown and manufactured in America.

The problem of to-day and of to-morrow is that of proper and economical distribution of our various agricultural products. America does not produce too many peaches, too many oranges, too many eggs, fresh vegetables, and other products for the use of even our own American people; but the problem is the distribution of these products to all of our people every day in the year at a price within the range of their purchasing power.

The technical instruction and skilled training which you 4-H Club members are receiving through our splendid Department of Agriculture will best enable you to meet the future problems of production, distribution, and utilization. I commend the great work which you are doing and the service which is rendered to the American people through the able leadership of your instructors and directors. Through your dominant leaders, vast fields of wheat, oats, and rye will continue to nod their heads to the morning sun; corn will grow luxuriantly and confine the August sun within its sheath; tobacco will grow on the hillsides and in the valleys for the contentment of world consumers; cotton fields throughout our southland will continue to grow as white as snow on the hillsides; nut trees of all kinds will continue to shake from their delicate branches brown fruits with the approaching of the autumnal season; the production of sugarcane and sugar beets will increase until Americans will eat from their own sugar bowl; the orchards and groves will continue to yield an abundance of luscious fruits and the production of vegetables will ever increase.

My friends, I wish you well in the shaping of America's future agricultural life.

WIDENING WISCONSIN AVENUE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3895) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to widen Wisconsin Avenue abutting squares 1299, 1300, and 1935.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 478. An act for the relief of Marijune Cron;
- H. R. 524. An act for the relief of the I. B. Krinsky Estate (Inc.) and the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland;
- H. R. 910. An act for the relief of William H. Johns;
- H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of C. F. Beach;
- H. R. 1964. An act for the relief of S. A. Jones;
- H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of Addie Belle Smith;
- H. R. 2465. An act for the relief of Earl D. Barkly;
- H. R. 2849. An act for the relief of the Lowell Oakland Co.;
- H. R. 2983. An act for the relief of Samuel F. Tait;
- H. R. 3422. An act for the relief of Gustav J. Braun;
- H. R. 6117. An act for the relief of the Central of Georgia Railway Co.;
- H. R. 6665. An act for the relief of B. C. Glover;
- H. R. 7661. An act for the relief of Margaret Stepp Bown;
- H. R. 7926. An act to provide for terms of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to be held at Easton, Pa.;
- H. R. 9227. An act to establish additional salary grades for mechanics' helpers in the motor-vehicle service;
- H. R. 9628. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Arkansas, through its State highway department, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across St. Francis River at or near Lake City, Ark., on State Highway No. 18;

H. R. 9989. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota, Le Sueur County, and Sibley County, in the State of Minnesota, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Minnesota River at or near Henderson, Minn.;

H. R. 10657. An act to amend section 26 of the act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended;

H. R. 11051. An act to amend section 60 of the act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900;

H. R. 11978. An act to authorize the appointment of employees in the executive branch of the Government and the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 367. Joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act to create in the Treasury Department a bureau of narcotics, and for other purposes," approved June 14, 1930.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 11781) entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. McNARY, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. RANSDELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10919) entitled "An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, and of Elise Steinger, housekeeper for Consul R. A. Wallace Treat at the Smyrna consulate, who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of Government funds and/or personal property by reason of theft, warlike conditions, catastrophes of nature, shipwreck, or other causes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference in the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11781) entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes."

JULY 5, 1930, LEGAL HOLIDAY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the resolution (S. J. Res. 184) to declare July 5, 1930, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TRANSFERRING JURISDICTION OVER PROPERTY TO DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PUBLIC PARKS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 4358) to authorize transfer of funds from the general revenues of the District of Columbia to the revenues of the water department of said District, and to provide for transfer of jurisdiction over certain property to the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to transfer \$20,729.90 from the general revenues of the District of Columbia to the credit of the revenues of the water department of said District, said amount being the sum paid from the revenues of the water department for the acquisition of parcel 72/1, containing 9.013 acres; and the said commissioners are further authorized and directed to transfer said parcel 72/1 to the jurisdiction of the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks as a part of the park system of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL EXPENSES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9408) to amend the act of March 3, 1917, an act making appropriations for the general expenses of the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask who is going to pay the expense of making this connection? The report of the Budget was conditioned on

the expense being paid by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, but the bill does not so state.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I have no objection to the gentleman offering an amendment of that kind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 3, 1917, making appropriations for the general expenses of the District of Columbia, and wherein appropriations are made for the water department, that paragraph 6 be amended to read as follows: "For the protection of the health of the residents of the District of Columbia and the employees of the United States Government residing in Maryland near the District of Columbia boundary the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, upon the request of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, a body corporate, established by chapter 313 of the acts of 1916 of the State of Maryland, or upon the request of its legally appointed successor, are hereby authorized to deliver water from the water-supply system of the District of Columbia to said Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission or its successor, for distribution to territory in Maryland within the Washington suburban sanitary district as designated in the aforesaid act, and to connect District of Columbia water mains with water mains in the State of Maryland at the following points, namely, in the vicinity of Chevy Chase Circle, in the vicinity of the intersection of Georgia and Eastern Avenues, in the vicinity of the intersection of Rhode Island and Eastern Avenues, in the vicinity of the intersection of the Anacostia Road and Eastern Avenue, and in the vicinity of Forty-ninth and Chesapeake Streets NW., under the conditions hereinafter named."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 16, strike out the words "Forty-ninth and Chesapeake" and insert "Forty-seventh and Fessenden."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: At the end of the bill insert: "Provided, That all expense of making the connection shall be borne by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, under the general rules of the House it is provided that suspensions shall be in order during the last six days of a session. Several times when it has been uncertain as to when the last six days would commence we have brought in a special order from the Committee on Rules making it in order to consider suspensions during the last six days or what we thought would be the last six days. It is not certain when we will adjourn, but we think adjournment must come some time during the next week, not later than Tuesday or Wednesday. I want to prefer a unanimous consent request that beginning with Friday of this week it will be in order for the Speaker to recognize for suspensions for the remainder of this session, under the general rules, as is provided in the rules during the last six days of a session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in private conversation with the gentleman from New York I understood him to say that in case he could not get this consent he would bring in a rule to make this in order?

Mr. SNELL. Yes. We think it rather necessary and we think this should be done in order to clean up our business and be ready to adjourn without delay when the time comes.

Mr. GARNER. I do not know that there could be any valid reason given for opposing a rule of that kind. I realize that if this side of the House gives consent for the suspension of the rules, it will do so with the knowledge that legislation will be considered, but I have the assurance of the Speaker, if I may say so, that no matters will be brought up unless they are matters which the Speaker believes to be in the interest of general legislation, rather than any political matters. With that understanding, I am not going to object to the request of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. I can say to the gentleman from Texas that at the present time I do not know what matters will be brought up, and I do not have anything definite in mind, but I think suspensions should be in order so that the regular business of the House may be proceeded with in a logical and normal way.

For that reason I think we should have this order made at this time.

Mr. GARNER. When does the gentleman anticipate adjournment?

Mr. SNELL. As quickly as possible.

Mr. GARNER. By next Tuesday or Wednesday?

Mr. SNELL. I am not going to make a definite statement, but I think surely by that time.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Personally, I hope adjournment will come no later than Monday. It is the last day of the month and the Fourth of July comes soon thereafter. I think the Members are very anxious to get away so they may be home by the Fourth of July.

Mr. SNELL. I will certainly cooperate to that end in every way I can.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I want to suggest that the gentleman make his request for not to exceed six days.

Mr. SNELL. I do not believe we should change the request made at present.

Mr. GARNER. Let me ask the gentleman whether he expects to have an evening session, or something of that kind, for the purpose of considering the Private Calendar? There are about 300 or 400 bills on that calendar.

Mr. SNELL. We have talked about that right along and I think probably we can. The gentleman from Connecticut has spoken about it and I think he is going to make that arrangement.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT—RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 11781) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H. R. 11781), having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, and 105; and agree to the same.

S. WALLACE DEMPSEY,

NATHAN L. STRONG,

J. J. MANSFIELD,

Managers on the part of the House.

HIRAM W. JOHNSON,

W. L. JONES,

CHAS. L. McNARY,

JOS. E. RANSDALL,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11781) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed upon:

The river and harbor bill as it passed the House authorized new work the total estimated cost of which was \$116,285,027.75. The amount added by amendment in the Senate was \$28,596,875, as follows:

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 11781 INVOLVING NEW AUTHORIZATIONS FOR RIVER AND HARBOR WORK	
New Bedford Harbor, Mass. (additional authorization)-----	\$318,000
Taunton River, Mass. (new report)-----	780,000
Connecticut River, Conn.-----	1,000,000
Newtown Creek, N. Y. (new report)-----	269,500
Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channels, New York Harbor, N. Y. (new report)-----	1,150,000
East Chester Creek, N. Y. (new report)-----	283,000
Schuylkill River, Pa. (new report)-----	1,300,000
Inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (two new reports)-----	35,500

Claiborne Harbor, Md. (new report).....	\$12, 125
Inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C. (additional authorization).....	100, 000
James River, Va. (additional authorization).....	1, 000, 000
Cape Fear River, N. C., above and below Wilmington (new report).....	796, 750
Far Creek, N. C. (additional authorization).....	10, 000
Brunswick Harbor, Ga. (additional authorization).....	816, 000
Intracoastal waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami (modification of existing project; no added cost).	
Miami Harbor, Fla. (amends House provision so as to adopt complete recommendation in report; no added cost).	
Caloosahatchee and Lake Okeechobee drainage area, Florida (additional authorization).....	2, 546, 000
Intracoastal waterway from Pensacola Bay to Mobile Bay, Ala. and Fla. (additional authorization).....	500, 000
Cedar Bayou, Tex. (new report).....	25, 000
Mississippi River from Illinois River to Minneapolis (additional authorization).....	4, 442, 000
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City (additional authorization).....	10, 200, 000
Tennessee River (additional authorization).....	1, 500, 000
San Diego Harbor, Calif. (additional authorization).....	246, 000
Oakland Harbor, Calif. (new report).....	197, 000
Noyo River, Calif. (new report).....	180, 000
Willamette River between Oregon City and Portland, Oreg. (new report).....	160, 000
Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, Oreg. and Wash. (additional authorization).....	500, 000
Everett Harbor, Wash. (new report).....	142, 000
Lake River, Wash. (new report).....	3, 000
Seward Harbor, Alaska (new report).....	85, 000
Total.....	28, 596, 875

The Senate made 44 amendments to section 1 of the bill, which authorizes new improvement work. These amendments covered additions to authorizations made by the House and the adoption of new reports received since the Committee on Rivers and Harbors closed its consideration of the bill. All of these additions were recommended by the War Department in official reports.

The remaining amendments relate to survey items and verbal amendments to House items, on all of which the House conferees receded.

S. WALLACE DEMPSEY,
NATHAN L. STRONG,
J. J. MANSFIELD,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in two Senate amendments, Senate amendment No. 32, particularly, providing for the Chicago drainage canal. Was any change made in that amendment?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No change was made in that amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Also in amendment No. 9, the Erie & Oswego Canal; was any change made in that amendment?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That was left exactly as it was.

Mr. STAFFORD. As the Senate proposed it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Is there in the bill any Senate amendment providing for the promotion or retirement of any Army officer?

Mr. DEMPSEY. None whatever.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. As the gentleman knows, the people of the Northwest are very much interested in the 9-foot channel in the upper Mississippi River. Did the House conferees agree to that?

Mr. DEMPSEY. They did.

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. DALLINGER. Is there any provision in the bill or any Senate amendment in regard to diversion of water from the Connecticut River?

Mr. DEMPSEY. There is not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman state whether there has been any material change in the Senate amendments?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The Senate amendments were accepted as the Senate passed them.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I am acquainted with the Senate amendments, I have no further questions.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman will recall the little colloquy we had this afternoon about the provisions of Senate amendment 32 with reference to the Illinois waterway, particularly in regard to the making of a survey of the amount of water that will be required as an annual average flow to meet the needs of a commercially useful waterway. At that time the gentleman suggested he thought perhaps the making of that survey could be handled under the general law which provides for the

making of surveys by direction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House or the Commerce Committee of the Senate. Does not the gentleman think this survey is a special survey that may not come under that authority?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think the engineers would recognize the fact they had two orders for surveys, one the order in this bill and the other the order which we would give them by resolution. I think they would recognize them both as being valid and would act under the second one as well as under the first one.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will say to the gentleman that under ordinary conditions, speaking for myself personally, I would be disposed to make some objection to this conference report. I think the Senate went far out of its way to throw obstacles in the way of securing the Illinois waterway because that project is hedged about with so many provisions that are dependent upon action in the future; and as I said this morning, the provision here making effective as to navigation the decree of the Supreme Court in a suit which was based entirely upon questions of sanitation was not only unnecessary but harmful. The people of the Middle West want this waterway and the Nation should want this waterway. [Applause].

Mr. DEMPSEY. The purpose of that provision, if the gentleman will permit me to say so, was one which was intended to be helpful to the waterway. There was some question in the minds of the representatives of Illinois whether they would have the right to use the water for navigation, and that provision was put in to clear up any possible doubt as to the right of the use of that water for navigation purposes. It was intended for the benefit of the waterway and not to hamper or shackle it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am directing my remarks particularly to the time for making the survey, and I hope the construction of the state of the law, so clearly stated by the gentleman from New York, will have advocates in the future, so that it will not be necessary to wait for every sort of investigation of this question until the waterway has been entirely completed.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAMTON. I heard something of what the gentleman said about the way that such a survey would be secured and the gentleman said something about "We can do so and so." Did the gentleman refer to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors or to the Congress?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House and the Committee on Commerce of the Senate are given authority by law to order surveys where there has been any work done upon a waterway, particularly where the waterway has been adopted; and this project will have been adopted when this bill becomes law, and we would have the right the next day, by resolution, to ask for a further survey.

Mr. CRAMTON. My thought is this: This is a matter that has been highly controversial for a long time, and recently has been under thorough discussion in the Senate. As a result the Senate adopted the language that is found here. As I understand the conferees have reported recommending to the House the acceptance of that Senate amendment.

Now, to-day, we are asked to take the unusual procedure of accepting the conference report without its being printed and lying over. My thought that I am leading up to is that I am hoping the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] will not attempt a construction of what this language means that might be held hereafter to have any binding force.

I think if we are going to give unanimous consent to the immediate acceptance of the report we ought not to be handicapped by any offhand construction by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CHALMERS. May I say a word? I understand that this amendment of the Senate to this bill that is before us now does not require any diversion of water from Lake Michigan in order to put into operation the commercial waterway of the Illinois River. You will find if you read the hearings that the Acting Chief of Engineers was before our committee and said that there was water enough naturally furnished by the rivers in Illinois to operate this waterway with an appropriation of seven and a half million dollars, without taking any water from the Great Lakes.

Mr. CRAMTON. My suggestion is that this is not a time for the gentleman from New York to give forth any binding construction of that language, but, rather, let the language stand for itself.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am not doing so. The gentleman misunderstands the colloquy between the gentleman from New

York and the gentleman from Illinois. My colloquy was simply this: The Senate amendment for the survey by the engineers is to determine what amount of water is necessary for navigation of the Illinois River with a 9-foot channel—

Mr. CRAMTON. It does not use the word "survey," but the word "study." The difference in words may be significant.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is not involved in this question. The gentleman from Illinois' suggestion with reference to this condition of affairs was this: There are 6,500 feet of water going down the Illinois River—that was the decision of the Supreme Court—until 1935, and after that 5,000 feet until 1939. After the 1st of January, 1939, 1,500 plus the pumpage, making a total in 1939 as it is now estimated of 3,200 feet. However, the pumpage has increased 100 feet per year for the last five years, and at the same rate for eight years we would have an additional 800 feet, which would make 4,000 feet.

The Illinois waterway will be completed probably by 1935. What it is intended for these engineers to do, as I understand it—and this is my individual opinion—is in the operation of that waterway to ascertain how much water is needed for the navigation and commercial use with a 9-foot waterway, with the smallest flow which can make it useful.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is, after the waterway is completed?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Here is what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] suggests, and it is not a controversial question at all. He suggested that the engineers should report before the time fixed in this amendment, that is before the 31st of January, 1938, because otherwise there will be only one year before there is a drop from 5,000 feet to 1,500 feet. He says that that might not be time for the Congress to act. All I have said to him is this. I have not attempted to construe this act, I have not attempted to give any word or line or any part of it any particular meaning, but I have said to him that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, under the law, have the right the instant this becomes a law to pass a resolution asking the Chief of Engineers to make that report at an earlier date, and I have said to him that I can see no harm in doing that, and I think that much good might come from its being done.

Mr. CRAMTON. And still the amendment the gentleman is just reporting to the House provides that the study shall not be made until after the waterway is completed.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then the report may be made on or before January, 1938.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And all the gentleman from Illinois says is "We would like that hurried up a little bit, after the waterway is completed, if you could do it."

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. In addition to the question of the time for the survey, it should be clear to any one stopping to contemplate the matter for a moment, that by the lack of water, and by the resulting lack of usefulness of this waterway, it can be shown that it is a perfect waste of energy and funds to do anything in regard to the waterway. The waterway can not demonstrate its usefulness and value unless there is water available in it to carry the commerce that is ready to float upon it.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the Committee on Rivers and Harbors unanimously accepts this language, as I am advised they do, I am unable to understand how it could be said that the first day after this becomes a law they might order a study which this law shall say shall not be ordered until after the waterway is completed.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not think the gentleman states quite accurately what the chairman of the committee said. I do not mean that the gentleman intentionally misstates it.

Mr. CRAMTON. I understood the gentleman to say the committee might on the next day after this becomes a law order such a study.

Mr. DEMPSEY. All the chairman said was this, that we have general authority to order surveys through committee resolution where there is an adopted project.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman does not anticipate that will be done in this case?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is not anticipating one way or the other.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. CHALMERS. As far as I am concerned, as a member of the committee, I want to register my protest against any understanding or agreement that may be referred to afterwards, as understood here to-day, about any amount of pumpage or any diversion of water beyond that allowed by the decree of the Supreme Court.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And I make the suggestion that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors can not pass any resolution that is in violation of law.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, we are asked to accept an amendment that definitely provides that this study shall be ordered after the waterway is completed. It makes some difference, possibly, whether that study is made before or after the waterway is completed. This amendment that we are now approving—and it has already been unanimously approved by the Rivers and Harbors Committee—provides that the study shall be made after the waterway is completed. Still, the chairman of the committee of this conference report refuses to say whether the Committee on Rivers and Harbors will attempt to exercise a general authority to order this study before the waterway is completed.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Oh, no; if the gentleman will permit, he can readily see it would not be practicable.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman answer this question?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me finish my sentence—it would not be practical to even begin the study until you have your waterway completed.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then it is the gentleman's expectation that this study will not be made until after the waterway is completed?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is not only his expectation, but he sees no way in which it can be studied until after it is completed.

Mr. CRAMTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendments, as adopted, will result in the addition of \$28,596,875 in authorizations to the expenditures authorized by the House. The bill, as it left the House, authorized expenditures to the amount of \$110,535,027.75. With the Senate amendments adopted the bill will call for an aggregate expenditure of \$138,141,902.75.

I have had a list of these increased cash expenditure authorizations made and will annex it to the statement I am now making.

In a general way the additional amounts authorized consist of the adoption of projects reported favorably by the engineers in precisely the terms recommended by them, and at costs specified in the reports. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, after a careful investigation into a considerable number of projects, approved by the engineers, concluded that, for the time being, something less than the work recommended would meet the needs of commerce, and this resulted in reductions of the expenditures recommended.

Another way in which the cash expenditure authorizations were increased by the Senate was by their dispensing with local contributions where they were required in the House bill.

A third way in which the Senate increased the cash authorizations was by their adding to sums recommended by the engineers and adopted by the House.

And last of all, 15 or 16 additional reports by the engineers were received by the Senate committee, after passage of the House bill.

The largest variations in amounts are for the upper Mississippi River, where the House bill authorized \$3,058,000 and the Senate amendment will carry \$7,500,000;

On the Missouri River, between Kansas City, Mo., and Sioux City, Iowa, where the House bill carried \$4,800,000, and the Senate bill \$15,000,000; and

On the Tennessee River, with an authorization of \$3,500,000 in the House bill, and of \$5,000,000 in the Senate bill.

Another large change is on the Caloosahatchee and Lake Okeechobee project in Florida, where the local contribution is cut from \$4,546,000 to \$2,000,000. Similarly, the local contribution required in the House bill of \$100,000 for the construction of a guard lock in the Chesapeake and Albemarle Canal, was stricken out by the Senate.

In the following cases the House committee reduced the amount of the work recommended by the engineers, and correspondingly the amounts to be expended, and the Senate amendments adopted the full project as recommended by the engineers, namely:

New Bedford Harbor, Mass. (H. Doc. 348-71-2)-----	\$318,000
James River, Va.-----	1,000,000
Brunswick Harbor, Ga. (S. Doc. 132-71-2)-----	810,000
Intracoastal waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, (S. Doc. 71-71-2), no added cost.	
Tampa Harbor, Fla. (H. Doc. 100-70-1), change in phraseology.	
Intracoastal waterway from Pensacola Bay to Mobile Bay, Ala.-----	500,000
San Diego Harbor, Calif. (S. Doc. 81-71-2)-----	246,000
Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers, Oreg. and Wash. (H. Doc. 195-70-1)-----	500,000
Seward Harbor, Alaska (H. Doc. 109-70-1)-----	85,000

The following are the projects which came in after the House bill was passed, with the approval of the engineers, all of which are embodied in the Senate bill, viz:

Taunton River, Mass. (H. Doc. 403)-----	\$780,000
Connecticut River, above Hartford, Conn.-----	1,000,000
East Chester Creek, N. Y. (Com. Doc. 37)-----	283,000
Claborne Harbor, Md. (S. Doc. 157)-----	12,125
Cape Fear River, N. C., above and below Wilmington (Com. Doc. 39)-----	796,750
Cedar Bayou, Tex. (S. Doc. 107)-----	25,000
Willamette River between Oregon City and Portland, Oreg. (H. Doc. 372)-----	160,000
Everett Harbor, Wash. (H. Doc. 377)-----	142,000
Lake River, Wash. (Com. Doc. 2, and favorable report of May 10, 1930)-----	3,000
Newtown Creek, N. Y. (Com. Doc. 42)-----	269,500
Schuylkill River (Com. Doc. 40)-----	1,300,000
Inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (S. Doc. 171 and Com. Doc. 41)-----	35,500
Oakland Harbor, Calif. (Com. Doc. 43)-----	197,000
Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channels, N. Y. (Com. Doc. 44)-----	1,150,000

In addition to authorizing additional expenditures the bill also adopts certain projects which, in the course of 10 years, will, to the extent of their cost, be charges on the Treasury. The only two cases of any importance are the upper Mississippi, where the 6-foot project is modified to provide for a depth of 9 feet. This project will, in the course of the time it will take to complete it, cost in the aggregate \$98,000,000. It is to be borne in mind, however, that an expenditure of only \$7,500,000 is authorized, and that it will be many years before the project will be completed, and that the expenditure will be spread over this long period. It has been freely charged that there is no recommendation of the engineers for this project. This is not quite true. A very distinguished survey board, consisting of four engineers, made the survey of this project, and made a most painstaking and detailed report, covering 43 printed pages, reaching the conclusion that \$50,000,000 of the work be authorized at once, but that the remaining work should be further studied, as it might result in a decrease in the estimated cost (H. Doc. 290, 71st Cong., 2d sess., p. 50). It is quite unusual to have more than one officer engaged in a survey. Here we had four. It is quite as unusual to have so elaborate and painstaking a report, obviously the result of prolonged investigation and study. So it is far from fair to say that this project is without recommendation. To be sure, the Board of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers differed with the survey board, but not in ultimate results, for the only conclusion to be drawn from the report of the Board of Engineers and of the Chief is that this project should be adopted and that just as soon as certain plans and studies can be made, in which they differ from the survey board, which has spent a very great length of time, and made a deep study of the subject.

There can be no question that a complete and favorable report would be made on this project within a few months, and that if not adopted now it would be adopted with practically no opposition as soon as a new report should be made by the Chief of Engineers. The opposition to the present adoption is on highly technical grounds; it means nothing more than deferring the adoption for a few months; and, what the project will ultimately cost can not justly be added to what the bill carries; only the expenditure authorized should be considered as a part of the expenditures involved in the present bill.

The second large authorization is that of the Tennessee River, involving \$75,000,000. Here there was a favorable report all along the line by the district engineer, the division engineers, by the board, and by the chief. Under the procedure ordinarily followed, under the practice in both the Senate and the House, the usual way would have been for the House to adopt this project just as the engineers recommend. Here, again, it can not be said that the ultimate cost of the project, or anything more than the \$5,000,000 of expenditures now authorized, should be considered as adding to the amount of the bill.

Again, it is claimed, rather recklessly, that the bill contains projects not recommended by the engineers. The fact is that the bill as it left the House contained a considerable number of projects in which the recommendations of the engineers have been considerably reduced. It contains practically no projects where an investigation had not been made and practically none where the project adopted was not in accord with the recommendations of the engineers. Nor can it be said that the Senate has added many projects which have not the approval of the engineers.

The salutary rule, and the one which is pursued, is not that Congress shall follow exactly or in all instances the recommendations of the engineers. The committees of both Houses have the highest respect for the engineers as such and as men. They regard the engineers as the finest experts in their line. There arise, however, not often but occasionally, cases which are to be determined as matters of policy or on economic grounds where the committee believes that general knowledge counts

for as much, if not more, than engineering skill. In such, and indeed in all cases, while paying the highest respect and deference to the opinion of the engineers on engineering questions the ultimate decision is with Congress to be made after full and complete investigation and on all of the facts and circumstances, including the engineering data.

There are about 105 Senate amendments. The important amendments have already been considered. The rest, some 60 in number, consist of surveys, where, as it was developed when a rivers and harbors bill came before the House some years ago, the average cost will not be over \$3 to \$5 for each amendment.

The consolidation of our waterways has been viewed by transportation experts as equally important with that of our railroads. For many years students of waterway transportation have agreed that the end to be attained in water transportation in this country is to have a connected system of waterways, so that every city, town, and hamlet located on any one of our waterways could send a ship or barge fully loaded to any other place having the advantage of a waterway location. To accomplish this entailed a comprehensive plan, and that means a large plan, involving many projects in order to connect all these waterways and make them a unified whole. This is accomplished in the pending bill; we already had the two oceans connected by the Panama Canal, but our two great inland systems of waterways—the Great Lakes and the Mississippi system, with 9,000 miles of canalized rivers—have no connection, and the Great Lakes had no connection with the sea. These two, the only missing links, are supplied in this bill through the improvement of the Illinois River and the taking over of the New York Erie and Oswego Canals. Now it will be possible to ship a vessel load of lumber from the Pacific coast without unloading or reloading, or a cargo of sulphur from Texas, or a cargo of sugar from Louisiana, or of oil from California or Texas to any destination on the Great Lakes on a through bill of lading, and at greatly reduced freight charges. Both the consumer and the producer will benefit by this large reduction in transportation cost.

Although the commerce on the Great Lakes is greatest in volume and cheapest in cost of any in the world, the products transported are simply coal, grain, ore, and stone. The result of connecting the Atlantic with the Great Lakes by the New York canals, which will be given depth and bridge clearances sufficient to make them as thoroughly efficient and economical as barge canals, and through the connection by the Illinois River of the Mississippi system with the Great Lakes the commerce on these great inland seas will grow and multiply to an enormous extent, and that as soon as the New York and the Illinois waterways are completed.

Through the pending bill, too, the Atlantic deeper waterways are completed from Boston to Florida. A navigable channel is constructed across Florida, cutting down the transportation distance between Gulf ports and those on the Atlantic by 600 miles.

We will not be threatened with shallow water and the necessity of loading the large freighters on the Great Lakes to only partial capacity in the future, because, allowing for increase in the size of freighters, the 24 feet to which the Lake channels will be deepened as the result of this bill will give an adequate transportation depth for many, many years to come. Besides that, we provide for the construction of regulatory or compensation works.

Through these two means—the deepening of the channels and these regulatory works—we will add to the present depth of 20 feet altogether 5½ or 6 feet.

This bill is the greatest bill in all of the history of the country in the beneficial results which it is sure to accomplish. Necessarily, it involves the expenditure of a considerable sum of money. However, the one aim of uniting and combining all of our waterways is accomplished by it, and that once for all. No expenditures aside from those here authorized will be necessary in the future. Indeed, looking over the country and reviewing the projects involved in this bill, it is difficult to see how many large rivers and harbors authorization bills can come before Congress for many years to come.

It is to be borne in mind, too, that our expenditures for rivers and harbors are not great as compared with those for other public works; we are expending many hundreds of millions of dollars on public buildings; and we have adopted the policy of spending \$125,000,000 a year, for three years to come, upon highways. Certainly the most enthusiastic advocates of good roads and of new and improved buildings will not claim that there is any greater demand for improved highways or new public buildings than there is for improvement of rivers and harbors, and thereby furnishing cheap transportation for our people.

I venture the assertion that there is many times the interest in and demand for the improvement of rivers and harbors than for any other public work or expenditure. Yet we are expending but \$60,000,000 a year on rivers and harbors, in face of more than twice that amount for highways and of a vastly greater expenditure for public buildings.

The public rating or estimate of the relative importance of issues is easily seen by reviewing presidential campaigns. No great orator, no speaker who was listened to by any large audience, addressed an audience throughout the last presidential campaign in which he did not fail to emphasize the fact that his party and his candidate was pledged to the improvement of our rivers and harbors. Again and again, everywhere where meetings were held was the importance of river and harbors improvement emphasized, and in each instance it met with the most enthusiastic response and support. I challenge anyone to find any considerable number of speeches where highways or public buildings were mentioned or where in any way their importance or need was emphasized.

In conclusion, I prophesy that this bill will prove far and away of the greatest value to our farmers, our manufacturers, and our consumers of any rivers and harbors bill ever passed in the history of this country.

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 11781, INVOLVING INCREASED AUTHORIZATIONS FOR RIVER AND HARBOR WORK

New Bedford Harbor, Mass. (additional authorization)-----	\$318,000
Taunton River, Mass. (new report)-----	780,000
Newtown Creek, N. Y. (new report)-----	269,500
Bay Ridge and Red Hook Channels, New York Harbor, N. Y. (new report)-----	1,150,000
East Chester Creek, N. Y. (new report)-----	283,000
Schuylkill River, Pa. (new report)-----	1,300,000
Inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (two new reports)-----	35,500
Claiborne Harbor, Md. (new report)-----	12,125
Inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C. (additional authorization)-----	100,000
James River, Va. (additional authorization)-----	1,000,000
Cape Fear River, N. C., above and below Wilmington (new report)-----	796,750
Far Creek, N. C. (additional authorization)-----	10,000
Brunswick Harbor, Ga. (additional authorization)-----	816,000
Intracoastal waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami (modification of existing project; no added cost).	
Miami Harbor, Fla. (amends House provision so as to adopt complete recommendation in report; no added cost).	
Caloosahatchee and Lake Okeechobee drainage area, Florida (additional authorization)-----	2,546,000
Intracoastal waterway from Pensacola Bay to Mobile Bay, Ala. and Fla. (additional authorization)-----	500,000
Cedar Bayou, Tex. (new report)-----	25,000
Mississippi River, from Illinois River to Minneapolis (additional authorization)-----	4,442,000
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City (additional authorization)-----	10,200,000
Tennessee River (additional authorization)-----	1,500,000
San Diego Harbor, Calif. (additional authorization)-----	246,000
Oakland Harbor, Calif. (new report)-----	197,000
Novo River, Calif. (new report)-----	180,000
Willamette River, between Oregon City and Portland, Oreg. (new report)-----	160,000
Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, Oreg. and Wash. (additional authorization)-----	500,000
Everett Harbor, Wash. (new report)-----	142,000
Lake River, Wash. (new report)-----	3,000
Seward Harbor, Alaska (new report)-----	85,000
	27,596,875

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

There was no objection.

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

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the river and harbor bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Speaker, a rivers and harbors bill, when completed, invariably pleases a great portion of the Members of the House and Senate. This bill in particular is one that cleans up all of the odds and ends of the waterway projects that should be adopted. Nearly every part of the United States is recognized in this bill, and justly so, because all of these projects have been thoroughly investigated by the Government engineers and passed after a complete hearing before the Rivers and Harbors Committee on each project. In my opinion, the bill adopted by the Senate is a good bill.

The only real controversial question before the Senate was the Illinois waterway, and in this, of course, I was greatly interested because the Illinois project is the most important link in the waterway between Lake Michigan and the Gulf of Mexico. Without the adoption of this waterway all the great interlocking river developments in the West and South would become almost useless because it would for all time prevent the interchange of

commerce between these rivers and the Great Lakes, which is the crux of the inland waterway development. This connection also makes it possible for the manufacturing industries on the Great Lakes to ship their products by a direct water route to the Southern Hemisphere. It is highly important that this great Illinois-Mississippi project should be adopted in such a way as to give the most efficient waterway service.

While the bill concerning the Illinois waterway, as it is now written, does not carry a complete diversion, at the same time it gives all the water necessary for the operation of the waterway until 1939, and in addition it asks for a survey during this period by the Government engineers to determine the exact amount of water that will be necessary to operate it as a useful commercial waterway for all time to come.

I believe that the demand by the citizens of the United States for the successful operation of this waterway will be so great that at the proper time Congress will authorize a diversion for the necessary water. I also believe that we should accept the project, as adopted by the Senate, and go along and complete the project at as early a date as possible. I hope the bill will pass as written.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH FARMING?

Mr. MOREHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a discussion of the farm problem by Mr. Fred D. Humphrey, of Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following discussion of the farm problem by Mr. Fred D. Humphrey, of Nebraska:

("Woe unto him that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work." (Jer. xxii, 13.) "He is no clown that drives a plow, but he that doth clownish things."—Ben. Franklin.)

WHAT'S WRONG WITH FARMING?

By Fred D. Humphrey, 1210 M Street, Lincoln, Nebr.

For the relief of the farmer a lot has been written. Some of it was good, some mere piffle. Most of it was based upon the viewpoint of the writer. For instance, the financier's way of helping the farmer is to loan him money. But that is simply adding fuel to the flames of debt that are now consuming the farmer.

The industrialist's method of helping the farmer is to work out some scheme whereby he can produce more grain at less cost. He is mainly interested in keeping down the price of food to the laboring man so that the cost of living will not be increased and wages advanced. So the manufacturer seeks to help the farmer reduce the cost of producing and handling grain. This article is an attempt to look at the farming situation from the farmer's standpoint, from an economic basis.

Three things must be accomplished before the farmer will be on the road to financial success.

First. An economic price for grain must be found.

Second. This economic price must be established.

Third. All artificial interferences with the establishment and maintenance of this economic price must be abolished as far as possible.

These three things will be taken up in their order.

What is a bushel of corn worth? How much should a bushel of wheat sell for? The first rule of profit is to sell something for more than it cost. So our first inquiry will naturally be to find out what it costs to produce a bushel of grain. This is called the cost of production price. When free and unrestrained by artificial barriers, two natural laws control the price of every article of commerce—the law of cost of production and the law of supply and demand. Over a hundred years ago Adam Smith in his Wealth of Nations called one the "natural" price and the other the "market" price, and went on to say that whenever the "market" price fell below the "natural" price that a hardship was worked upon the producer.

He explained further that the "natural" price was what it cost to produce the article; the cost of labor, wear and tear on machinery, depreciation of land and buildings, interest on the investment, and taxes. While few farmers could give the cost of producing grain, the agricultural colleges of the Middle West have for a number of years kept an accurate and exact account of the average cost of producing a bushel of grain. Having arrived at the cost of producing a bushel of grain, having found an economic cost of production price, the next step is to establish it. And this is a long story.

ECONOMIC EVOLUTION

To many this world is a "mighty maze," but to those who have made a study of it, the Creator has a plan and a purpose in its making. The plan of creation proceeds upon orderly paths of progressive growth, or evolution, and its purpose is the ultimate perfection of man. Two laws of growth are apparent: The law of the survival of the fittest, which is the law of growth for animals, and the law of service and sacrifice, which is the law of growth for men. Business is based, more or less, upon these laws. Under individualism, where the private ownership of property is the basis of civilization, the price of an article is

determined largely by the law of the cost of production and the law of supply and demand. The law of supply and demand is the foundation of the competitive system, where success consists in the destruction of the competitor through buccaneer cutthroat prices and the survival of the fittest. The law of cost of production is the foundation of the cooperative system, where success consists of better service, right prices, and in a good-will spirit of live and let live.

We have been gradually working out from under the gambling influence of the competitive system, where the law of supply and demand fixed the price of an article and the cost of manufacture had little to do with it, and getting onto the certain and business basis of the cooperative system where the price is based largely upon the cost of production plus a fair and reasonable profit. It was to aid this change that the tariff, the Esch-Cummins law, the Federal reserve law, the immigration law, and other helps to business and labor were passed. For instance, under the tariff law, by agreement, manufacturers could make prices upon a cost of production basis in this country without the competition of foreign-made goods that were the product of cheap labor. It was figured that the high standard of living for labor in this country was a benefit to the people as a whole and should be maintained by a tariff tax.

The aim, therefore, of every business is to operate upon a cost of production or budget basis, and to get out from under the competitive and destructive effects of the law of supply and demand. Nearly every other branch of industry and labor has been helped by the Government to make this change through such legislation as the tariff, the Esch-Cummins Act, the immigration law, and the Federal reserve law. These enactments have had to do with competition, either at home or abroad, and the handling of surpluses. The farmer is the last to attempt to make this change, and he is entitled to the same consideration and help from the Government that other business and labor have had.

COMBINATION NECESSARY

In order that farmers may get a cost of production plus a profit price for their grain it is necessary for them to combine. Crop pooling on a large scale is an efficient method of cooperative marketing. It is a sane and sensible way of organizing the farmers so that they can have something to say about the price of grain.

The way to sell at an advantage is to have few sellers and many buyers. This situation is just reversed when the farmer comes to market with his grain. At the elevator there is only one buyer, the grain dealer, and many sellers, the farmers. The success of the farmer depends upon the number of buyers; the success of the grain dealer depends upon the number of sellers. The more sellers, the cheaper he will buy.

Crop pooling is an attempt to reduce the number of sellers by getting the farmers to have one man sell their grain for them. The more farmers you can get to join the pool the harder you make it for the grain buyer. The ideal condition is when all the farmers sign up. Then the only place the grain buyer can fill his orders is from their agent. When this situation is brought about the farmer can name the price the grain buyer will have to pay as there is no one else from whom he can purchase.

To get out from under destructive effects of the competitive law of supply and demand, and base agriculture upon the beneficent cooperative law of cost of production, the farmer must do as the manufacturer has done—he must organize to control the surplus grain and must provide some way of taking care of the loss on grain sold for export. In my judgment, the best form of organization is the wheat pool. It has been tried in Canada with great success.

All relief legislation is based upon the tariff principle of a cost-of-production price in the home market and a world price in the foreign market. This situation is brought about by an equalization fee or a debenture, and control of the surplus behind a tariff wall. The crop is handled by pooling the grain so that it may be distributed in accordance with the law of supply and demand, obeying the three requirements of quantity, time, and place. Control of the surplus maintains the domestic-market price and permits the sale of export grain at the foreign price without affecting the home market. The fund necessary for carrying on these operations is raised either by a tariff debenture or an equalization fee. It is a physical impossibility for 20,000,000 farmers to organize without Government help. All that the farmer asks is that the Government provide the loans and organization necessary to put the thing on its feet.

THE WEST DEMANDS BENEFIT OF TARIFF

Now what the West insists upon is that the farmer be placed on the same high American standard of living, and this can be done only by making the tariff effective as to his produce so that he will not have to compete with cheap foreign labor and the low standard of living under which the peasant exists. By handling the crop surplus through an equalization fee or a debenture the Government can help the farmer get upon a cost-of-production basis and thereby put him in step with industry and labor. Unless this is done the injustice of the present arrangement is bound to be felt sooner or later because there is a natural law of business whereby such infractions of equity are punished.

It was this natural law of justice that Thomas Jefferson was thinking of when he wrote a friend after the defeat of abolition in Virginia in 1791: "I tremble for my country when I think of the negro and remember that God is just."

The next step forward in our economic life is to put farming upon a cost of production business basis. We do not take a Government estimate of the number of shoes that are produced in the United States and then fix the price accordingly. We find out the cost of production and make our price from that. That is exactly what we must do for grain.

EQUALITY FOR AGRICULTURE

That the farmer is in dire financial straits is due to the economic inequality that exists in the United States to-day. The farmer is laboring under an economic disadvantage. He buys in a protected market at a home price, and sells in an unprotected market at a world price. This means that he buys at high prices and sells at low. This situation has arisen since the war, and has been made acute by deflation. To give some idea of the change that has taken place, a few prices will be quoted. The binder the farmer used to buy for \$125 now costs him \$250, and the wagon that he used to pay \$65 for now sells for \$150. Practically everything that the farmer buys has increased in price in the same proportion. On the other hand, pre-war prices prevail on what the farmer sells. Speaking of this great agricultural section, in a March issue of Collier's, Roger W. Babson says: "Here was a tremendous area with a population of over 12,000,000 of people, who had experienced hard times since the great smash of 1920. The reason was not poor crops but a low price for the things the farmer produced and a high price for the things he bought."

The difference in price between what the farmer pays for what he buys and what he gets for what he sells is so great that the 1928 World Almanac states that the farmer's dollar is worth only 60 cents, and Secretary Jardine in the 1926 Agriculture Yearbook says that when the farmer sells corn for 70 cents he is really only getting 45 cents on a pre-war price basis. Buying at high prices and selling at low has put the farmer so in debt that farm mortgages have more than doubled since 1910. This can not go on, and this unjust economic situation must be righted.

To right this wrong economic condition over which the farmer has had no control and which has been imposed upon him by the Government in special legislation for the benefit of the other groups of society, it is now proposed to give agriculture the same protection that labor and industry have enjoyed.

The prosperity of the farmer concerns all of us, because his condition affects us as a whole. W. J. Bryan said that if you destroyed the cities and left the farms, that the cities would spring up again as if by magic; but if you destroyed the farms, that grass would grow in the streets of the cities. That the farmer is the basis of civilization is the verdict of history. The fall of every empire began with the decay of the rural population. When the farmer fails, civilization falls. There must be a profitable return for the tiller of the soil as well as for the toiler in the town. A great nation can not be maintained on industry alone. It must raise its own food and must be renewed and sustained by a prosperous and growing farm population. Tenantry can not produce the great men necessary to carry on a great nation.

Business also reflects the condition of the farmer. The 5,000,000 idle men who walk the streets of the cities of this country to-day are there because of the distressed condition of the American farmer. Our individual and national prosperity depends upon his success. It vitally concerns us to help the farmer get upon a paying basis, and farm-relief legislation is the most efficient means to this end. It should be supported by everyone who loves fair play and a square deal and who wants to see economic justice enthroned in this great Republic. Its enactment is demanded by a hard-working and long-suffering people who are entitled to the same consideration and protection by the Government that industry and labor have had.

BARRIERS TO AN ECONOMIC PRICE

Before we can establish an economic, cost of production plus a profit price for the farmer's produce, it is necessary to tear down the existing artificial barriers to the free and untrammelled operation of the laws of cost of production and supply and demand. The present method of doing business on the Chicago Board of Trade is a constant source of irritation and hindrance to the operation of these laws. By allowing unlimited speculation and short selling, mere sentiment rules the price of grain. While it is constantly affirmed by the board that it operates under the law of supply and demand, we find that the price of grain rises and falls as the gamble goes, and anything that makes sentiment affects the price. If the law of supply and demand controlled the board, only the grain that goes to market would affect the price.

But under existing conditions, the prospect of a large crop, a rain in India, or the prediction of a failure through drought or frost, or even a drop in the stock market affects the price of grain. Ask any board of trade man if it is the grain on the farm or the grain that goes to market that makes the price. If he says it is the grain on the farm that controls the price, then it does no good for the farmer to hold

his grain; if he says it is the grain that goes to market, how is it that the prospect of a large crop three months before it can be harvested and taken to market affects the price?

PRICE FIXING

The problem of the farmer now is not so much the raising of the grain as the selling of it at a profitable price. The man who produces and owns the grain ought to have something to say about the price. Under present conditions he has nothing to say about it. Not only that, but the price as now fixed by the Chicago Board of Trade is not based upon any economic law but a mere matter of speculation. This must be changed if the farmer is ever to get upon a cost of production basis. The first step in putting agriculture upon a sound business basis is to pass a law that to sell on the board one must have the grain or a bona fide contract for it from one who has. Gambling in the property of the farmer must cease. No other business could succeed under such conditions, and no other business allows it.

The farmer is not only subject to the competition of his neighbors who have grain to sell but has to meet the competition of those who have no grain but are allowed to sell on the board something they do not have. It is gambling pure and simple, and gambling is a relic of barbarism. That is the difference between civilization and barbarism; in barbarism one takes without paying or giving any service; in civilization one refuses to take without giving compensation or service. Satisfaction guaranteed or money back is the modern merchant's way of expressing this fact.

WHO SELL WHAT THEY DO NOT OWN AND REAP WHERE THEY HAVE NOT SOWN

The big obstacle to any change in the present method of fixing the price of grain is the rule of the Chicago Board of Trade that permits of selling short or the selling of grain by those who have none. This rule makes unlimited speculation possible and destroys a stable market. When you consider that the whole grain crop is sold every month, or twelve times as much as exists is sold every year, you realize to what alarming extent speculation takes place in grain trading. Naturally where there is so much more bought and sold in a speculative way the speculative price controls, to the great loss of the farmer and the grain trade in general. To remedy this evil and prevent gambling it is necessary to pass a law that to sell on the board one must have the grain or a contract for it from one who has. This rule will take care of legitimate business and hedging and prevent the violent and destructive price fluctuations that accompany gambling on the board.

GAMBLING

Gambling is wrong per se in itself, because it is taking something for nothing, and taking something for nothing is another form of stealing. Gambling is an attempt to get wealth without work, and, therefore, wrong. That is right which helps evolution; that is wrong which hinders the growth of the individual. Man grows by effort. It is not in getting the thing, but in the effort put forth in its attainment that gives advancement. We gain strength by putting brain and muscle to the strain.

The theory upon which the Chicago price is fixed is that of bargaining and belongs to the Dark Ages of trading. How long would any business last if it auctioned off its goods? Fifty years ago people used to bargain for everything they bought, but now business is built upon the solid foundation of fair prices. James Allen, in his book, says, "Justice is the giving and receiving of equal values. What is called striking a bargain is a kind of theft. It means that purchaser gives value for only a portion of his purchase, the remainder being appropriated as clear gain. The bargaining spirit of business is not the true spirit of commerce. It is the selfish, thieving spirit which wants to get something for nothing. The sound business man purges his business of all bargaining, and builds it on the more dignified basis of justice. He supplies a good article at its right price, and does not alter." He has but one price—that based upon cost of production plus a reasonable profit. To keep step with industry and labor, the farmer must go and do likewise.

ECONOMIC INJUSTICE THE GREAT WRONG

The West has endured the stress of unfair economic conditions imposed by the Government in a high protective tariff for the last 10 years. All other lines of industry and labor have been helped by legislation to build anew upon a cost-of-production basis, but agriculture has been left to shift for itself. It is the only business to-day not organized upon a cost-of-production basis. Unless farming is put in step with other lines of industry, the East may yet be made to realize how far their prosperity is based upon ours. It was because the industrialists of Rome refused to hear the cry of the home farmers of that day for a price that would enable them to prosper, and bought grain in Sicily and Egypt because it was cheap, that the Roman Empire became disorganized and Rome fell. Are we going to profit by their failure? The West is not in want, but it is in the slavery of debt. Is slavery less galling because self-imposed, or debt less tyrannical because an elected sovereign? Debt is the taskmaster of this age, and interest is the chain that binds. This is a war of abolition—the aboli-

tion of debt—and grain is the liberator, who, when prices are based upon the solid ground of cost of production plus a profit business basis, will free the debt slaves of the West.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI, ST. CROIX, AND MINNESOTA RIVERS

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the rivers and harbors conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the farmers and business men of Minnesota are vitally interested in the development of river transportation, and therefore I desire at this time to speak upon the 9-foot channel project in the Mississippi River and for the authorization for surveys on the St. Croix and Minnesota Rivers.

The present rivers and harbors bill contains a provision for a 9-foot channel in the upper Mississippi River and provides an authorization of \$7,500,000 as the initial appropriation, in addition to other amounts authorized under existing projects. The importance of the adoption of the 9-foot project at this time can not be overestimated in its benefits for Minnesota and other States in the upper Mississippi Valley, and I most urgently request the House and the conferees on the rivers and harbors bill to concur in the Senate provision.

The total cost of the project is estimated to be less than \$100,000,000. While this amount might seem large, it is estimated that the entire cost will be saved to the farmers and consumers within two or three years after completion, by reason of lower transportation rates on agricultural and other products.

The Secretary of War and the Board of Engineers of the War Department have given recognition to the establishment of a 9-foot channel in the upper Mississippi River. Under the recommendations made by the board it appears to me that the proper time is at hand for the adoption of this project in the present rivers and harbors bill.

I quote briefly from the report made by the Chief of Engineers:

The improvement of the main stem of the Mississippi River as far north as the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, goes logically in hand with the recently completed 9-foot project on the Ohio to Pittsburgh and the ultimate opening of the Missouri to the greatest feasible depth. It is an essential part of the Mississippi Valley system and part of the route from that system to the Great Lakes. Reliable and economical navigation is not practicable on a depth of less than 6 feet, but would be assured by a depth of 9 feet. It is recommended that all permanent structures on the upper Mississippi River to be built under the existing project between the mouth of the Mississippi and St. Paul-Minneapolis be executed with a view of being adapted without reconstruction or relocation to plans for an ultimate 9-foot depth, and that after completion of the survey now in progress complete and detailed plans for a 9-foot project from the mouth of the Missouri to St. Paul-Minneapolis be prepared and submitted to Congress.

The construction of the Panama Canal reduced the cost of transportation from coast to coast. The intercoast water rate now is less than the rate by rail from the central United States to any seaport. This virtual increase of the distance from the farm to seaports is further aggravated by the recent increase in rail rates. Should the Mississippi be developed to the proportions of a trunk stream throughout, it would tend to equalize the competition between our inland States and the agricultural regions of other countries more advantageously located near the oceans.

I desire to call the attention of the committee to a statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture for the year 1921, on the effect of increases in freight rates:

This transportation matter is one of vital importance to agriculture. The country has been developed on the low long haul. Land values, crops, and farming practices in general have been adjusted to this development. Large advances in freight rates, therefore, while bearable in a time of high prices, if continued, are bound to involve a remaking of our agricultural map. The simple process of marking up the transportation cost a few cents per hundred pounds has the same effect on a surplus-producing State as picking it up and setting it down 100 to 300 miles farther from market.

I also desire to call the attention of the House to statements made by the President while a member of the Cabinet as Secretary of Commerce:

It seems certain that the cost of transportation to these competitive markets must be deducted from the farm price, and that it not only affects the actual grain moved to these markets, but establishes a lower comparative price level for all grain produced.

In the mid-West, the territory tributary to any of these projects, the economic situation is considerably distorted; there is much agricultural distress and incessant demands for remedial legislation. This situation

to a large extent has been brought about by transportation changes. Increases in railway rates since the war force the mid-West farmer to pay from 6 to 12 cents more per bushel to reach world markets than before the war. Foreign farmers produce close to ocean ports and pay but little, if any, more than pre-war costs, because shipping rates are substantially at pre-war levels.

While it is true that these rate increases apply only on the exports of grain, nevertheless the price which the farmer receives in foreign markets is the principal factor in determining his return upon the whole crop, not alone the export balance. It is this transportation differential that is unquestionably one of the most important causes for our present agricultural depression.

Coincident with these increased rail rates the mid-West has also been affected adversely by the operation of the Panama Canal. Cheaper water transportation has brought the coasts relatively closer together at the same time that increased rail rates, figuratively speaking, have moved the mid-West farther from seaboard. This situation has been expressed graphically by setting up a new measuring unit in the shape of the number of cents that it takes to move a ton of freight. By using this measuring road, it can be stated, that for a certain manufacture these post-war influences have moved Chicago 336 cents away from the Pacific coast, while New York has been moved 224 cents closer to the Pacific coast. These factors operate reciprocally and not only place a handicap on the outbound products of the mid-West but also add to the costs of inbound supplies.

It appears to me that the necessity for the development of the upper Mississippi River can not be questioned by any reasonable minded individual, and the time is now at hand for the complete adoption of the project.

Hand in hand with the development of the upper Mississippi is included a survey for a 9-foot channel in the St. Croix River and a survey for a 6-foot channel in the Minnesota River at the present time. The development of these two rivers will make possible lower transportation rates and complete use of the important tributaries in the Mississippi River system.

These projects are necessities, the ultimate consummation of which will go a long ways toward solving the difficult economic problem with which we are confronted in the Middle West.

CONDITIONS IN VENEZUELA

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in regard to a resolution introduced regarding conditions in Venezuela.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me extending my remarks, I want to refer to a resolution introduced by me in the House to-day relative to the conditions which it has been intimated exist in our neighbor Republic, Venezuela. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas it is charged in affidavits, letters, and writings set out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States of Tuesday, June 3, 1930, at pages 9939 to 9955, that the Government set up in Venezuela has been for many years, and now is, a despotism of the most obnoxious types; and

Whereas it is inconceivable that the Government of the United States of America should continue to maintain diplomatic relations with any so-called government that maintains itself in power by inflicting the most inhuman tortures upon men, women, and children, in order to present to the world an appearance of "peace and order"; and

Whereas it appears that the despotism that has been in effect for so long a time in Venezuela is in direct conflict with the republican form of government which is published to the world as being the form of government existing in that country, and upon which representation Venezuela has been able to secure entry into the family of civilized nations; and

Whereas it appears that this chaotic condition in Venezuela has resulted in the unlawful imprisonment of a citizen of the United States of America and the denial to him of the protection of the law published as being in force and effect in Venezuela; and

Whereas it appears that this despotism in Venezuela could not exist if it were not for the moral support and aid that the despot Juan Vincente Gomez receives from the United States of America: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives of the said United States is hereby requested and urged to make a full investigation of conditions in Venezuela with the object of ascertaining the facts relative to the charges set forth in the affidavits, letter, and writings published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 3, 1930, at pages aforesaid, in order that the Congress of the United States may be fully informed to what extent, if any, the Government of the United States is responsible for the horrible conditions that are alleged to exist in Venezuela, South America.

Resolved further, That said committee or a subcommittee thereof be, and it hereby is, given full power to subpoena witnesses and require their testimony before it or any subcommittee thereof.

Resolved further, That the said committee report the evidence and its findings thereon, together with recommendations as to it might seem appropriate, to the Congress with all convenient speed.

It has been brought to my attention that a citizen of the United States, Mr. James E. Welch, of the State of Louisiana, had been for a considerable period of time incarcerated by the Venezuelan Government in jail in that country without the authority of law; and from Mr. Welch's statement and other information which I have received there does not seem to have been the least semblance for grounds for his being incarcerated in this filthy prison.

After my attention had been called to this fact I was led to make a study of this particular case, and this made it necessary for me to look into the general political conditions existing in that country and I must say that I am appalled at the conditions that seem to exist in Venezuela. It is inconceivable to me that such conditions that appear to have existed for many years could continue and not result in protest from all civilized nations of the world. This particular citizen of the United States having been so grossly misused by this Government, the guaranteed protection by his country is what interested me more than any other phase of the conditions that exist there.

I have examined the evidence submitted on the part of those interested in obtaining justice for James E. Welch, citizen of the United States, and have been appalled to find that the Government of the United States would bring itself to recognize any so-called government, maintained by such practices as seem to be the rule under the Gomez régime in Venezuela. I frankly admit as a Member of the Congress of the United States that if one-hundredth part of the things charged against Gomez in a book which I have recently read, Gomez the Shame of America, by Jose Rafael Pocatererra, be true, then his countenance in power by the aid, directly or indirectly, in the United States is one of the foulest blots upon the record of this country; and I say further without hesitation that if any reasonable portion of the things charged in this book be true, then those who are responsible for the recognition and maintenance in Venezuela have betrayed the people of this country, and especially the things which this country was supposed to have fought for in the World War.

Some time ago Senator RANSELL introduced a resolution in the Senate asking for the investigation of these conditions by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in which I am very much interested, and I sincerely hope that the Senate and House will both make an investigation for the purpose of ascertaining if the statements placed in the RECORD by Senator RANSELL are true or only alleged.

It seems to me that it is a poor public policy for the Government to be negotiating treaties having for their declared purpose the establishing of peace in the world based upon an "enlightened sense of justice" if we are to stand by, give aid and comfort to a despot who maintains himself in power, if reports be true, by resorting to practices that would put to shame the most barbaric chief that ever ruled over any uncivilized tribe in the darkest ages of the world's history.

Of course, these charges against this Government may not be well founded but in view of the fact that a citizen of the United States claims to have received the barbarous treatment that he has received and in view of other charges that are being made I am convinced it is the duty of this Congress to investigate same and I sincerely trust that the resolution that I have introduced will bring about action by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

THE BLACK BASS

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the bill, H. R. 941, passed yesterday?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to say a few words in support of legislation now before the House—a bill to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass. This bill is offered for the protection of the greatest of all American game fish, the black bass, which will soon become extinct in the United States unless some nationwide protection is offered for its salvation.

Experience has shown that the black bass can not be artificially propagated the same as trout and other fishes, but must be given protection and opportunity to reproduce under natural conditions. Hence, if this noble fish should eventually disappear from the waters of the United States, it will be gone forever and as completely as the buffalo and the passenger pigeon.

Some States already have laws on their statute books preventing the sale of black bass, but these laws are more or less

nullified by the fact that black bass is shipped out of the State in barrels with rough fish on the top and bottom and with black bass in between and offered for sale in States where there are no laws to prohibit the transaction. This bill, we believe, will put a stop to this evasion of the State laws and will do more for the protection of black bass than anything that has been offered in this connection up to this time.

As a boy, I experienced the thrill that comes from an encounter with this king of our game fish, and enjoyed the boyhood pleasures of hunting and fishing on our native streams in Illinois and I have always had a keen desire to make it possible for the boys of future generations to have some share in like pleasures and pastimes which have no equal and are, perhaps, the most healthful and wholesome of all the pleasures of boyhood.

I hope that no one in the House will raise an objection to this bill and that we may be able to take one sure step forward in our plan of conservation by enacting the bill into law.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes to-morrow after the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the gentleman from Massachusetts obtained consent to address the House for 10 minutes to-morrow. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that following him he may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 10919) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, and so forth, for printing under the rule.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRTY-FIRST NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman offers a resolution from the Committee on Printing. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 256

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a House document the proceedings of the Thirty-first National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for the year 1930, with accompanying illustrations.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, what is the nature of that?

Mr. KIESS. It is a resolution for printing the proceedings of the National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. It is not a new thing at all, as we have been doing it for a number of years. It costs approximately \$1,900. I am surprised that there should be any opposition to a resolution of this kind, when to-morrow or next day we may be called upon to appropriate millions of dollars for World War veterans. It merely confirms the statement I have often made that it is easier to pass a bill appropriating millions of dollars than to pass one involving only a few thousand dollars.

Mr. GARNER. This is a unanimous report?

Mr. KIESS. It is.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE TENTH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, I present another privileged resolution from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 255

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a House document the proceedings of the Tenth National Convention of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War for the year 1930, with accompanying illustrations.

Mr. KIESS. This will cost \$1,383.30.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to its present consideration?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, if agreeable to the leadership, to address the House on Thursday after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, on what subject?

Mr. CRAMTON. I would like to discuss the subject of the duplication of effort and waste of public funds due to the War Department taking over the functions of the Geological Survey and the Reclamation Service and other activities of the Interior Department.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. There is nothing about prohibition?

Mr. CRAMTON. Nothing of the kind; although I recognize the need of the gentleman from Wisconsin for light on that. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] may have 15 minutes on Thursday, following the address of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] may have 15 minutes on Thursday, following the address of the gentleman from Michigan. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the indulgence of the House immediately after the address of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] to the extent of five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes on Thursday, following the address of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT RECORDS

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 260.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 260. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 260

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, directed to return to the Treasury Department, taking receipt therefore, the original records, documents, books, and papers, inventoried, which were adduced as evidence before the select committee appointed under House Resolution 231, Sixty-eighth Congress, and by that committee turned over to the files of the House to accompany its report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. What is the object?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. The purpose of it is to return to the Treasury Department the files that our committee used during the consideration of the duplication of funds a few years ago.

Mr. GARNER. Has the Treasury Department made a request that they be returned?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Has the committee made a thorough investigation of the question?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. These papers were impounded by us and have been kept in the committee room. They may be lost. If there is anything going to be done I object to their going back.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the rivers and harbors bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I have nothing to

speak of in this bill. I have no direct interest in it. The Mississippi River from Cape Girardeau to the Head of the Passes is under the jurisdiction and control of the Mississippi River Commission, and my interest in the great river is from the standpoint of flood control, which, when effectuated, will mean a navigable river the year around.

But I am as enthusiastic as any member on Rivers and Harbors for our waterways that are not under the dominion of the Mississippi River Commission. Why? Because the development of the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Illinois, and every other navigable tributary of the big river that moves through New Orleans to the Gulf means necessarily something in the way of commerce to the old city of which every American is proud, and that her native sons love as the last city on the river.

I sent down through our newspaper correspondents to-night expressions which I know will be gratifying to our people who can never forget the glories of the past and who sigh for their return for the renaissance which will again story the mighty stream with the romance immortalized by Mark Twain. Said DEMPSEY, in a brief message into which he compressed a book of information, "Tell them I think that the passage of this bill means more for the valley and the Great Lakes States than anything that has happened legislatively during 100 years"—and mark me, the Great Lakes States will in the future vie with the valley States in claiming the credit for the passage of this constructive measure.

And so said Ed HULL, who has played the part of a hero in the strife. With characteristic courage he stated clearly with faith in the greatness that opulence can and will bring to his countrymen, if time and experience demonstrate that there are imperfections in the bill we shall make them perfections. Let us build upon this splendid foundation enduringly, so that even in this generation men will say, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

Mr. Speaker, some time since I had the pleasure of attending with other members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, a joint discussion with the Board of Engineers in regard to the Erie Canal. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], one of the big men of this House, had been advocating for a long time the development of the Erie Canal upon the ground that the present equipment used in that canal can not economically transport the freight that would be transported profitably in larger barges.

During the course of his address Mr. DEMPSEY made what was to me an astounding statement, and I dare say astounding to a great many others, and yet very gratifying. Mr. DEMPSEY was very eloquent, because he felt his subject keenly. He is a man greatly interested in the development of the country from a waterways standpoint, and I say for him that he knows no North, no South, no East, no West. Mr. DEMPSEY is a real waterway man and urges his views with the zeal of a crusader following Peter the Hermit. We Democrats on the committee greatly admire Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. DEMPSEY, in the course of his address to the Board of Engineers, made the statement that Mr. L. F. Loree, president of the Delaware & Hudson Railroad, one of the great captains of industry of this country before he became a transportation man, and who is educated to his finger tips upon traffic matters, declared recently that the traffic of this country is doubling every 12 years, and that if the waterway development of the country is not given the most serious thought and support by the National Government, within 25 years the transportation system of this country will be seriously embarrassed as a result of inability to carry on and perform the great function that the American people believe is the function of the transportation agencies of our country. That is very gratifying, because I believe that this big man in the transportation world has based his opinion on expert knowledge of the subject, and as I understand his viewpoint is supported by some leading traffic men of the country, and it is gratifying, I say again, because it holds out the magnificent prospect of a wonderful business development in our country when the transportation agencies will find difficulty in handling it during the next 12 years.

But, he says, notwithstanding all of this, embarrassment is likely to result unless we develop the waterways notwithstanding the fact that to-day freight cars move at the rate of 40 miles a day, where only six years ago they moved at the rate of only 13 miles a day. Locomotives have a greater capacity and power than a few years ago, and everything within the transportation potentialities of the country are receiving the attention that would make them adequate, but the National Government must do its duty and perform satisfactorily the service that the people require, and to do that we must develop the waterways.

Of course, Mr. Loree, a veritable giant in the transportation world, knows that every development of our waterways means a corresponding development and expansion of railroads to meet the increased demands of trade, promoted and stimulated by the economic movement of goods and commodities.

Of course, there is a school of thought that States ought to do something in that direction. We all know that States will do service in the direction of the development of waterways only sporadically, as it were. As a result of some great political campaign, something might be done by a State, and then the State and the people will relapse into a condition of inertia, almost, and the development will not receive the support that it ought to receive. Why? Because the people of the country have come to the conviction that the National Government is in that business, necessarily in that business because, after all, it is interstate in character to such an extent as to make it fundamentally one of the great purposes of the Federal Government. The attitude of Mr. Loree is highly instructive and constructive, for it is helpful to those real friends of the railroads who have insisted that the different modes of our transportation system are interdependent, and that the prosperity of any one of the modes is felt advantageously by the others.

I have prepared a few remarks upon the subject. I hope they will prove entertaining, if not informative.

For months past this country, as well as the balance of the world, has been, and still is, suffering from a business recession, which must be admitted, and we would simply be futilely and foolishly blinding ourselves to the fact if we refused to recognize the situation. That is the reason why, gentlemen, I said it was gratifying to have the picture thrown upon the House canvas for our edification, showing that business will increase to the remarkable extent Mr. Loree inferentially, according to Mr. DEMPSEY, predicted for the next 25 years. I am always glad to let the sunshine of hope filter through the fog of depression and pessimism.

Unemployment, particularly in certain lines, is unquestionably considerable, with resultant suffering and lessened purchasing power. But the industrial and financial structure of the country is fundamentally sound, and if mistakes are avoided and constructive action advanced, there need be no substantial fear of the future. In the minds of men of light and leading in all the great marts of trade, from the United States Chamber of Commerce to the little board of trade in the small town, as well as in the expressions from financial editors of our great dailies, there is the thought that both the severity and the duration of the trade recession will be directly in proportion to the sound constructive leadership and business sense shown by our bankers, merchants, and manufacturers in the immediate future and during the next three months. No one can predict the exact date on which the country may hope to return to normalcy, but every economist practically declares that the recession need not be of long duration and that we may expect an improvement in conditions reasonably soon, provided we collectively and individually use common sense and courage.

While it is true that we should not depend too greatly upon governmental authority as if it were a magician's wand to bring about prosperity, still the Federal, State, city, and town administrations may by wise and needed improvements, which really become desirable investments, take up considerable slack and thereby measurably lessen unemployment. Like all men who have lived long enough to have given the subject any thought, I know that there is no royal road to success and that prosperity does not come merely for the wishing for it. It does not come and will not come through proclamations, however gorgeous and resonant with polysyllabic spluttering that heat the imagination but do not burnish or brighten it; nor does prosperity come through consultation and conference alone, however exalted the notables and potentates that attend may be. If success is to be achieved, there must be community, city, State, and National effort intelligently applied and directed. In this great enterprise of leading and carrying the country back to prosperity, contentment, and the full dinner pail the Federal Government can do noble things. It can lead, inspire, and coordinate many suspended activities and press them to accomplishment, which in itself will be stimulating to the depressed manufacturer, worker, farmer and consumer, merchant and patron.

I am an optimist by nature and revel in the thought our country, great and magnificent as it is to-day, is but approaching the arch wherethrough gleams that brilliant and picturesque but untroubled world of opulence that lies beyond and on the margin of which we can glimpse the glories of the coming day. [Applause.] We have just momentarily halted in the great forward march and are about to resume the journey. The

morn will be all the brighter for the night having been so dark for a little while. Listen to this hopeful note from Julius H. Barnes, chairman of the National Business Survey Conference called at the direction of President Hoover:

Detailed reports on the business situation reaching the headquarters of the National Business Survey Conference continue encouraging. Business is on the upgrade, and we are rapidly approaching the time for the ordinary revival of outdoor work, which will further accelerate progress.

The shock of the deflation in security prices has largely been absorbed. The danger of a long depression appears fairly over; with every evidence of early renewal of the normal onward march of living standards and business progress.

LEADERS GAIN CONFIDENCE

We do not need to detail the reassuring factors that became manifest even two months ago, because to-day business reviews, economists, and business leaders are speaking with confidence and on a growing record of business recovery.

This improvement became possible because of the collective common sense, the courage, and enterprise of all kinds of Americans in business and out. We do, however, need to continue to apply these qualities, especially for the next few weeks. Careful planning and cooperation can improve buying power still further and can help to relieve individual hardship. Three months is a short period in the evolution of business but a long time to the worker out of a job, even if he has accumulated savings.

BIG BUSINESS DOES ITS PART

Large business units are doing their part daily to help. The railroads, the public utilities, the steel industry, and others have increased and speeded up their construction plans. Reports coming in from business establishments disclose also that they generally are following through the suggestion of the business-survey conference that until outdoor construction generally can get under way they can assist by advancing within prudent judgment all necessary repairs, improvements, betterments, etc., of both normal and emergency character. Home owners, too, can help by doing needed work now, so that men temporarily idle can be carried over until larger programs can be started.

American business is carrying out its pledge to make every effort to create and maintain employment until business momentum is fully regained and the emergency is over. Wage scales, too, are being maintained to sustain buying power.

MORE PERSONS EMPLOYED

One of the most encouraging factors at the present time is found in the fact that at least 44,000,000 persons are gainfully employed, which is 10,000,000 more than were at work in 1921. This in itself helps to explain the checking of this business recession in so short a time, because these 10,000,000 additional workers, earning higher income than is possible in earlier years, themselves furnish a buying power which keeps fellow workers employed and factories running to serve their needs.

Any wide unemployment immediately reacts on business, and the modern business man, knowing this, is as anxious as the worker himself to keep unemployment at a minimum.

President Hoover is anxious to do his share and will be an Aaron holding up the hands of the Moses impersonified by the combined courage and vision of the American people who will lead the country out of the wilderness of unemployment and doubt into the land flowing with the milk and honey of an even greater prosperity than any we have already enjoyed. And Congress will endeavor to be a hero in the strife, as it were, to do great things for the country it represents. Already it has almost unanimously increased the authorization for roads from seventy-five to one hundred and twenty-five million dollars. And now we have a bill the total authorization of which may approximate \$150,000,000. And why not? It is three years since we have had a river and harbor bill, which means that we are authorizing about fifty million a year, a pitifully small sum when it is realized that these sums are not expenditures from which there is no return but a wise investment yielding a golden result in the way of direct and indirect savings and economies that are promoting the national welfare. So that even now political and economic seers can envision a fabulous future and unimaginable wealth flowing from a scientifically developed waterway system, coast, harbor, and inland.

The gleam which led President Hoover when he was Secretary of Commerce is still lighting his way, and has enlarged the view and brightened the vision of WALLACE DEMPSEY, for the years have but emphasized in him a conviction that America's destiny is inseparably associated with waterways that, rising in our mountains, ultimately find their way to the sea. These streams, great and small, are our best asset, for they are the routes easily and economically maintained over which much of our commerce must reach the seas. As a Member of Congress

and one of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I have fought for waterway development with the zeal of a crusader following Peter the Hermit.

As an American fond of dreaming of my country's greatness in terms of "ocean to ocean and from the Lakes to the Gulf," I have fought the good fight, and not in vain, I hope. Born and reared in New Orleans, I knew from my earliest days that every drop of rain and snow that falls between the crest of the Alleghenies and ramparts of the Rockies had to roll on by New Orleans to the eternal sea. Why should we of the lower reaches of the Father of Waters not know what rivers can do in the way of harm when unrestrained, and what a blessing they may be when controlled and regulated? Let me recall to those who live in the valley a picture that presented itself to my mind here on the floor of the House about two years ago, inspired by the eloquent addresses I heard Mr. Hoover make on his then favorite subject, The Development and Use of Our Waterways.

The territory pictured by me of the Mississippi Valley comprises two-thirds of the total national area. It domiciles over half of the entire population. Its contributions to the national wealth are 68 per cent of exportable products, 52 per cent of manufactures, and 70 per cent of agricultural products of the Nation.

In this territory is contained the industrial center of the Nation, at the foot of Lake Michigan; the agricultural center, near the confluence of the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers, and the center of population in southwestern Indiana, close to the Illinois line.

For this chief wealth-producing section of the United States and of the world the natural arteries of transportation are the Great Lakes and the Mississippi-Illinois-Ohio River systems, flowing into the Gulf of Mexico.

The Federal Government has spent nearly \$430,000,000 on waterways in the Mississippi Basin. Of this, over \$100,000,000 were appropriated to the development of the Mississippi from its mouth to the Ohio, and about one hundred million more to the improvement of the Ohio and its immediate confluence. As a result of this national effort the Mississippi is navigable by barge of 9-foot draft from Cairo to the Gulf, and the Ohio from the industrial centers of western Pennsylvania to its confluence with the Mississippi.

At an expenditure of \$60,000,000 the people of the Sanitary District of Chicago have dredged and improved the northern link of the Illinois-Mississippi waterway from Chicago to Joliet. The State of Illinois, at the cost of \$20,000,000 more, has partly completed and has under construction the continuing link from Joliet to Utica.

In the heart of this system of waterways—a clot, blocking off the circulation of lake traffic from the rivers to the south and east—is the undredged section of the Illinois-Mississippi Rivers from Utica to Cairo. The opening of this artery involves the expenditure by the National Government of less than \$5,000,000, plus an undetermined sum of perhaps \$25,000,000 for compensating works to maintain and restore lake levels. The improvement itself consists of deepening to 9 feet the two rivers between Utica and Cairo, removing four locks and dams in the Illinois, and assuring a constant and adequate flow of water from Lake Michigan into the Mississippi.

Adequate navigation of the Mississippi from St. Louis and of the Ohio-Mississippi from Pittsburgh to the Gulf and the Great Lakes is dependent upon the construction of this link.

The Government has appropriated approximately \$40,000,000 for deepening the Missouri from Kansas City to St. Louis and the Mississippi from Minneapolis to the latter metropolis. The project will change the present 3½-foot depth to one of 6 feet.

Total Federal appropriations for the improvement of coastwise harbors aggregate more than \$500,000,000. The cost of the Panama Canal was nearly \$400,000,000. These expenditures were borne by all of the people, yet because of the undeveloped link in the Lakes to Gulf waterway agriculture and industry in this great central empire are withheld from their full share in the benefits of these improvements, and the shippers of this section are forced to compete disadvantageously with those of the eastern centers.

An illustration of this inequality is in the fact that machinery can be shipped from points in the Middle West by rail to the eastern seaboard, thence by water through the Panama Canal to Pacific ports, more cheaply than it can be sent by rail direct from the point of manufacture to its western destination.

About 7,000,000 tons of cargo passed through the Panama Canal in 1919; in 1924 this tonnage had increased to between 27,000,000 and 30,000,000. The Ohio-Monongahela-Allegheny Rivers system carried about 38,000,000 tons in 1923. The Mississippi-Warrior Rivers service, under adverse conditions, in the first years of operation transported 4,000,000 tons of freight. In about this same period one railroad operating between Chicago and the Gulf increased its freight tonnage from 38,000,000 to over 55,000,000.

In the immediate territory traversed by the projected Illinois-Mississippi improvement 25,000,000 tons of freight a year are immediately

available for the waterway, which will have an annual capacity of 60,000,000 tons.

The city of Chicago alone uses annually about 38,000,000 tons of coal, with consumption increasing at the rate of 1,000,000 tons a year. Over half of this coal is mined in southern Illinois, within one day's motor-truck haul of the Illinois River. The construction of the Illinois-Mississippi deep waterway will lower the cost of this coal in the Chicago district by about \$1 a ton, with a commensurate reduction in the cost of coal shipped by this 9-foot channel to such Lake cities as Milwaukee, Duluth, Superior, and Detroit. As another indicant of the tonnage available for shipment by this waterway, 200,000,000 bushels of grain are raised yearly in Illinois within hauling distance of the river.

Every congressional district in the States of South Dakota, Minnesota, Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, Nebraska, Ohio, and Missouri utilized the Mississippi barge line during its first five years of operation. The water rates being 20 per cent lower than corresponding rail rates, this barge line saved for shippers directly \$3,392,000, and indirectly an indeterminate sum through reduction in the rates of competing railroads.

The industrial and agricultural centers of the Allegheny watershed and of the South can be linked by water routes with the Great Lakes only by the construction of the deep waterway between Utica and Cairo.

Over half of the Nation's population can secure the full benefits of the Panama Canal investment only through this construction.

The Federal Government, by the small expenditure involved, can enhance immeasurably the value of the \$550,000,000 investment in Mississippi Basin waterways and can give to all of the people of the United States the most comprehensive system of water transportation in the world.

Mr. Speaker, only the one that has the faith in him can see the numberless towns and cities yet unborn that are to adorn the banks of our immense waterways—cities and towns that will promote the welfare of our country and bring happiness to millions who will find unending employment in the incalculable commerce that will move over an inland route only as one example from Boston to the Rio Grande. Not only will this make for the development of a commerce that will pale into insignificance all of the argosies dreamed of in the past but will make for a military defense that has been urged by Secretaries of War and Commerce for many years past in every succeeding administration since the Civil War.

Mr. Speaker, when the United States sprang into existence in 1789 as a result of the great Constitutional Convention that gave birth to that wonderful federation, no one believed that in the incredibly short period of 141 years the United States would be composed of 48 great Commonwealths and would reach from the Canadian line down to the Gulf of Mexico. It was then only 13 States or Colonies straggling along the Atlantic coast.

No dreamer was fantastic enough to look into the future and tell the world that he beheld a dream so dazzling as the imperial civilization that is our boast and our glory of to-day. Stand before a map of our country and look. See it as it rolls under your gaze from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Ponder over the trials and tribulations of the American pioneers as they marched westward, settling around the Great Lakes, and then over the Mississippi and across the Louisiana Purchase, which became their own in 1803, and across the Rockies to the shores of the Pacific Ocean, either through the Oregon Territory, the American title to which was established in 1846, or by way of the empire ceded to us by Mexico in 1848, and you will realize that performance has outgrown any promise that might have been made when the Constitution of our country was adopted.

Gaze at that map and see the Lone Star State, with a territory as great as that of the Republic of Germany. Look down and see Alaska at the bottom of the map, whose mountains and lakes defy the brush of the painter or the tongue of the poet to describe. Glance at the Philippines, queen of the eastern seas, fairest of all Edens, with Samoa, Hawaii, Porto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, and drink in the thought that Old Glory, the flag of our country, waves under the icy gale and beneath the northern lights as proudly as it floats under the balmy breezes and the soft and glorious radiance of the southern cross.

Mr. Speaker, we who have fought the good fight for rivers and harbors and inland and coastal waterways are not mere dreamers. We have grown old witnessing many marvelous accomplishments by our country. One great conquest after another has been her proud achievement. We who are looking westward see a greater destiny ahead than the wonderful civilization that blesses us to-day. The sunset of life gives us mystical lore and coming events cast their shadows before. Boston to the Rio Grande, with New Orleans at the crossroads, means for the greater glory of our country in peace times and a means of national defense in times of war, which I hope will never

come again to curse the world with its horrors, atrocities, and crucifixions.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS

Mr. MOORE of Virginia, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Mrs. C. L. Scott, H. R. 4622, Seventieth Congress, first session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 12696. An act authorizing an appropriation for the purchase of the Vollbehr collection of incunabula.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 134. An act authorizing an appropriation for the purchase of land for the Indian colony near Ely, Nev., and for other purposes;

S. 135. An act to provide for the payment for benefits received by the Paiute Indian Reservation lands within the Newlands irrigation project, Nevada, and for other purposes;

S. 363. An act for the relief of Charles W. Martin;

S. 485. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal reserve act and section 5240 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 486. An act to amend section 5153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

S. 2718. An act for the relief of Stephen W. Douglass, chief pharmacist, United States Navy, retired;

S. 3627. An act to amend the Federal reserve act so as to enable national banks voluntarily to surrender the right to exercise trust powers and to relieve themselves of the necessity of complying with the laws governing banks exercising such powers, and for other purposes;

S. 4096. An act to amend section 4 of the Federal reserve act; and

S. 4466. An act to make a correction in an act of Congress approved February 28, 1929.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 23, 1930:

H. R. 7643. An act to establish a term of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada at Las Vegas, Nev.

On June 24, 1930:

H. R. 12696. An act authorizing an appropriation for the purchase of the Vollbehr collection of incunabula.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 25, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday, June 25, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

Prohibiting the purchase of German reparation bonds by national banks, Federal reserve banks, and member banks of the Federal reserve system (H. J. Res. 364).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. VESTAL: Committee on Patents. H. R. 12549. A bill to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright and to permit the United States to enter the International Copyright Union; with amendment (Rept. No. 2016). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 9701. A bill authorizing the payment of an indemnity to the French Government on account of injuries received by Henry Borday, a French citizen, when he was assaulted at his place of business at Port au Prince, Haiti, by two United States Marines; with-

out amendment (Rept. No. 2019). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13035. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Grand Calumet River at East Chicago, Ind.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2020). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PARKER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. J. Res. 161. A joint resolution to suspend the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve consolidations or unifications of railway properties; with amendment (Rept. No. 2023). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. BRITTEN: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4940. A bill for the relief of Commander Charles E. Parsons, Supply Corps, United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 2017). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 12534. A bill for the relief of Warren Burke; without amendment (Rept. No. 2018). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 13128) to amend the farm loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 13129) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana or any political subdivisions or public agencies thereof, or any of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River southerly from the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation at or near the point known and designated as Wilder Ferry, in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEMP: A bill (H. R. 13130) a bill granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Bogue Chitto River between Sun and Bush, St. Tammany Parish, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER of California: A bill (H. R. 13131) to amend section 72 of the Judicial Code (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 145) by providing two terms of court annually at Oakland, in the southern division of the northern district of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAVITT (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 13132) authorizing the use of Osage funds for attorneys' fees and expenses of litigation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by departmental request), a bill (H. R. 13133) to authorize an appropriation of tribal funds to purchase certain privately owned lands within the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 13134) to amend an act entitled "An act creating the Great Lakes Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Clair River at or near Port Huron, Mich.," approved June —, 1930, being Public Act No. —, of the second session of the Seventy-first Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 13135) to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, in the State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SWANSON: A bill (H. R. 13136) granting pensions to certain widows and remarried widows of Civil War veterans after the expiration of 15 years from the date of marriage to such veteran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 13137) to amend section 8 of the food and drugs act of June 30, 1906, as amended, so as to require the country of origin to be stated in the case of foreign-grown canned vegetables; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 379) to change the name of B Street NW., in Washington, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LARSEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 380) to extend the provisions of Public Resolution No. 47, Seventy-first Congress, approved March 3, 1930; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 381) to extend the provisions of Public Resolution No. 47, Seventy-first Congress, approved March 3, 1930; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOYLAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 382) authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a pedestal for the statue or memorial to Thomas Jefferson, in the city of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 383) to appoint a commission to make a study of proposed change in the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIMMONS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 384) making appropriations available to carry into effect the provisions of the act of the Seventy-first Congress entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force and the fire department of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CABLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 385) to authorize the President to suspend for a specified period the immigration of aliens to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FREAR: Resolution (H. Res. 268) to appoint a committee to inquire into an income and estate tax law for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GASQUE: Resolution (H. Res. 269) to investigate conditions in Venezuela, South America; 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. 13138) granting a pension to John Divine; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAIRD: A bill (H. R. 13139) granting an increase of pension to Luese Schneider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEEDY: A bill (H. R. 13140) granting a pension to Rhomena F. Woodbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 13141) granting an increase of pension to Emily F. Severs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 13142) for the relief of Thomas E. Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13143) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Haley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13144) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 13145) granting a pension to Charles F. Barber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 13146) granting an increase of pension to Earl S. Reeves; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 13147) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca G. Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13148) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGRADY: A bill (H. R. 13149) granting an increase of pension to Maranda Fasold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13150) for the relief of Frank W. Trutt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 13151) granting a pension to Jennie Simmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13152) granting a pension to Mary Olive Hankey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 13153) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13154) granting an increase of pension to Laura L. McHaney; 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:

7642. Petition of Fred A. Snyder Post, No. 353, American Legion, Northampton, Pa., urging hospital support of World War disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7643. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution adopted by the Eighteenth Conference of the National Federation of Settlements, assembled

in Rochester, N. Y., June 5, urging the appointment of Miss Grace Abbott to the Cabinet portfolio of labor; to the Committee on Labor.

7644. Also, resolution adopted at a meeting of the Women's Republican Club of New York City, petitioning all Members of Congress of Greater New York to support the Saturday half holiday bill for all Federal employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

7645. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of 750 members of the Los Angeles Camp, No. 36, United Spanish War Veterans, Los Angeles, Calif., extending their heartfelt appreciation to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States for the passage of the act of June 2, 1930, granting to the many disabled Spanish War comrades an increase of pension; to the Committee on Pensions.

7646. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Anthony Wayne Post, American Legion, Fairfield, Ill., urging the passage of the Johnson bill without amendment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7647. Also, petition of the LaSalle Extension University, Michigan Avenue at Forty-fourth Street, Chicago, Ill., protesting the passage of House bill 11096; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7648. Also, petition of Straus & Schram, 1105-1113 Thirty-fifth Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the defeat of House bill 11096, stating in their opinion 5 cents is too great a charge for such service as the bill provides; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7649. Also petition of Margaret D. Dunn, 201 East Randolph Avenue, Alexandria, Va., urging the consideration and passage of the Saturday half-holiday bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

7650. By Mr. WATRES: Petition of Joseph E. Beck and the board of directors of the Family Welfare Association of Scranton, Pa., urging action on Senate bill 3060; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, June 25, 1930

Rev. James W. Morris, D. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God, the Fountain of Wisdom and Father of Lights, it is in Thy light that we see light. Grant us, therefore, we beseech Thee, such illumination by Thy spirit of mind and heart that we may abound more and more in all wisdom and spiritual discernment. Make us to accept each duty as a divine command and each fine opportunity as a heavenly call, that thus walking in Thy light we may in all life's decisions and resolves prove ourselves true sons of light. We ask these things in the name of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, the true Light of the World. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. WATSON and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11781) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 317. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant certain oil and gas prospecting permits and leases;

S. 1792. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of California;

S. 2323. An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish certain additional cotton statistics;

S. 3422. An act to authorize the Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Patuxent River, south of Burch, Calvert County, Md.;

S. 3873. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Carondelet, Mo.;

S. 3893. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the State of South Da-

kota the silver service presented to the United States for the cruiser *South Dakota*;

S. 4028. An act to amend the Federal farm loan act as amended;

S. 4243. An act to provide for the closing of certain streets and alleys in the Reno section of the District of Columbia;

S. 4287. An act to amend section 202 of Title II of the Federal farm loan act by providing for loans by Federal intermediate credit banks to financing institutions on bills payable and by eliminating the requirement that loans, advances, or discounts shall have a minimum maturity of six months;

S. 4358. An act to authorize transfer of funds from the general revenues of the District of Columbia to the revenues of the water department of said District, and to provide for transfer of jurisdiction over certain property to the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks;

S. 4517. An act to provide for the regulation of tolls over certain bridges; and

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to provide for the erection of a memorial tablet at the United States Naval Academy to commemorate the officers and men lost in the United States submarine *S-4*.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1959. An act to authorize the creation of game sanctuaries or refuges within the Ocala National Forest in the State of Florida; and

S. 4577. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River between Longview, Wash., and Rainier, Oreg.

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

S. 215. An act to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1923, entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services," as amended by the act of May 28, 1928;

S. 525. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to loan to the Louisiana State Museum, of the city of New Orleans, La., the silver service in use on the cruiser *New Orleans*;

S. 3068. An act to amend section 355 of the Revised Statutes; and

S. 3845. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911, as amended March 4, 1915, June 26, 1918, and June 7, 1924.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) to print and bind additional copies of Senate Document No. 166, Seventieth Congress, entitled "Interstate Commerce Act, Annotated," with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 101. An act for the award of the air-mail flyer's medal of honor;

H. R. 3592. An act to further amend section 37 of the national defense act of June 4, 1920, as amended by section 2 of the act of September 22, 1922, so as to more clearly define the status of reserve officers not on active duty or on active duty for training only;

H. R. 5708. An act for estimates necessary for the proper maintenance of the flood-control works at Lowell Creek, Seward, Alaska;

H. R. 9408. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1917, an act making appropriations for the general expenses of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9590. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas;

H. R. 9893. An act for the relief of Herman Lincoln Chatkoff;

H. R. 10782. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service;

H. R. 12014. An act to permit payments for the operation of motor cycles and automobiles used for necessary travel on official business, on a mileage basis in lieu of actual operating expenses;

H. R. 12063. An act to amend section 16 of the Federal farm loan act;