

of the 44-hour week in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7747. Also, petition of certain citizens of Woodward County, Okla., urging enactment of legislation providing for payment of World War veterans' adjusted service certificates in cash; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7748. Also, petition of the Norfolk and Portsmouth Cotton Exchange, in regard to conditions in the cotton industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7749. By Mr. GRIFFIN: Resolution of the Retail Dry Goods Association of New York City, protesting against increase in first-class postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7750. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Retail Dry Goods Association of New York, opposing increased postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7751. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, with reference to the Soviet Government of Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7752. Also, petition of the National Retail Dry Goods Association of New York, opposing increased postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7753. Also, petition of the St. John Letter Co. (Inc.), of New York City, opposing increased postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7754. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolutions of the Retail Dry Goods Association of New York, in opposition to increase in postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7755. By Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma: Petition of Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Collinsville, Okla., concerning unemployment in the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1930

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., delivered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast given the dawn its inalienable glory, midnight its quenchless stars, noonday its potentialities, and the westering sun its vesper hymn, speak to these hearts of ours, woven as they are of human joys and cares, washed with sorrow, swift to mirth, like waters blown by changing winds to laughter, that dawn and sunset and all colors of the earth may yield to us their richest store through the kindness of the years. Light Thou our way with flaming love along the viewless streams that bear us down the dark of life, that we may beacon the world's night and set to pulsing music the unthinking silence that men call death.

*So in the hush of this our tryst with Thee
Speak to our hearts, dear Lord, and set them free.*

Amen.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, appeared in his seat to-day.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. Fess and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a privileged communication relative to the Senator elect from New Jersey, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 1930, DWIGHT W. MORROW was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Jersey a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term of Hon. Walter E. Edge.

Witness his excellency our governor, Arthur N. Pierson, president of the senate, and our seal hereto affixed at Trenton, this 2d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1930.

ARTHUR N. PIERSON,

President of the Senate, Acting Governor.

By the governor:

[SEAL.]

JOSEPH F. S. FITZPATRICK,
Secretary of State.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, Mr. MORROW is present and ready to take the oath.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file. The Senator elect will come forward and be sworn.

Mr. MORROW, escorted by Mr. KEAN, advanced to the Vice President's desk; and, the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him by the Vice President, he took his seat in the Senate.

THE BUDGET

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(For the message of the President see page 129 of the proceedings of the House of this day.)

REPORT OF SENATE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the secretary of the Senate Office Building Commission transmitting a report relative to bids for the work covered by plans and drawings for the new Delaware Avenue and C Street entrance to the Senate Office Building, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE BOTANIC GARDEN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Director of the United States Botanic Garden transmitting pursuant to law, a statement relative to travel from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia in connection with official business of the office during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE FOR 1931

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting copy of a circular issued by the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament furnishing information regarding the proposals of candidates for the Nobel peace prize for the year 1931, which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table.

USELESS PAPERS IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of papers and documents on the files of the Treasury Department which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. SMOOT and Mr. SIMMONS members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

CIVIL-SERVICE APPOINTEES (S. DOC. NO. 224)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the secretary of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution No. 285, a list of the names of employees in the classified service appointed between November 11, 1918, and June 9, 1930, inclusive, in the District of Columbia from the States of Vermont, Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, whose quotas are in excess of their apportionment, which, with the accompanying papers, on motion of Mr. HEFLIN, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS OF COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 221)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims,

transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended November 29, 1930, the amount thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims, which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SALE OF SURPLUS HYDROELECTRIC POWER AT WILSON DAM
(S. DOC. NO. 222)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 307, agreed to June 28, 1930, photostatic copies of the letters which constitute the contract under which surplus hydroelectric power generated at Wilson Dam, Muscle Shoals, Ala., is being sold to the Alabama Power Co., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION
(S. DOC. NO. 223)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, president of the National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORT OF BOARD FOR PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the activities of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint communication from the chairman and president, respectively, of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine (Inc.), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the activities of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama, together with a statement of receipts and disbursements for the year ended October 31, 1930, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

PORTO RICAN HURRICANE RELIEF COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the second annual report of the Porto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of its activities for the year ended September 30, 1930, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PURCHASE OF AIRCRAFT FOR NAVY DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of designs, aircraft, aircraft parts, and aeronautical accessories purchased by the Navy Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, the prices paid therefor and the reasons for the award in each case, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate certain communications from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the following reports, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

The annual report of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930;

A report showing suits arising under the public vessels act of March 3, 1925, in which final decrees were entered, exclusive of cases on appeal; and

A report showing suits arising under the act of March 9, 1920, authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty involving merchant vessels, in which final decrees were entered against the United States, exclusive of cases on appeal.

EXPENDITURES OF COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of expenditures under appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

USELESS PAPERS IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to papers and documents in the Post Office Department which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the department, and have no permanent value or historical interest, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. PHIPPS and Mr. McKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

BITTER ROOT IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning the development work in connection with the Bitter Root irrigation project in Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

REPORT OF WAR MINERALS RELIEF COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the War Minerals Relief Commission, including receipts and disbursements, for the year ended November 30, 1930, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

COST REPORT ON INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to law, a report showing the cost and other data with respect to Indian irrigation projects as compiled to the end of the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EXPENDITURES OF FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of expenditures for the Five Civilized Tribes from the appropriation "Support of Indians and administration of Indian property, 1930," which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EXPENDITURES ON TRIBAL AND ALLOTTED INDIAN LANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of expenditures by the Geological Survey on tribal and allotted Indian lands during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, together with a copy of a communication from the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the detailed receipts and expenditures connected with the hospital for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

USELESS PAPERS IN INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of papers in the files of the Interior Department which are not needed or useful in the transac-

tion of the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. NYE and Mr. PITTMAN members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF THE TARIFF COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the Fourteenth Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitted, pursuant to law, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year 1930, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PAYMENT OF FEDERAL MONEYS TO STATES AND TERRITORIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his recommendation for the enactment of legislation for the simplification of procedure for the payment of Federal moneys to States and Territories, which, with the accompanying communication, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RETURNS OF FEDERAL CONTRACTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his recommendation for the enactment of legislation in the matter of the returns, audit, and filing of Federal contracts, which, with the accompanying communication, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports and recommendations concerning claims against the United States presented by the following persons and companies: David Gordon Building & Construction Co., Howard Dimick, Mildred N. O'Lone, C. O. Smith, National Dry Dock & Repair Co. (Inc.), Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., B. & O. Manufacturing Co., and T. Morris White, which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

HEALING ARTS PRACTICE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Commission on Licensure healing arts practice act, District of Columbia, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SETTLEMENT OF SHIPPING BOARD CLAIMS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims arbitrated or settled by agreement from October 16, 1929, to October 15, 1930, by the United States Shipping Board and/or United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1930, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

RULES OF THE STEAMBOAT INSPECTION SERVICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a complete set of general rules and regu-

lations prescribed by the Board of Supervising Inspectors, Steamboat Inspection Service, at the meeting of January, 1930, which regulations have been approved by the Secretary of Commerce, which, with the accompanying documents, were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF BOARD OF MEDIATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the United States Board of Mediation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF VETERANS' BUREAU

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the director of the bureau for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF FEDERAL RADIO COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Federal Radio Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the Fourteenth Annual Report of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitted, pursuant to law, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitted, pursuant to law, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ANNUAL REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the official proceedings of the commission for the year ended December 31, 1929, with other information relating to the regulation and operation of the public utilities in the District of Columbia coming under the jurisdiction of said commission, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CREDENTIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the credentials of DWIGHT W. MORROW, chosen a Senator from the State of New Jersey for the term commencing on the 4th day of March, 1931, which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

He also laid before the Senate the credentials of MATTHEW M. NEELY, chosen a Senator from the State of West Virginia for the term commencing on the 4th day of March, 1931, which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

He also laid before the Senate the credentials of GEORGE W. NORRIS, chosen a Senator from the State of Nebraska for the term commencing on the 4th day of March, 1931, which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

He also laid before the Senate the credentials of BYRON P. HARRISON, chosen a Senator from the State of Mississippi for the term commencing on the 4th day of March, 1931, which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

He also laid before the Senate the credentials of L. J. DICKINSON, chosen a Senator from the State of Iowa for the term commencing on the 4th day of March, 1931, which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

He also laid before the Senate the credentials of THOMAS D. SCHALL, chosen a Senator from the State of Minnesota

for the term commencing on the 4th day of March, 1931, which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

He also laid before the Senate the credentials of Joseph T. ROBINSON, chosen a Senator from the State of Arkansas for the term commencing on the 4th day of March, 1931, which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

He also laid before the Senate the credentials of JOHN H. BANKHEAD, chosen a Senator from the State of Alabama for the term commencing on the 4th day of March, 1931, which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

He also laid before the Senate the credentials of SAM G. BRATTON, chosen a Senator from the State of New Mexico for the term commencing on the 4th day of March, 1931, which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

He also laid before the Senate the credentials of DANIEL O. HASTINGS, chosen a Senator from the State of Delaware for the term commencing on the 4th day of March, 1931, which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

RESOLUTION IN THE NEWBERRY CASE

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I send to the desk Senate Resolution 172, passed by the Senate in the Sixty-eighth Congress, and ask that it be read. It is very short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Under what order of business are we proceeding?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The presentation of petitions and memorials.

Mr. McNARY. I think the reading of the resolution should come at a later time.

Mr. BLACK. It is a very short resolution which was passed by the Senate in the Sixty-eighth Congress and which I desire to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, (1) That the contest of Henry Ford against Truman H. Newberry be, and it is hereby, dismissed.

(2) That Truman H. Newberry is hereby declared to be a duly elected Senator from the State of Michigan for the term of six years commencing on the 4th day of March, 1919, and is entitled to hold his seat in the Senate of the United States.

(3) That whether the amount expended in this primary was \$195,000, as was fully reported or openly acknowledged, or whether there were some few thousand dollars in excess, the amount expended was in either case too large, much larger than ought to have been expended.

The expenditure of such excessive sums in behalf of a candidate, either with or without his knowledge and consent, being contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the honor and dignity of the Senate, and dangerous to the perpetuity of a free government, such excessive expenditures are hereby severely condemned and disapproved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. BROOKHART presented a petition of sundry ex-service men of Council Bluffs, Iowa, praying for the payment of ex-service men's adjusted compensation certificates, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES presented petitions from aeries of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in the State of Washington, praying for the passage of legislation creating a Federal industrial commission, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WALCOTT presented a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Society of the War of 1812 in the State of Connecticut, and a petition from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Connecticut, favoring the passage of legislation making the Star-Spangled Banner the national anthem, which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Board of Public Utilities Commissioners of the State of Connecticut opposing the passage of Senate bill 6, providing for the appointment of a new Federal commission with regulatory jurisdiction over communication and power utilities, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norwich, Conn., favoring the passage of legislation for the Federal supervision of

motion pictures and establishing higher standards for the production of films that are to be licensed in interstate and international commerce, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Society of the War of 1812, protesting against the use of any building, either in or contiguous to Fort McHenry, as a prison and favoring the preservation of Fort McHenry as a national shrine by protecting it against private or official profanation and desecration, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Branch No. 60, of Stamford, Conn., praying for the passage of the so-called Kendall shorter week bill (H. R. 6603), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions numerously signed by sundry citizens of the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES

Sundry messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

LAKE OKEECHOBEE AND THE CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER, FLA. (S. DOC. NO. 225)

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I renew my request to have printed as a public document the report on Lake Okeechobee and the Caloosahatchee River in Florida with special reference to navigation and flood control. It is a report to the United States District Engineer, Jacksonville, Fla., in connection with a review of reports published in House Document No. 215, Seventieth Congress, first session, Senate Document No. 213, Seventieth Congress, second session.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I objected yesterday to the request of the Senator from Florida, but I have examined the report submitted. It is not anything that is of general interest throughout the entire United States. Ordinarily I would object to the printing of any such document, but the Senator assures me that at some time or some day it will be a matter of general interest to the United States, and for that reason I will withdraw my objection. I wish to give notice, however, that hereafter requests of this kind offered for printing will meet with objection from me.

Mr. FLETCHER. Included in the request is the printing of the illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTATE OF NAPOLEON B. HEARN

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported favorably without amendment the Senate Concurrent Resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) submitted by Mr. TOWNSEND on the 2d instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives to the Sussex Trust Co., executor under the will of Napoleon B. Hearn, late an employee of the Capitol police, a sum equal to six months of his compensation as such employee, one-half of said sum to be paid by the Senate and one-half by the House, and an additional amount, not exceeding \$250, to defray the funeral expenses of said Napoleon B. Hearn, shall be paid by the House.

LOUISE C. THORNTON

Mr. DENEEN, from the same committee, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 337) submitted by Mr. HEFLIN on the 2d instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1930, to Louise C. Thornton, widow of James L. Thornton, late clerk to Senator J. THOMAS HEFLIN, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

REAL-ESTATE TRANSACTIONS IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. DENEEN, from the same committee, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 339) submitted by Mr. BROOKHART on the 2d instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia or subcommittee thereof investigating security, mortgage, and real-estate transactions and laws under authority of Resolution No. 58, agreed to June 4, 1929, hereby is authorized to expend \$7,500 from the contingent fund of the Senate in addition to the amount heretofore authorized for said purpose.

EMPLOYMENT OF LABORER

Mr. DENEEN, from the same committee, reported favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 340) submitted by Mr. WATSON on the 2d instant, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to employ a laborer to be paid at the rate of \$1,440 per annum out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 5006) to extend the time for the construction of the bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; and

A bill (S. 5007) to extend the time for the construction of the bridge across the Rio Grande at or near San Benito, Tex.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 5008) for the relief of Clarence E. Fore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5009) granting a pension to L. Avant;

A bill (S. 5010) granting a pension to George Hammer; and

A bill (S. 5011) granting a pension to David B. Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 5012) granting a pension to Lucien N. Patterson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5013) granting a pension to Daisy Ballard (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5014) for the relief of Fannie Gregory (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 5015) granting a pension to Ronald S. Niven; and

A bill (S. 5016) granting a pension to John Joseph Barry; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5017) for the relief of Andrew M. Dunlop; and

A bill (S. 5018) granting compensation to Mary I. Latta; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ODDIE:

A bill (S. 5019) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes,' approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes," approved June 24, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAVIS:

A bill (S. 5020) to empower the Government to write into the specifications and contracts the compensation to be paid to laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public works of the United States and of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Manufactures.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 5021) to expedite the construction of public buildings and works outside of the District of Columbia by enabling possession and title of sites to be taken in advance of final judgment in proceedings for the acquisition thereof under the power of eminent domain; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

(By request.) A bill (S. 5022) to amend section 229 of the Judicial Code;

(By request.) A bill (S. 5023) to make permanent certain temporary judgeships;

(By request.) A bill (S. 5024) to amend the act providing for the annual conference of senior circuit judges; and

(By request.) A bill (S. 5025) to amend section 126 of the Judicial Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 5026) to amend section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission act, as amended; and

A bill (S. 5027) to amend section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 5028) granting compensation to Moses Y. Starbuck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 5029) to amend the act providing for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 5030) to regulate interstate commerce by pipeline agencies operating in the purchase, production, distribution, sale, or transportation of natural and artificial gas; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 5031) granting a pension to Mrs. Hattie Bolton (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5032) granting a pension to Wallace A. Kennedy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRAZIER (by request):

A bill (S. 5033) to authorize an appropriation of tribal funds to purchase certain privately owned lands within the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz.;

A bill (S. 5034) authorizing the use of Osage funds for attorneys' fees and expenses of litigation; and

A bill (S. 5035) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations to or in behalf of institutions conducted for the benefit of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KEAN:

A bill (S. 5036) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River near Trenton, N. J.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. STEIWER:

A bill (S. 5037) to repeal the limitation on the filling of a vacancy occurring in the office of senior circuit judge for the ninth judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 5038) to authorize an appropriation for the construction of additional barracks at Fort Douglas, Utah; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 5039) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey certain land to the city of Asheville, N. C., for park and street purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. COPELAND. I introduce a bill for reference to the Committee on the Library. It relates to a memorial to the late Senator Seward, one of my predecessors.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 5040) to provide for a memorial to William H. Seward for his distinguished services; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 5041) granting a pension to Martha A. Fox; and

A bill (S. 5042) granting an increase of pension to Martha Jewell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 5044) to provide for deepening, widening, and improving the Cape Cod Canal, Mass.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 5045) to authorize certain improvements at Camp Devens, Mass.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5046) granting an increase of pension to Eva Davis Cogswell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 5047) for the relief of Beryl Elliott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEBERT:

A bill (S. 5048) granting a pension to Amasa P. Taber; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALE:

A bill (S. 5049) granting an increase of pension to Adelia A. Deforge (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5050) granting an increase of pension to Martha B. Wheeler (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5051) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Matten (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 5052) granting a pension to Frank M. Andrews (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5053) granting an increase of pension to Anna S. Bergeson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5054) for the relief of Vincent J. Conrad; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5055) for the relief of John C. Seebach; and

A bill (S. 5056) for the relief of F. W. Tyler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 5057) to provide for extending during the present emergency the time of payment of loans made by Federal land banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 5058) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of a machine-shop building at the United States navy yard, Puget Sound, Wash.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PARTIAL REFUNDS TO STATES FOR RELIEF EXPENDITURES

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I introduce a bill, the title of which is "A bill to reimburse the States and their political subdivisions for certain relief expenditures," which I ask may be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

This bill provides for the authorization of an appropriation of \$100,000,000 in order that the National Government may share with the several States and their political subdivisions the increased expenditures necessitated to relieve suffering, poverty, and distress resulting from unemployment, part-time employment, and general business depression throughout the Nation. Briefly, the bill provides that 50 per cent of all funds expended in excess of the expenditures made in 1929 by the several States and municipalities during the years 1930 and 1931 shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United States. In a word, this bill would require the National Government to pay one-half of all increases in the next two years in certain relief expenditures in the several States.

My proposal would not only permit the States and their subdivisions to be more liberal in extending relief, but particularly in industrial centers would lessen the additional tax burdens upon them necessitated by the rapid increase in local expenditures for the prevention of poverty and its concomitant deprivations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 5043) to reimburse the States and their political subdivisions for certain relief expenditures was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, for the relief of the several States and political subdivisions thereof, as a reimbursement or contribution in aid from the United States, induced by the extraordinary conditions of necessity and emergency resulting from the serious financial burden of caring for distressed persons residing in such States and political subdivisions.

Sec. 2. Any State desiring to participate in the benefits of this act shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the total amounts expended each month during 1929, 1930, and 1931, for the pur-

pose of relieving the unemployed, including the aged and sick, by such State and its political subdivisions.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury shall distribute the sum herein appropriated on a monthly basis, allotting to each State which certifies an expenditure for any one month of 1930 and 1931 of a greater sum than such State and all its political subdivisions expended for the same month in 1929, an amount equal to 50 per cent of the amount of the average of the monthly expenditures of such State for 1929. The first payment hereunder shall include the sums payable for each month from January 1, 1930, to the date of the approval of this act.

Sec. 4. The proper authorities of each State shall distribute monthly on a pro rata basis any sums received under authority of this act to the State and each political subdivision thereof whose expenditures for relief purposes were included in the certified statement of expenditures to the Secretary of the Treasury.

RELIEF OF FARMERS IN DROUGHT-STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 211) providing for the authorization of an appropriation of \$60,000,000 for the relief of drought-stricken and storm-stricken districts of the country. To-day, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and at the request of the Department of Agriculture—and I am advised that it meets with the approval of the Director of the Budget—I introduce another joint resolution covering the same subject matter, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 216) for the relief of farmers in the drought-stricken areas of the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SUSPENSION OF GENERAL IMMIGRATION

Mr. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to suspend for a period of two years general immigration into the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "1933" and insert in lieu thereof "1936."

On page 2, lines 11 and 12, strike out "1932 and 1933" and insert in lieu thereof "1932, 1933, 1934, 1935, and 1936."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to suspend for a period of five years general immigration into the United States."

AMENDMENT TO MOTOR BUS BILL

Mr. DILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10288) to regulate the transportation of persons in interstate and foreign commerce by motor carriers operating on the public highways, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 10, beginning at line 8, strike out all of section 4, section 5, and section 6.

COSTS OF PRODUCTION OF MATCHES AND REFINED SUGAR

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I submit a Senate resolution and ask to have it read. If there is objection, I shall ask that it may go over under the rule, but I trust that it may be considered now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 348), as follows:

Whereas the United States Tariff Commission was directed by Senate Resolution 325 and Senate Resolution 309, as amended by Senate Resolution 325, under the authority conferred by section 336 of the tariff act of 1930, and for the purposes of that section, to investigate the differences in the costs of production of matches, friction or lucifer, etc., as classified under paragraph 1516 of such act, and of refined sugar, and of any like or similar foreign articles: Be it therefore

Resolved, That such direction as to matches, friction or lucifer, and refined sugar be hereby rescinded.

Mr. COPELAND. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. JONES. I did not hear the reading of the last part of the resolution. May it be again read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will again read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk again read the resolution.

Mr. JONES. I have no objection to rescinding such a resolution.

Mr. COPELAND. I would like to state why I wish to have it rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. COPELAND. I asked the Senate to pass a resolution providing for an investigation of the cost of refined sugar. It has developed that Mr. HAWLEY, of the House, had asked that an investigation be made as to the proper differential between refined sugar and raw sugar, which is the thing I have in mind. The Tariff Commission informed me that there were delicate diplomatic questions involved in the form of my resolution and suggested this amendment.

Then, as regards matches, it has developed that all parties to the controversy are now satisfied. Therefore it would save the expense to the Government to have these two matters stricken off the calendar of the Tariff Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

REFERENCE TO COMMITTEES OF TREATIES AND NOMINATIONS

Mr. WATSON. I submit the order which I send to the Secretary's desk, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the order, as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on calendar days of the balance of the third session of the Seventy-first Congress, when Executive messages transmitting nominations or treaties are received and there is no executive session of the Senate, the President of the Senate is authorized, unless objection is made, to refer to the proper committees, as in executive session, such messages with the accompanying nominations or treaties.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the order?

There being no objection, the order was considered and agreed to.

CATHERINE T. SMITH

Mr. WATSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 349), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1930, to Catherine T. Smith, widow of Frank M. Smith, late the janitor of the Senate, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

CONSERVATION OF WILD ANIMAL LIFE

Mr. WALCOTT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 350), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the special committee directed by Senate Resolution 246, agreed to April 17, 1930, to investigate appropriate methods for the replacement and conservation of wild animal life is hereby authorized to expend in furtherance of such purposes \$10,000 in addition to the amount heretofore authorized.

INVESTIGATION RELATIVE TO CONVICT LABOR IN THE PRODUCTION OF TIMBER

Mr. STEIWER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 351), which was ordered to lie over under the rule:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is requested to cause an investigation to be made under the regulations prescribed pursuant to the authority contained in section 307 of the tariff act of 1930 for the purpose of ascertaining the extent to which convict labor is used in the manufacture or production of timber products in any territory subject to the jurisdiction or control of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and to report thereon to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

REPORT OF EMERGENCY COMMISSION ON UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I do not think it will lead to any debate. It shall, I will not press it.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 352) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be, and is hereby, requested to transmit to the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, the following: The report of the President's Emergency Commission on Unemployment, Col. Arthur D. Woods, chairman.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I present an editorial from to-day's issue of the Washington Daily News relative to the Pennsylvania senatorship entitled "Half a Seat," which I ask to have published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALF A SEAT

Assuming that JIM DAVIS can prove his right by fair election to his seat as Senator from Pennsylvania, that does not explain the Senate's rush yesterday in seating him. What was the hurry? Why did the Senate act before all the evidence was in?

The Senate had asked its committee to investigate campaign expenditures. The committee was ready to report on various campaigns, including that of Davis. But at the last minute new and previously unreported Davis campaign expenditures were uncovered. So the committee took the only course possible of asking for a brief delay to consider the new evidence.

That the Senate insisted on seating DAVIS at once and deliberately ignoring the new evidence is so astounding that it will require a great deal of explaining.

Does it mean that the Senate majority does not care how a Member is elected or how much money he spends? Does it mean that the Senate has reversed the policy on which it excluded VARE of Pennsylvania and Smith of Illinois for excessive expenditures?

The VARE-Beidleman ticket spent \$780,000, and VARE was refused his seat, though he argued that most of the money was used for Beidleman. The DAVIS-Brown ticket spent \$628,000, according to the first report of the committee, and now on the basis of the new evidence committee members estimate the total at "more than \$1,000,000."

What was the pressure upon the Republican Old Guard and the Democratic powwow under Leader JOE ROBINSON which resulted in the Senate's unexpected and unexplained winking at charges of a million-dollar election?

The Senate probably has not heard the last of this.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—KINGS MOUNTAIN CELEBRATION

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I request that certain data which I herewith present be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I am not doing this to censure anyone, or to cause any unpleasantness; but I feel that it is due me that the record be kept straight.

When I went to the Kings Mountain celebration on October 7, 1930, as a member of the committee appointed by the Vice President to attend the exercises, I presented myself and requested that I be furnished with tags for my car and such tickets of admission as I might be entitled to. I was informed that I was not a member of the committee, and so, of course, the privileges to which I was entitled as a member were not accorded me.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], who was a member of the committee, and Representative STEVENSON, of South Carolina, who was also a member of the committee, stated to the authorities in charge that I was a member, Senator OVERMAN saying that he had a certified copy of the appointments and that he, Senator FESS, and Senator BLEASE were the appointees.

I did receive courtesies from those in charge and am making no complaint; but there were those present—some dressed in uniforms—who were very officious and who seemed to think that I was endeavoring to obtain privileges to which I was not entitled.

This record is to show that I was entitled to all of the courtesies and privileges which were due to a Senator of the United States, as a member of the committee appointed by the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the data presented by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHERAW, S. C., September 24, 1930.

Senator COLE. L. BLEASE,
Pendleton, S. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am requested by Mr. C. O. Kuester, chairman of the Kings Mountain Sesquicentennial Committee, to invite you to a formal dinner to be given by him on October 6, at 7 o'clock p. m., at the Hotel Charlotte, in Charlotte, N. C., and to request that you let him know whether you propose to attend or not. Write him, C. O. Kuester, chairman, Charlotte Chamber of Commerce Building, Charlotte, N. C.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. STEVENSON.

PENDLETON, S. C., September 26, 1930.

HON. W. F. STEVENSON, M. C.,
Cheraw, S. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: YOURS of September 24 to hand. I have to-day written Mr. Kuester advising him that because of some other engagements it will be impossible for me to attend the dinner in Charlotte on October 6.

I appreciate very much your kindness in writing me and am sorry that I will not be able to be with you on this occasion.

With kindest personal regards and my very best wishes, I am,
As ever,

COLE. L. BLEASE.

PENDLETON, S. C., September 26, 1930.

HON. C. O. KUESTER,
Chairman Kings Mountain Sesquicentennial Committee,
Charlotte Chamber of Commerce Building, Charlotte, N. C.

DEAR MR. KUESTER: Congressman STEVENSON has conveyed to me your kind invitation to attend the formal dinner to be given by you on October 6 at 7 o'clock p. m., at the Hotel Charlotte, and I regret very much that I shall not be able to be present because of other engagements.

However, I appreciate very much your courtesy and desire to send my best wishes for a most happy occasion.

With kindest regards, I am, very respectfully,

COLE. L. BLEASE.

CHARLOTTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Charlotte, N. C., September 26, 1930.

HON. COLE. LIVINGSTON BLEASE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BLEASE: Remember you have been cordially invited and expected to attend the Kings Mountain celebration at Kings Mountain October 7.

The plan is, if it is possible, to gather in Charlotte on Monday night, October 6, and go to the battle ground on the 7th. I am giving a dinner at the Hotel Charlotte on the evening of October 6 at 7 o'clock, and I invite you to be my guest at that time.

If you can not be in Charlotte, please let me know if I may expect you at Kings Mountain, so I will have reserved seats for you on the President's stand.

Yours truly,

C. O. KUESTER, Chairman.

PENDLETON, S. C., October 1, 1930.

HON. C. O. KUESTER,
Chairman Kings Mountain Sesquicentennial Committee,
Charlotte Chamber of Commerce Building, Charlotte, N. C.:

Will not be able to attend your banquet on night of the 6th. I will attend Kings Mountain celebration October 7 as member of committee representing the United States Senate. Could you please wire me what time President's train is expected to arrive at Kings Mountain?

COLE. L. BLEASE.

CHARLOTTE, N. C., October 1, 1930.

HON. COLE. L. BLEASE,
Pendleton, S. C.:

President's train arrives in Kings Mountain promptly at 1 o'clock. We shall expect you at the celebration at Kings Mountain. See letter.

C. O. KUESTER, Chairman.

CHARLOTTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Charlotte, N. C., October 1, 1930.

HON. COLE. L. BLEASE,
Pendleton, S. C.

DEAR SIR: Go to the town of Kings Mountain and try and get there by 11.30 if you possibly can. The parade starts at 1 o'clock, and I will have tickets for you at the Kings Mountain Hotel.

We are glad you are going to be with us at that time. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

C. O. KUESTER, Chairman.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, the following telegram was sent to each of the gentlemen here named: Hon. Edwin P. Thayer, Washington, D. C.; Hon. LEE S. OVERMAN, Salisbury, N. C.; Hon. SIMEON D. FESS, Washington, D. C.; Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH, Lynchburg, S. C.; Hon. W. F. STEVENSON, Cheraw, S. C.; Hon. CHARLES CURTIS, Washington, D. C.; Hon. C. O. Kuester, Charlotte, N. C.:

PENDLETON, S. C., October 8, 1930.

Second column, page 36, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Wednesday, July 9, 1930, reads as follows, under the head Anniversary of the Battle of Kings Mountain:

"The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the terms of House Concurrent Resolution No. 21 the Chair appoints the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE] as members on the part of the Senate of the joint committee to represent the Con-

gress at the celebration to be held at the battle ground of the Battle of Kings Mountain, S. C., on October 7, 1930."

Will you please advise me if any change was authorized in the above, and if so, by whom?

COLE. L. BLEASE.

St. Louis, Mo., October 12, 1930.

HON. COLE. L. BLEASE,
Jefferson Hotel, Columbia, S. C.:

There were no changes made in the committee referred to in your message.

CHARLES CURTIS.

CHARLOTTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Charlotte, N. C., October 8, 1930.

HON. COLE. L. BLEASE,
Pendleton, S. C.

DEAR SENATOR BLEASE: Your telegram just received, and I send you telegram as sent to me from Lincolnton, N. C., and this is where I got my information. If there is an error—and I am sure there has been an error made since I talked with you—I will be only too glad to correct it by the Associated Press, and upon receipt of this letter let me know and I will immediately correct it.

I have no other information except this telegram, which I am sending to you, which I ask that you return to me. Senator, I had a car for you to go to the battle ground yesterday, and sorry you could not come. Remember you advised me that it would not be possible for you to attend the celebration previous to the celebration, and had you not given me that information I would have been on the lookout for you in a more satisfactory way; but remember, Senator, I had a tremendous job, and hundreds of folks pulling at me from one side and the other, and nothing would have given me more pleasure than to have done everything in the world I could for you; and I again say that upon receipt of your wire I shall make all proper corrections immediately.

In getting up our program I wired to Congressman JONAS's office at Washington, and within a few days the telegram was sent to me by Mr. JONAS. Now, I do not think there is anything except simply an error, to be perfectly frank, Senator. I do not think any injustice was intended by anyone. I understand your position, and nothing would please me more than to make any correction you suggest that I make as chairman of the committee.

Let me hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

C. O. KUESTER.

[Inclosure]

LINCOLNTON, N. C., September 26, 1930.

C. O. KUESTER,
Chairman Kings Mountain Committee,
Charlotte, N. C.:

Senators LEE S. OVERMAN, Salisbury, N. C.; SIMEON D. FESS, Republican National Committee, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.; ELLISON D. SMITH, Lynchburg, S. C.; Representatives WILLIAM F. STEVENSON, Cheraw, S. C.; B. CARROLL REECE, Johnson City, Tenn., and myself.

CHARLES A. JONAS.

PENDLETON, S. C., October 9, 1930.

HON. C. O. KUESTER,
Chairman Kings Mountain Sesquicentennial Committee,
Charlotte Chamber of Commerce, Charlotte, N. C.

DEAR MR. KUESTER: Your letter of the 8th instant received. I am glad to have the information which you transmit therein, and am returning Mr. JONAS's telegram to you herewith. I am not blaming you with the occurrence, and just wish to get it straightened out.

I would prefer that you take no action about an announcement until you hear further from me, as I am now investigating the circumstances. However, if permanent records of the occasion are to be made for preservation, in the meantime I would be glad for you to see that I receive the credit to which I am justly entitled, and later I shall furnish you further data.

With kind regards and my best wishes, I am,

Very respectfully,

COLE. L. BLEASE.

CHERAW, S. C., October 8, 1930.

Senator COLE. L. BLEASE,
Pendleton, S. C.:

Your wire. I had no notice of any change in senatorial commission to attend Kings Mountain celebration, and was greatly surprised when I saw Senator SMITH instead of you in the program. I am puzzled to know who made the unauthorized substitution.

W. F. STEVENSON, M. C.

SALISBURY, N. C., October 8, 1930.

Senator COLE. BLEASE,
Pendleton, S. C.:

Your information correct. No changes made in official appointments. Vice President informed me he would appoint you, FESS, and myself. No power other than Vice President's could change. It being a joint resolution, no change was made.

LEE S. OVERMAN.

LYNCHBURG, S. C., October 9, 1930.
 Hon. COLE L. BLEASE,
 Pendleton, S. C.:

I was invited to attend the dinner given on October 6 and exercises on October 7 at Kings Mountain. I had a letter from Mr. STEVENSON stating that he had seen my name on the official program. I do not know who made up the program for the day nor can I give you any information in regard to this affair.

E. D. SMITH.

PENDLETON, S. C., October 8, 1930.

Hon. EDWIN P. THAYER,
 Secretary United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Please wire me names of three Senators appointed by Vice President to serve on committee to represent Senate at Kings Mountain celebration and date of appointment.

COLE L. BLEASE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 9, 1930.

Hon. COLE L. BLEASE,
 Pendleton, S. C.:

Answering your telegrams under date July 9, Vice President CURTIS appointed Senators FESS, OVERMAN, and BLEASE as members on part of Senate of joint committee to represent Congress at celebration at Battle of Kings Mountain October 7, under terms House Concurrent Resolution 21, which authorizes President of the Senate to appoint members on part of Senate. If any change made this would be done by Vice President.

EDWIN P. THAYER.

PENDLETON, S. C., October 9, 1930.

Hon. CHARLES A. JONAS, M. C.,
 Lincolnton, N. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JONAS: I am inclosing herewith copy of wire sent by you to the Hon. C. O. Kuester, chairman of the Kings Mountain sesquicentennial committee of Charlotte, N. C., under date of September 26, 1930, that is self-explanatory, together with copy of wire that I sent Mr. Kuester under date of October 8, 1930, that likewise explains itself.

You will note that I quote from the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 1930, in my wire to Mr. Kuester. Would you please be so kind as to inform me by what authority you stated that Senator SMITH had been appointed in my stead to represent the Senate on the congressional committee and all other facts that you know in relation to same?

With kind regards and my best wishes, I am,
 Very respectfully,

COLE L. BLEASE.

LINCOLNTON, N. C., October 10, 1930.

Hon. COLE L. BLEASE,
 Pendleton, N. C.

DEAR SENATOR BLEASE: Congressman JONAS is in the mountain counties of the ninth district on a speaking tour at the present time, and I therefore have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated October 9.

You may be sure that your letter will be brought to his attention promptly upon his return to the office.

Yours very truly,

LUCY RAREY,

Assistant Secretary to the Hon. Charles A. Jonas.

NOTE: I have not had the courtesy of any reply from Congressman JONAS save the above acknowledgment of my letter by his secretary.

COLE L. BLEASE.

DECEMBER 1, 1930.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
 COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY,
 October 13, 1930.

Hon. COLE L. BLEASE,
 Pendleton, S. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BLEASE: Your wire of October 8 reached the office while I was in Ohio and was not received by me until to-day.

I am inclosing a copy of a letter I sent to Senator OVERMAN expressing why it would not be possible for me to be present. I should have also written you. I regret the oversight.

Very truly yours,

SIMEON D. FESS.

CHARLOTTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
 Charlotte, N. C., October 16, 1930.

Senator COLE L. BLEASE,
 Pendleton, S. C.

DEAR SENATOR BLEASE: Thank you for copy of telegrams. Appreciate your sending these to me. I regret very much that there was an error made in printing the name of Senator SMITH instead of your name on the program, but I sent you the telegram which gave us this committee, and, as stated in a previous letter, I am satisfied it is just an error and no injustice was intended you whatsoever, and if there is any correction you would like for me to make, as previously written you, I will be only too glad

to make a public correction of this error; but, however, it was no fault of mine the way I see it.

Senator, I am perfectly willing, as you know, to do anything you suggest that you desire that I do. This was not printed anywhere in the world except in the program, and I have seen this committee carried in no newspapers, and the program was the only place that carried this committee.

Assuring you of my highest personal regards, and any time I can be of service to you let me know.

Sincerely yours,

C. O. KUESTER.

CHERAW, S. C., October 16, 1930.

Senator COLE L. BLEASE,
 Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Copies of your communications as to who was on the senatorial commission at Kings Mountain have just been received, and Senator SMITH, in his telegram, seems to lay it on me, and I respectfully decline to be made the goat.

When I got the official program, after I invited you and you had declined, I found they had Senator SMITH's name instead of yours as to the members of the commission, and I wrote Senator SMITH on the 3d of October that I had been notified that you had been appointed and had invited you to this dinner at Charlotte, and said to him:

"Acting on the information which I had no reason to doubt, I invited Senator BLEASE and the other Senators on the commission and Senator BLEASE wrote me that he would be unable to attend. To-day I got the official program and find that you are the member of this commission instead of Senator BLEASE, and I herewith invite you to dinner and will ask you please to write Mr. Kuester, care of Charlotte Chamber of Commerce, Charlotte, N. C., at once if you can be there, as he wants to know who will be the guests there at that time. I don't know how the mix-up came about, because I was first notified that BLEASE was on the commission. I suppose he must have declined or else it was a newspaper mistake in making the report."

When I got to Charlotte I found Senator SMITH there and asked him if he got my letter, and he said, oh, yes, he got it but he had already been invited to dinner otherwise. My surprise was as great as yours when I found it changed, but I supposed that those people handling the celebration knew what they were doing when they printed that program. I consider it an outrageous treatment of you, and so has everyone that I have talked to about it. Being directed by the chairman to invite the other commissioners, I promptly invited you, and see now that I was correct in so doing.

Most sincerely,

W. F. STEVENSON.

PROPOSED SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON RELIEF LEGISLATION

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, on yesterday I introduced Senate Resolution 338. That resolution proposes to create a special select committee to have charge of relief legislation. I desire at this time to offer for the RECORD a statement appearing in to-day's New York Times, and I ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

BILLS LAID BEFORE CONGRESS ON EMPLOYMENT RELIEF AND TO DEAL WITH COUNTRY'S ECONOMIC RECOVERY

WASHINGTON, December 2.—Measures on employment relief and economic recovery introduced in the Senate and House to-day included the following:

By Senator GLENN: A resolution to carry out President Hoover's recommendation for an emergency fund of \$150,000,000 to accelerate public works.

By Senators ROBINSON of Arkansas, McNARY, and CARAWAY: Resolutions to provide \$60,000,000 to aid drought-stricken farmers.

By Senator BLAINE: Bill for creating a Federal industrial commission to study the stabilization of employment.

By Senator CAPPER: Resolution to distribute 40,000,000 bushels of the Farm Board's wheat surplus to relief organizations for food.

By Senator BROOKHART: Bill increasing appropriations for public roads from \$125,000,000 to \$500,000,000 for two years.

By Senator KEYES and Representative ELLIOTT: Twin bills to expedite work on Federal buildings.

By Senator REED: Bill to suspend immigration for two years from all countries on this hemisphere and from Europe.

By Senator ODDIE: Bill to embargo the importation of all products from Soviet Russia.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, on yesterday eight separate and distinct bills were introduced proposing, in a measure, to carry out the recommendations of the President. Those bills, in the regular course, were referred to various committees.

Mr. President, I submit that when the President of the United States devotes one-half of his message to an emergency, the Senate should consider such emergency, should investigate the facts, and should prepare, introduce, and

consider measures designed to relieve the distress incident to such emergency. I maintain that it would be a better policy for the Senate to appoint a special committee to handle the entire question of relief than to depend upon numerous committees unrelated to try to handle the situation. I serve notice that on to-morrow I shall call from the table Senate Resolution 333 and ask for a vote upon it.

Mr. President, the question before the Senate is whether the Senate will appropriate a lump sum and place such sum in the hands of the President to be spent by him or whether the Congress itself will undertake to handle the situation. I am frank to say that I prefer that the Congress handle the situation. I believe the Congress is in a better position and is better able to know what the country needs than is any department or bureau of the Government. Believing as I do, I serve notice that to-morrow, during the morning hour, I shall call for the consideration of the resolution.

CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed, and the calendar, under Rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. McNARY. In view of the approaching consideration of the calendar, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	King	Shortridge
Barkley	Frazier	La Follette	Simmons
Bingham	George	McGill	Smith
Black	Gillett	McKellar	Smoot
Blaine	Glenn	McMaster	Steiwer
Blease	Goff	McNary	Stephens
Borah	Goldsborough	Morrow	Swanson
Brock	Gould	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Greene	Norbeck	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Hale	Norris	Townsend
Bulkeley	Harris	Nye	Trammell
Capper	Harrison	Oddie	Tydings
Caraway	Hastings	Overman	Vandenberg
Carey	Hatfield	Patterson	Wagner
Connally	Hayden	Phipps	Walcott
Copeland	Hebert	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Howell	Reed	Waterman
Dale	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Davis	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Deneen	Kean	Schall	Williamson
Dill	Kendrick	Sheppard	
Fess	Keyes	Shipstead	

Mr. SWANSON. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Secretary will state the first bill on the calendar.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 168) providing for the biennial appointment of a board of visitors to inspect and report upon the government and conditions in the Philippine Islands was announced as first in order.

Mr. BINGHAM. Let that bill go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) to amend Rule XXXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to the privilege of the floor was announced as next in order.

Mr. COUZENS. I ask that the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 551) to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 49) authorizing Committee on Manufactures, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to investigate immediately the working conditions of employees in the textile industry of the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 153) granting consent to the city and county of San Francisco to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bay of San Francisco from Rincon Hill to a point near the South Mole of San Antonio Estuary, in the county of Alameda, in said State, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ODDIE. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 119) authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate Commerce to investigate the wreck of the airplane *City of San Francisco* and certain matters pertaining to interstate air commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. FESS. I ask that the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

HEALTH AND WELFARE OF MOTHERS AND INFANTS

The bill (S. 255) for the promotion of the health and welfare of mothers and infants, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. PHIPPS asked that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I should like to know why the bill which has just been called on the calendar should go over. The author of the bill is the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, is the Senator inquiring about Order of Business No. 368, being Senate bill 255?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONES. I desire to give notice that at the very first opportunity I expect to move to take up that measure. I consider it a very important one. It deals with the health and mortality of children and mothers, and, as I have said, at the very first opportunity I propose to move for the consideration of the bill. I shall not do it this morning because the consideration of the bill will take some little time.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next bill in order on the calendar will be stated.

The bill (H. R. 9592) to amend section 407 of the merchant marine act, 1928, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1278) to authorize the issuance of certificates of admission to aliens, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. COPELAND. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 149) for the relief of unemployed persons in the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. BROOKHART. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 23) to regulate the procurement of motor transportation in the Army was announced as next in order.

Mr. BLAINE. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 245) providing for the appointment of a committee to inquire into the failure of the Speaker of the House of Representatives to take some action of Senate Joint Resolution 3, relative to the commencement of the terms of President, Vice President, and Members of Congress was announced as next in order.

Mr. FESS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 120) to authorize the President to detail engineers of the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Agriculture to assist the governments of the Latin American

Republics in highway matters was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7998) to amend subsection (d) of section 11 of the merchant marine act of June 5, 1920, as amended by section 301 of the merchant marine act of May 22, 1928, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4066) to authorize the merger of the Georgetown Gas Light Co. with and into the Washington Gas Light Co., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOWELL. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3229) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of New York was announced as next in order.

Mr. COPELAND. I ask that this bill go over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

PRACTICE BEFORE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

The bill (H. R. 699) to prevent fraud, deception, or improper practice in connection with business before the United States Patent Office, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN] or some one else should give a statement explaining the provisions of this bill. I do not wish to ask that it go over; but the Senate is just hurriedly passing over the calendar. We have proceeded for quite a distance on the calendar and have given consideration to no measure. I should like to have an explanation of the provisions of this bill.

Mr. WATERMAN. Mr. President, since the last session I have not been able to give this bill any attention at all, or to renew my familiarity with it as it existed at that time. I can say that the bill is one which has had two or three objections to it which in my opinion were not well founded.

The bill is for the purpose of so framing the law that people who ought not to be permitted to approach the Patent Office shall be kept away. It is nothing more or less than a reasonable limitation upon applications and admissions to practice before the Patent Office. In my opinion, the bill as it has been reported to the Senate is one that is highly worthy of passage; and while I can not this morning go into an argument upon it, because I am not prepared to do so, I hope that the objections, if there are any, will be withdrawn.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, that statement is not explanatory, at least to my satisfaction, of this bill. I think the purpose of these amendments and of the bill itself ought to be made clear to the Senate, and the necessity for them shown.

Mr. WATERMAN. I will say to the Senator that on a future day I will do that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well. I understand that the Senator is not ready to do it now; and therefore the bill will have to go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1916) to amend section 1025 of the Revised Statutes of the United States was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] is pending.

Mr. McNARY. In view of the absence of the Senator, I suggest that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4357) to limit the jurisdiction of district courts of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED and Mr. COPELAND. Let that go over.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, let me remark that that bill, Order of Business 697, ought, I think, to be passed. The only purpose of it is to permit the United States district attorney to take his stenographer into the grand-jury room.

Mr. REED. No, Mr. President; I think we are looking at different numbers on the calendar. Order of Business 683, Senate bill 1916, allows the presence of stenographers in the grand-jury room. I do not object to that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. This bill changes the jurisdiction of the Federal courts.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me inquire, then, who did object to Senate bill 1916?

Mr. REED. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] objected to it, I believe, in the absence of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON].

Mr. McNARY. Yes; in view of that Senator's absence, I objected.

Mr. REED. The Senator from New Mexico has offered an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

The bill (H. R. 10288) to regulate the transportation of persons in interstate and foreign commerce by motor carriers operating on the public highways was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This bill is the unfinished business.

Mr. COUZENS. Let it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3344) supplementing the national prohibition act for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. BLAINE. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3558) to amend section 8 of the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3399) to amend section 2 (e) of the air commerce act of 1926 was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] has an amendment to that bill. At any rate, I will ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4377) to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States on account of property damage, personal injury, or death.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, this is a very important measure. Would the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] object to its going over?

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, this bill has been on the calendar for some time. It is a measure that was passed by a previous Congress as amended by suggestions made by the Comptroller General. It provides for the settlement of claims against the Government. That is, it provides that instead of certain claims being settled by the departments each department shall send its claims to the Comptroller General and he may settle them on the basis which has been the practice heretofore. That would cause uniformity in the settlement of claims.

Mr. KING. What is the limit that the officials of the Government would be permitted to pay in settlement of these claims?

Mr. HOWELL. The limit of the claims is the same as it has been before.

Mr. KING. Five hundred dollars?

Mr. HOWELL. Five hundred dollars; or I think the bill does provide that claims up to \$1,000 can be settled.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, in the first section of the bill it provides for the adjudication and payment of claims not exceeding \$50,000.

Mr. HOWELL. But such claims have to be referred back to Congress.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, my understanding about that is that with respect to claims above the limit of \$500 or \$1,000—as I recollect the limit is \$1,000—the Comptroller General takes the testimony and refers the testimony to the Congress for action.

The bill really is intended to substitute some regular, orderly way of taking testimony to go before the Committee on Claims instead of having the Committee on Claims determine the matter upon ex parte affidavits. The inquiry is prosecuted before the Comptroller General in the regular, orderly way, and testimony is taken before him which he transmits with his recommendations to the Congress for action by the Committee on Claims.

The subject really is one which ought to have the attention of Congress, because everyone who has had any experience at all before the Committee on Claims realizes that it is in no situation to determine with any degree of justice or accuracy the controversies that arise.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I inquire if any increased authority is given to any official under this bill other than that official enjoys under the present law?

Mr. HOWELL. There is not.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator from Nebraska or the Senator from Montana?

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

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What will be the jurisdiction of the Committee on Claims if the bill passes?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It is not affected, except that all claims must first be presented to the Comptroller General before being acted upon by the Congress or the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. He has the power finally to adjudicate claims of less than \$1,000?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. He has power finally to adjudicate them, and the payments are made. In the case of claims for more than \$1,000 and less than \$50,000, he takes testimony and transmits it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And transmits it back to the Congress?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And then the committees take jurisdiction?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, this bill simply provides for the orderly settlement of claims and the proper taking of testimony.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the bill be read.

The Chief Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I. PROPERTY DAMAGE CLAIMS

SECTION 1. (a) Subject to the limitations of this act, the United States hereby grants authority as hereinafter provided for the adjudication and payment of claims on account of damage to or loss of privately owned property not exceeding \$50,000 in amount, if the damage or loss proximately resulted from the negligence or wrongful act or omission of any officer or employee of the Government within the scope of his office or employment and not out of contract.

(b) The heads of the respective departments and establishments shall promptly cause an investigation to be made under such regulations as the Comptroller General shall prescribe of any happening or event in which the United States, through its officers or employees, becomes involved, irrespective of whether or not there appears liability on the part of the United States, and shall transmit for settlement any claim for damages under this title to the General Accounting Office, together with the record and their report and recommendations as to the amount to be allowed, if any.

(c) The General Accounting Office shall settle and adjust the claims as reported, and shall deduct from the amount found due the owner the amount of any lawful claim of the United States, whether liquidated or unliquidated, against such owner. The net amount, not exceeding \$1,000, due a claimant owner shall be

paid under any appropriations available for use of the respective department or establishment under which the damage occurred which the Comptroller General in his discretion may direct to be charged therewith. Any claim in net amount in excess of \$1,000 shall be certified to the Congress for its consideration and action, and such certificate shall contain a brief statement of the facts and reasons for allowance of the claim and for deductions, if any. Any amount found due and paid under this title shall forever discharge the United States from any claim or demand on account of the damage or loss involved in the particular claim. The right of Congress is expressly reserved to return to the Comptroller General, as provided in section 312 (a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of June 10, 1921 (42 Stat. 25, 26), any claim settled by him for further examination and report or to refer any such claim to the Court of Claims, as provided in section 151 of the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1138), for the investigation and determination of facts with its conclusion thereon.

(d) No claim shall be considered under this title unless presented in writing to the department within 90 days from the date of the accrual of said claim: *Provided*, That the deposit in the mails of a duly registered letter addressed to the head of the department or establishment concerned, containing notification of the claim, shall be deemed to be presentation of a claim as required by this section.

SEC. 2. The Court of Claims shall be exclusively competent, under such rules as it may prescribe, to review as on certiorari any settlement made by the General Accounting Office under the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That application be duly made for certiorari within 90 days from the date of such settlement: *Provided further*, That the record on such review shall consist of a transcript of all the papers filed in the General Accounting Office in the claim prior to its settlement, together with a copy of the decision of the Comptroller General therein.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect any right of the United States to reimbursement from an officer or employee of the Government willfully causing the damage or loss giving rise to any claim against the United States under this title.

SEC. 4. (a) The provisions of this title shall not apply to—

(1) Any claim arising out of the loss or miscarriage or negligent transmission of letters or postal matter.

(2) Any claim arising in respect of the assessment or collection of any tax or customs duty.

(3) Any claim for which settlement is provided by the act of October 6, 1917 (U. S. C., title 34, secs. 981–982, inclusive), relating to the loss, damage, or destruction of the property of officers and enlisted men in the naval service, in the Marine Corps, and in the Coast Guard; by the act of March 3, 1885 (U. S. C., title 31, secs. 218–222, inclusive), as amended, relating to the loss, damage, or destruction of the property of the officers, enlisted men, and members of the Nurse Corps (female) of the Army; or by the act of March 9, 1920 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 741–752, inclusive), or the act of March 3, 1925 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 781–790, inclusive), relating to claims or suits in admiralty against the United States.

(4) Any claim arising out of the conveyance, transfer, assignment, or delivery of money or other property or out of the payment to or seizure by the President or Alien Property Custodian of any money or other property, in administering the provisions of the trading with the enemy act, as amended.

(5) Any claim arising out of the administration of the quarantine laws except the laws administered by the Public Health Service of the Treasury Department.

(6) Any claim arising out of the activities or work of the Government, its agents or employees, relating to flood control.

(7) Any claim arising out of the activities of the Government, its agents or employees, relating to river and harbor work.

(b) The act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding \$1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922 (U. S. C., title 31, secs. 215–217), is hereby repealed, except that any claim accruing prior to such repeal may be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined, and certified in the same manner and to the same extent as if this act were not law, and nothing contained in the exceptions in section 4 of this act shall be considered as precluding the Congress from considering claims for injuries or damages arising under said exceptions.

(c) The provisions of any act, in so far as inconsistent with the provisions of this title, are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

TITLE II. PERSONAL INJURY AND DEATH CLAIMS

SEC. 201. (a) Subject to the limitations of this act the Government of the United States authorizes the payment of claims on account of personal injury or death, if the injury or death was either (1) proximately caused by the negligence or wrongful act or omission of any officer or employee of the Government acting within the scope of his office or employment, or (2) proximately attributable to any defect or insufficiency in any machinery, vehicle, or appliance and such defect or insufficiency was due to the negligence or wrongful omission of an officer or employee of the Government.

(b) No compensation shall be allowed for any such injury or death if the injury or death proximately results from the fact that the person injured or the decedent was intoxicated or under the influence of drugs, or if the injury or death is proximately caused by the willful misconduct of the person injured or the deceased, or by the intention of the person injured or the deceased to bring about injury or death to himself or another.

(c) No compensation shall be allowed for any such injury or death to the extent that the injury is continued or aggravated, or that the death is caused by an unreasonable refusal or negligent failure to submit to or procure medical or surgical treatment, the risk of which is, in the judgment of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission (hereinafter referred to as the commission), based upon expert medical or surgical advice, inconsiderable in view of the seriousness of the injury.

Sec. 202. (a) Authority is hereby conferred upon the commission, acting on behalf of the Government, to consider any claim liability for which is recognized under section 201, if the amount of the claim does not exceed \$7,500, and said commission shall transmit the claim with the report and recommendation to the General Accounting Office for audit and settlement. Such amount as may be found to be due to any claimant shall be certified to the Congress as a just claim for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor, together with a brief statement of the character of each claim, the amount claimed, and the amount allowed, with a summary of the evidence upon which the allowance was made: *Provided*, That no claim shall be considered unless filed in writing with the commission within 90 days after the injury or death caused by the injury, except that for reasonable cause shown the Comptroller General may allow claims for compensation for such injury or death to be filed any time within one year thereafter: *Provided*, That the deposit in the mails of a duly registered letter addressed to the commissioner or to the head of the respective department or establishment concerned, containing notification of the claim, shall be deemed to be presentation of a claim as required by this section.

(b) Acceptance by any claimant of the amount determined under this title shall be deemed to be in full settlement of the claim against the Government of the United States and the officer or employee.

(c) The Comptroller General shall by regulation provide for the form and manner in which claims under this title shall be presented before the commission and the General Accounting Office.

Sec. 203. The President shall provide rules, including penalties for the violation thereof, for the reporting to the commission both by officers or employees of such department or establishment and by their immediate superiors of injuries or death which may become the basis of a claim under this title.

Sec. 204. (a) The compensation for personal injury shall be paid to the injured individual, except that if the individual dies before compensation has been paid, the compensation shall be allowed and paid as in the case of compensation for death.

(b) Compensation for death shall be allowed and paid as follows:

(1) Compensation shall be allowed only for death caused by injury and occurring within three years after the injury, except that no compensation shall be awarded where the death takes place more than one year after the cessation of disability resulting from such injury, or (in the absence of any such disability preceding death) more than one year after the injury.

(2) The compensation shall be allowed and paid to the following beneficiaries:

(A) To the widow or widower, or if there is no widow or widower, then to the children, share and share alike. Compensation to a child shall not be allowed unless the child is unmarried and is either under 18 years of age or, having reached the age of 18, is physically or mentally incapable of self-support. Compensation for a child under 18 years of age shall be paid to the legal guardian.

(B) To any parent or grandparent or brother or sister who was totally or partially dependent for support upon the deceased at the time of his death, having due regard for the extent of the dependency in cases of partial dependency under this paragraph.

(3) The total compensation which may be allowed on account of any one injury, or injury and death caused thereby, shall not exceed \$7,500.

(4) The right of a beneficiary to compensation for death shall not survive the death of such beneficiary.

(c) In addition to the money compensation provided under this title—

(1) In the case of personal injury, the injured individual shall be allowed such expenses for any medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies (including artificial members and other prosthetic appliances) as the commission adjudges necessary and reasonable for care of or relief from the results of an injury, subject to such regulations as the commission may prescribe with respect to the procurement of such services and supplies.

(2) In the case of death, the personal representatives of the decedent shall be allowed such funeral and burial expenses of the decedent as the commission adjudges to be necessary and reasonable, in an amount not to exceed \$200.

Sec. 205. As used in this title—

(a) The term "child" means (1) a legitimate child, (2) a child legally adopted prior to the death of the deceased, (3) a stepchild, if a member of the deceased's household at the time of his death, (4) a posthumous child, and (5) an illegitimate child, but as to the father only, if acknowledged in writing by him, or if he has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's support or has been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child: *Provided*, That an illegitimate child whose father

has not been determined by a competent court shall have the same rights as a legitimate child under this act.

(b) The term "widow" means the deceased's wife living with or dependent for support upon him at the time of his death, or living apart from him at such time because of his desertion.

(c) The term "widower" means the deceased's husband living with her at the time of her death.

(d) The term "parent" means a father, mother, father or mother through adoption, stepfather, stepmother, and persons who have stood in loco parentis to the deceased for a period of not less than two years just prior to his death.

(e) The term "grandparent" means a grandfather or grandmother.

Sec. 206. The allowance of compensation for personal injury to any claimant under this title may be denied, to such extent as the Comptroller General deems necessary, unless such claimant has, as frequently and at such times and places as may be reasonably required by the commission, submitted himself to examination by a medical officer of the United States or by a duly qualified physician, designated or approved by the commission. The individual injured may have a duly qualified physician designated and paid by him present to participate in such examination. In case of any disagreement between the physician making an examination on the part of the United States and the physician designated by the individual injured, the commission shall appoint a third physician, duly qualified, who shall make an examination. For all examinations after the first required under this title, the claimant shall, in the discretion of the commission, be paid his reasonable traveling and other expenses. Fees for examination made on the part of the United States under this title by physicians who are not already in the services of the United States shall be fixed by the commission. Such fees and traveling and other expenses shall be paid out of the appropriations for the administration of this title.

Sec. 207. (a) Any assignment of a claim of compensation under this title shall be void, and all compensation and claims therefor shall be exempt from all claims of creditors.

(b) If an injury or death for which compensation is payable under this title is caused under circumstances creating a legal liability upon some person other than the United States to pay damages therefor, the Comptroller General shall require the beneficiary to assign to the United States any right of action he may have to enforce such liability of such other person or any right which he may have to share in any money or other property received in satisfaction of such liability of such other person, or the Comptroller General may require said beneficiary to prosecute said action in his own name.

(c) If the beneficiary refuses to make such assignment or to prosecute said action in his own name when required by the Comptroller General, he shall not be entitled to any compensation under this title.

(d) The cause of action when assigned to the United States shall be prosecuted by the Comptroller General, if he shall deem recovery possible, and if the Comptroller General realizes upon such cause of action he shall apply the money or other property so received in the following manner: After deducting the amount of the compensation paid to the beneficiary, including any payments made under subdivision (c) of section 204, and the expenses of such realization, which sum shall be paid into the Treasury, the surplus, if any, shall be paid to the beneficiary.

(e) If an injury or death for which compensation is payable under this title is caused under circumstances creating a legal liability in some person other than the United States to pay damages therefor, and a beneficiary entitled to compensation from the United States for such injury or death receives, as a result of a suit brought by him or on his behalf, or as a result of a settlement made by him or on his behalf, any money or other property in satisfaction of the liability of such other person, such beneficiary shall, after deducting the costs of suit and a reasonable attorney's fee, apply the money or other property so received in the following manner:

(1) If the compensation has been paid, he shall refund to the United States so much of the amount of compensation which has been paid by the United States, including any payments made under subdivision (c) of section 204, as is not in excess of the amount of the money and property received. Any amount so refunded shall be paid into the Treasury.

(2) If the compensation has not been paid, he shall credit the money or other property so received upon any compensation payable to him by the United States on account of the same injury or death.

Sec. 208. The provisions of this title shall not apply to—

(a) Any claim for which compensation is provided by the Federal employees' compensation act, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, ch. 15), or by the World War veterans' act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 38, ch. 10, as amended).

(b) Any claim for injury or death incurred in line of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States in cases where relief is provided by other law.

Sec. 209. The act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, ch. 15), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 43. That this act may be cited as the Federal employees' compensation act."

TITLE III. MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 301. When used in this act—

(a) The term "department or establishment" means any executive department or independent establishment not in the legislative or judicial branches of the Government, or any corporation acting as a governmental instrumentality or agency in which the United States owns or controls 51 per cent or more of the voting shares and securities, but shall not include the Panama Railroad;

(b) The term "officer or employee of the Government" means any officer or employee of any department or establishment as above defined, any member of the military or naval forces of the United States, or any other person acting on behalf of the United States in any official capacity under or by authority of any such department or establishment; and

(c) The term "acting in the scope of his office or employment," in the case of any member of the military or naval forces of the United States, means acting in line of duty and, in the case of an officer or employee of any corporation acting as a governmental instrumentality or agency, means acting in the execution of a governmental activity.

Sec. 302. In any claim brought under this act the head of the executive department or other independent establishment, court or governmental instrumentality shall, as a part of the determination or decision, determine and allow reasonable attorney's fees not to exceed 15 per cent of the amount recovered, if recovery be had, to be paid out of the amount recovered to the attorneys of the claimant. Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with such claim any amount other than that allowed under this section, if recovery be had, shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not more than \$2,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

Sec. 303. Section 173 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 280), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 173. No claim shall be allowed by the accounting officers or the head of any executive department or other independent establishment or governmental instrumentality, or by any court of the United States, or by the Congress to any person where such claimant or those under whom he claims shall willfully, knowingly, and with intent to defraud the United States have claimed more than was justly due in respect of such claim or presented any false evidence to Congress or to any department, establishment, instrumentality, or court in support thereof."

Sec. 304. The claims of persons under the age of 21 years, first accrued during minority, and of idiots, lunatics, insane persons, and persons beyond the seas at the time the claim accrued, entitled to the claim, shall not be barred if the same be filed with the head of the department within one year after the disability has ceased.

Sec. 305. This act may be cited as the "Federal tort claims act."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this bill involves very large and extensive changes from the present practice established. Therefore, it would be impossible to consider it during the morning hour while we are on the calendar. So I ask that it go over for the day.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I wish the Senator would withdraw his objection. It will not take long to consider the bill, and it is a very important measure.

Mr. McNARY. That is the very reason why I am objecting to its consideration. It is too important to be considered now in the short time we have. I have not had time to study the bill. I have been amazed as I have listened to the reading of some of its provisions, and therefore, in order that we may promote legislation in a proper way, I shall insist upon my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon objects, and the bill will be passed over.

RECOGNITION OF PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

The bill (S. 3822) to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the Philippine Islands and for the recognition of their independence, etc., was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CHANGE OF NAME OF IOWA CIRCLE

The bill (H. R. 7996) to change the name of Iowa Circle in the city of Washington to Logan Circle was considered, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4015) to provide for the revocation and suspension of operators' and chauffeurs' licenses and registration certificates; to require proof of ability to respond in damages for injuries caused by the operation of motor vehicles; to prescribe the form of and conditions in insurance

policies covering the liability of motor-vehicle operators; to subject such policies to the approval of the commissioner of insurance; to constitute the director of traffic the agent of nonresident owners and operators of motor vehicles operated in the District of Columbia for the purpose of service of process; to provide for the report of accidents; to authorize the director of traffic to make rules for the administration of this statute; and to prescribe penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BLAINE. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4254) to provide for the compromise and settlement of claims held by the United States of America arising under the provisions of section 210 of the transportation act, 1920, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOWELL. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2497) to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4561) for the relief of Sally S. Twilley was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3644) for compensation in behalf of John M. Flynn was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOWELL. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4555) to amend certain sections in the Code of Law for the District of Columbia relating to offenses against public policy was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 454) to establish a commission to be known as a commission on a national museum of engineering and industry was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

LAURA A. DEPODESTA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1759) for the relief of Laura A. DePodesta, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, to strike out the period after the word "death," insert a comma, and add the following: "said sum to be in full settlement of all claims for damages against the Government on account of the death of her husband," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Laura A. DePodesta, widow of Anthony DePodesta, late a Lieutenant, Officers' Reserve Corps, Air Service, United States Army, who was killed in an airplane accident while in the line of duty at Langley Field, Va., on July 17, 1925, the sum of \$1,575, being a gratuity equal to six months' pay at the rate received by Lieutenant DePodesta at the time of his death, said sum to be in full settlement of all claims for damages against the Government on account of the death of her husband.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 191) for the relief of George B. Marx was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOWELL. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3238) for the relief of Martin E. Riley was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOWELL. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5212) for the relief of George Charles Walthers was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOWELL. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4334) to provide for the erection of a suitable monument to the memory of the first permanent settlement of the West at Harrodsburg, Ky., was announced as next in order.

Mr. FESS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

WORK OF THE FOREST SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 10782) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this House bill and the Senate joint resolution which immediately follows on the calendar, which I have reported as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I ask to go over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 183) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the Territories of the United States under the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the request of the Senator from Oregon, this joint resolution will be passed over.

REGULATION OF COTTON EXCHANGES

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 195) authorizing investigation of certain operations on cotton exchanges.

The joint resolution had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 1, line 5, to strike out "1916" and insert in lieu thereof "1926"; on page 2, line 2, after the numerals "1928," to strike out the word "and"; on page 2, after the numerals "1929," to insert a comma and the words "and the first half of 1930"; on page 2, line 9, after the word "hearings," to insert the words "to contract for stenographic reporting service" and a comma; on page 2, line 10, after the word "assistants," to insert the words "in the District of Columbia and elsewhere"; on page 2, line 14, after the word "such," to insert the word "other"; on page 2, line 14, after the word "expenditures," to insert the words "including expenses for printing and binding" and a comma, so as to make the bill read:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to investigate through the Grain Futures Administration the cause of the 1926 decline in cotton, ascertaining the amount of cotton futures sold in 1926, the amount of short selling when the drastic slump occurred, who did this short selling, and the effect of this heavy short selling on prices, and any further information which will enable the farmers to know the true state of conditions and the parties responsible for this decline; also to make a similar investigation for 1927, 1928, 1929, and the first half of 1930, giving the amount of short selling and the amount of public participation induced to take part in these futures, and to ascertain whether or not the majority of the public lost or won on the deals, and to report this information to the Senate.

Sec. 2. That for the purposes of this resolution the Grain Futures Administration is authorized to hold hearings, to contract for stenographic reporting service, to employ experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for printing and binding, as it deems advisable.

Sec. 3. That to defray the necessary expenses entailed by this investigation there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any funds in the United States Treasury a sum not exceeding \$125,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Texas whether it is necessary to have \$125,000 for that purpose?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, department officials estimated that it would take that much to make a thorough and efficient investigation. The resolution calls for information which is very much needed, and which has never been ascertained, to wit, information as to the effect of short selling practices on cotton prices. It would be worth many, many times the expense of an investigation if we could get that information.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no question as to the advisability of getting the information, but it seems to me that \$125,000 is entirely too much money to expend for that purpose.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would accept an amendment making the amount \$100,000.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I had in mind. Whatever applies to one cotton exchange will apply to every such exchange in the United States, because their practices are exactly the same. So it would be necessary to make an investigation of only one exchange.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would accept an amendment providing for a smaller amount, and we would try to get along with that.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought that \$75,000 would be sufficient.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well; I accept that amount.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 19, to strike out "\$125,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 373) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, this joint resolution was intended to take the place of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which, it will be remembered, passed in the final hours of the last session. Therefore it is no longer needed, and I move that it be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 4597) to provide educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia with leave of absence with part pay for purposes of educational improvement, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, some suggestions have been brought to my attention which may call for amendments, and, not anticipating that the bill would be reached this morning, I have not prepared them. I will ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

GRAND CALUMET RIVER BRIDGE, INDIANA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13035) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Grand Calumet River at East Chicago, Ind., which was read the third time and passed.

REFUND TO FARMERS' GRAIN CO., NEBRASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 899) authorizing the Treasurer of the United States to refund to the Farmers' Grain Co., of Omaha, Nebr., income taxes illegally paid to the United States Treasurer, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the numerals "\$2,186.36," to strike out the comma and the words "with interest at 7 per cent," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to refund, from moneys not otherwise

appropriated, the sum of \$2,186.36 to the Farmers' Grain Co., of Omaha, Nebr., this sum being paid illegally and through error by said company as income taxes to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and covered into the United States Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will some one explain to us why that money was not recovered in the ordinary way through refunds at the Treasury?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that this money was paid upon the demand of a Treasury official, and it was afterwards ascertained, and the Treasury Department admit, that the collection was illegal; that they had no right to demand it. The money was paid into the Treasury and became a part of the funds in the Treasury, and the statute of limitations ran.

All this bill does is to authorize the payment of a claim which is admitted to be correct except for the technicality that the statute of limitations has intervened. There is no question about the money being illegally and wrongfully collected.

Mr. REED. The Senator does not believe in abolishing the statute of limitations as to these tax returns, surely?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not. The statute of limitations is all right; but this was money paid upon demands made by representatives of the Government, as I understand it, after the taxpayers had paid their taxes. An examination was made and the officials claimed there was more due, and the taxpayers paid it. It was afterwards discovered that what they had paid in the first place was the correct amount, and that this second payment had been illegally demanded. A good many of these cooperative institutions are not familiar with the law, and they allowed their rights to lapse.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to a question?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Is there any question as to the illegality of the tax which the bill seeks to refund?

Mr. NORRIS. According to my understanding, there is no question whatever about it.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, there is not only no question about it, but the Government admits that it owes this cooperative association money.

Mr. NORRIS. That is correct; the Government does not deny it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Government has really benefited, then, by the failure to secure a refund within the limitation period?

Mr. NORRIS. It has had the use of the money all this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator from Nebraska correctly, the only question here is that the statute of limitations has run against the claim?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. FESS. This bill simply provides for refunding the money?

Mr. NORRIS. That is right.

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

FAIRMONT CREAMERY CO., NEBRASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3620) for the relief of the Fairmont Creamery Co., of Omaha, Nebr., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the word "due" to insert a colon and the words "Provided, That in the settlement of said claim there shall be no allowance of interest," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is hereby authorized and directed to receive, consider, and determine, in accordance with law, but without regard to any statute of limitations, any claim filed not later than six months after the passage of this act, by the Fairmont Creamery Co., Omaha, Nebr., for the refund of Federal income and profits taxes collected from the said Fairmont Creamery Co. for 1918 in excess of the amount properly due: *Provided,* That in the settlement of said claim there shall be no allowance of interest.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to the said Fairmont Creamery Co. any amount allowed in the determination of any claim filed in accordance with this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

LEBANON EQUITY EXCHANGE, NEBRASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4018) for the relief of the Lebanon Equity Exchange, of Lebanon, Nebr., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the word "due," to insert a colon and the words "Provided, That in the settlement of said claim there shall be no allowance of interest," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to receive, consider, and determine, in accordance with law but without regard to any statute of limitations, any claim filed not later than six months after the passage of this act by the Lebanon Equity Exchange, Lebanon, Nebr., for the refund of Federal income and profits taxes collected from the said Lebanon Equity Exchange for the year 1920 in excess of the amount properly due: *Provided,* That in the settlement of said claim there shall be no allowance of interest.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. COOPER NICHOLSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4274) for the relief of Dr. Cooper Nicholson, which had been reported by the Committee on Claims with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Dr. Cooper Nicholson, who suffered an injury to his left eye while in charge of Main Hospital No. 1, at Muscle Shoals, Ala., during the World War.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Dr. Cooper Nicholson."

ESTATE OF BENJAMIN BRAZNELL

The bill (S. 457) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin Braznell was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reopen and allow the claim of the Braddock Trust Co., executor of the estate of Benjamin Braznell, late of Pittsburgh, Pa., and refund the sum of \$2,323.47, the balance of taxes illegally collected under existing laws and decisions.

EMMETT BROOKS

The bill (H. R. 10093) for the relief of Emmett Brooks was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and in full settlement of all claims against the Government, the sum of \$351.05 to Emmett Brooks in payment for fees as United States commissioner for services rendered for the period beginning with the January quarter, 1925, and ending with the March quarter, 1929.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES IN CUSTOMS SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 12742) to amend the act entitled "An act to adjust the compensation of certain employees in the Customs Service," approved May 29, 1928, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Finance if the bill has the unanimous support of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it has the unanimous support of the Finance Committee and the approval of the department.

The Comptroller General issued a number of decisions, which affected adversely the provisions in the original bill, and this measure is simply to meet the legal points raised by the Comptroller General. For example, the Comptroller General ruled that if an inspector of customs, who was receiving \$2,100 per annum, was transferred to the position of clerk, he would be compelled to suffer a reduction in salary to \$1,700 per annum. There were a number of other similar points in the Comptroller General's decisions, and this measure is simply to overcome the objections raised by the Comptroller General, but in no way increases the rates of compensation specified in the original bill passed two years ago.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to adjust the compensation of certain employees in the Customs Service," approved May 29, 1928, be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. The following annual rates of compensation are hereby established for the employees in the Customs Service hereinafter specified:

- " (a) Laborers, \$1,500.
- " (b) Verifiers-openers-packers, \$1,680, \$1,740, \$1,800, \$1,860, \$1,920, \$1,980, and \$2,040.
- " (c) Clerks, entrance salary, \$1,700; clerks having one year's satisfactory service, \$1,800; clerks having two years' satisfactory service, \$1,900; clerks having three years' satisfactory service, \$2,000; clerks having four years' satisfactory service, \$2,100; thereafter promotion of clerks to higher rates of compensation shall be in accordance with existing law.
- " (d) Customs guards, \$1,860, \$1,920, \$1,980, \$2,040, \$2,100, \$2,200, \$2,300, and \$2,400.
- " (e) Inspectors, \$2,100, \$2,200, \$2,300, \$2,400, \$2,500, \$2,600, \$2,700, \$2,800, \$2,900, \$3,000, \$3,100, \$3,200, and \$3,300.
- " (f) Station inspectors, \$3,000, \$3,100, \$3,200, \$3,300, \$3,400, \$3,500, and \$3,600.

" Sec. 2. All new appointments of employees specified in section 1 shall be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate salary range: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to waive the foregoing provision of this section in the case of employees who are transferred from a position in any class specified in section 1 or from any position in the Customs Service to a position in any of the classes specified in section 1, including that of clerk when such transfer is made in the interest of good administration: *Provided further,* That in fixing the entrance salary of clerks transferred from any position in the Customs Service or the Bureau of Customs, and in giving them increases in pay at any time thereafter, as provided in section 1 (c) of this act, credit may be given for all previous continuous service in the Customs Field Service or in the Bureau of Customs, whether clerical or otherwise, in positions requiring a first-grade clerical, or higher grade, civil-service examination.

" Sec. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the promotion at any time of any employee from a position in any of the grades or classes specified in section 1 of this act to a vacancy in a position administratively allocated to any grade under authority of section 3 of the act approved May 28, 1928, entitled "An act to amend the salary rates contained in the compensation schedules of the act of March 4, 1923, entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civil positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services," or to a vacant position legally allocated to any grade created by or under authority of Congress after the passage of this act, regardless of the period of time the employee has served and regardless of the designation of the vacant position, and when so promoted such employee shall receive the compensation authorized by law for such positions and thereafter shall cease to be affected by the provisions of section 1 of this act; and nothing contained herein shall be construed to reduce the rate of compensation of any employee in the Customs Service.

" Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to pay the rates of compensation herein established.

" Sec. 5. This act shall be effective as of the date of its enactment: *Provided, however,* That all promotions, transfers, reinstatements, and other changes heretofore made with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury affecting the pay status of any employee in which credit was given for previous satisfactory non-continuous service in the Customs Field Service or Bureau of Customs or which conform to the provisions of the act of May 29, 1928, as amended by this act, are hereby ratified and made effective as of their designated effective dates."

PIONEER STEAMSHIP CO.

The bill (S. 896) to pay the Pioneer Steamship Co. the sum of \$3,100.50, money paid as duty for repairs in foreign ports, was considered. The bill had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Pioneer Steamship Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of \$3,100.50 for money paid as duty upon certain repairs in foreign ports.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would like to ask under what theory the duty was collected because, as I recall the law, necessary repairs in foreign ports do not call for the payment of duty upon the ship coming into the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator reporting the bill is not in the Chamber.

Mr. KING. Let it go over, then.

Mr. HOWELL. Has the bill gone over?

Mr. KING. If the Senator from Nebraska can offer the explanation, I do not ask that it go over. I ask merely for some information.

Mr. HOWELL. This is a case where five vessels of the Pioneer Steamship Co. on their last voyage in 1917 were detained in Canadian waters and were there during the winter. Certain repairs were made upon one of the steamships, those repairs being necessary. As a result, a tax or duty was levied upon those repairs. Inasmuch as the vessels were then conveying or had been conveying cargoes for the Government, through the Food Administration, it was urged by the company that they were entitled to a refund because they were not responsible for their vessels being tied up as they were.

The Secretary of the Treasury said he did not believe that exceptions should be made, as exceptions were not provided for under the law, but that if Congress saw fit to give such a bill favorable consideration, he would advise the adoption of the bill which is before the Senate at this time. The Claims Committee took the matter under consideration and believes that the steamship company is entitled to a refund under the circumstances.

Mr. KING. The question I had in mind was whether or not the vessels came under the section of the statute which provides that certain repairs in foreign ports are not to be subject to the tariff duties that were laid by the laws of the United States.

Mr. HOWELL. No; the repairs did not come under any such provision. The repairs came under the provision of the statute which requires a duty to be levied.

Mr. KING. I fancy that if we enact this legislation, though I am not opposed to it, we will have many applications for similar refunds. Personally, I believe that American boats should be permitted to have repairs made in foreign ports without being required to pay a duty thereon. If we should do that, we would facilitate to a very large degree the construction of vessels and encourage our merchant marine.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to my colleague that this is a case where the Food Administration ordered the ships to go to this port. It was not as if the company had exercised their own authority to send them to a foreign port. I agree with my colleagues that except in such a case I would never vote for a repayment to be made, but as the Food Administration ordered the ships there and they had to go there, it seems to me it is nothing more than right that they should have the refund.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

DONATION OF TROPHY GUN TO F. D. HUBBEL RELIEF CORPS

The bill (H. R. 4050) donating trophy gun to F. D. Hubbel Relief Corps, No. 103, of Hillsboro, Ill., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War, in his discretion, is hereby authorized to deliver to the order of the F. D. Hubbel Relief Corps, No. 103, Hillsboro, Ill., Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, one trophy gun, stored in the Watervliet Arsenal at Watervliet, N. Y., and described as follows: Twelve pounder, weight 1,000 pounds, diameter bore 4½ inches, length 58½ inches, and marked 1862: *Provided,* That the United States shall be put to no expense in connection with the delivery of said gun.

NINTH INTERNATIONAL DAIRY CONGRESS

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 333) to authorize an appropriation of \$10,000 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Ninth International Dairy Congress, Copenhagen, Denmark, 1931, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That for the purpose of defraying the expenses of participation of the Government of the United States by means of delegates in the Ninth International Dairy Congress, to be held in Copenhagen, Denmark, in July, 1931, an appropriation in the sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized for travel expenses, subsistence or per diem in lieu thereof (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act), printing and binding, compensation of employees, rent, official cards, entertainment, and such other expenses as the President shall deem proper.

GREAT LAKES BRIDGE COMMISSION

The bill (S. 4769) 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 25, 1930, being Public Act No. 433 of the second session of the Seventy-first Congress, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Pending certain inquiries I wish to make with respect to the development of this project since the last session of Congress, I ask that the bill may go over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

SUITS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 201) consenting that certain States may sue the United States, and providing for trial on the merits in any suit brought hereunder by a State to recover direct taxes alleged to have been illegally collected by the United States during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1866, 1867, 1868, and vesting the right in each State to sue in its own name, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the joint resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 335 OF CRIMINAL CODE

The bill (H. R. 10341) to amend section 335 of the Criminal Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 335 of the Criminal Code, chapter 321, paragraph 335; Thirty-fifth Statutes, page 1152 (sec. 541, title 18, U. S. C.), be amended to read as follows:

"All offenses which may be punished by death or imprisonment for a term exceeding one year shall be deemed felonies. All other offenses shall be deemed misdemeanors: Provided, That all offenses the penalty for which does not exceed confinement in a common jail, without hard labor for a period of six months, or a fine of not more than \$500, or both, shall be deemed to be petty offenses; and all such petty offenses may be prosecuted upon information or complaint."

REPEAL OF OBSOLETE STATUTES

The bill (H. R. 10198) to repeal obsolete statutes and to improve the United States Code was considered.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments as follows:

On page 2, at the proper place, insert:

40 Stat. 152, seventh paragraph, act of June 12, 1917, c. 27..... Title 16, sec. 116.

Also, on the same page, at the proper place, to strike out: 32 Stat. 203, sec. 3, act of May 22, 1902, c. 820..... Title 16, sec. 123.

Also, on the same page, at the proper place, to insert:

40 Stat. 152, twelfth paragraph, act of June 12, 1917, c. 27..... Title 16, sec. 135.

Also, on the same page, to strike out:

- R. S. 2052..... Title 25, sec. 26.
27 Stat. 120, first proviso, act of July 13, 1892, c. 164; 30 Stat. 573, first proviso, act of July 1, 1898, c. 545..... Title 25, sec. 27.
R. S. 2056, as amended by 22 Stat. 87, act of May 17, 1882, c. 163..... Title 25, sec. 28.
R. S. 2060..... Title 25, sec. 30.
R. S. 2061..... Title 25, sec. 38.
R. S. 2080..... Title 25, sec. 72.
R. S. 2083..... Title 25, sec. 91.
R. S. 2084..... Title 25, sec. 92.

Also, on the same page, to strike out:

- R. S. 2098..... Title 25, sec. 126.
R. S. 2100..... Title 25, sec. 127.
18 Stat. 424, last clause of seventh paragraph, act of March 3, 1875, c. 132..... Title 25, sec. 129.

Also, on the same page, to strike out:

- 34 Stat. 1174, last paragraph, act of March 2, 1907, c. 2511..... Title 32, sec. 34.
43 Stat. 606, sec. 9, act of June 7, 1924, c. 316..... Title 33, sec. 425.
R. S. 1413..... Title 34, sec. 141.
R. S. 1414..... Title 34, sec. 142.
R. S. 1415..... Title 34, sec. 143.
R. S. 1438..... Title 34, sec. 144.
R. S. 1439..... Title 34, sec. 145.

Also, on page 3, to strike out:

- 40 Stat. 430, act of December 20, 1917, c. 6..... Title 43, sec. 236.
41 Stat. 271, fifth complete paragraph, act of July 24, 1919, c. 26..... Title 43, sec. 237.
34 Stat. 1248, act of March 2, 1907, c. 2568..... Title 43, sec. 262.
35 Stat. 350, third complete paragraph, act of May 27, 1908, c. 200..... Title 43, sec. 379.
40 Stat. 675, thirteenth complete paragraph, act of July 1, 1918, c. 113..... Title 43, sec. 380.
44 Stat. 650, sec. 49, act of May 25, 1926, c. 383..... Title 43, sec. 423g (appendix).

Also, on page 3, to strike out:

- R. S. 2354..... Title 43, sec. 673.
R. S. 2355..... Title 43, sec. 674.
R. S. 2365..... Title 43, sec. 676.

Also, on page 4, to strike out:

- 33 Stat. 64, act of March 9, 1904, c. 503..... Title 43, sec. 1167.

Also, on page 4, to insert:

- R. S. 4205..... Title 46, sec. 99.

Also, on page 4, to strike out "393, first eighteen paragraphs" and to strike out "336" and insert "337," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following obsolete sections and parts of sections of the Revised Statutes and Statutes at Large are hereby repealed:

Table with 2 columns: Statutes (Stat. or R. S.) and U. S. Code. Lists various statutes and their corresponding code sections to be repealed.

Statutes (Stat. or R. S.)	U. S. Code
R. S. 2400.....	Title 43, sec. 756.
R. S. 2404.....	Title 43, sec. 764.
R. S. 2405.....	Title 43, sec. 765.
R. S. 2407.....	Title 43, sec. 767.
R. S. 2411.....	Title 43, sec. 771.
37 Stat. 687, act of February 27, 1913, c. 85.....	Title 43, sec. 860.
R. S. 4205.....	Title 46, sec. 99.
34 Stat. 1162, both provisos, act of March 2, 1907, c. 2511.....	Title 48, sec. 4.
36 Stat. 248, thirteenth paragraph, act of March 23, 1910, c. 115.....	Title 48, sec. 5.
31 Stat. 328, sec. 17, act of June 6, 1900, c. 786.....	Title 48, sec. 28.
31 Stat. 333, sec. 32, except the first two sentences, act of June 6, 1900, c. 786, as amended by 33 Stat. 1266, sec. 2, act of March 3, 1905, c. 1497.....	Title 48, sec. 42.
33 Stat. 1266, sec. 3, act of March 3, 1905, c. 1497.....	Title 48, sec. 65.
23 Stat. 391, act of April 27, 1904, c. 1629.....	Title 48, sec. 331-337.
40 Stat. 604, act of June 13, 1918, c. 97.....	Title 48, sec. 618.
25 Stat. 489, sec. 1, act of September 22, 1888, c. 1028.....	Title 50, sec. 11.
26 Stat. 769, last paragraph, act of February 24, 1891, c. 283.....	Title 50, sec. 12.
31 Stat. 910, second proviso, act of March 2, 1901, c. 803.....	Title 50, sec. 13.
27 Stat. 461, proviso, act of February 18, 1893, c. 136.....	Title 50, sec. 14.
25 Stat. 491, first two complete paragraphs, act of September 22, 1888, c. 1028.....	Title 50, sec. 15.

SEC. 2. Rights or liabilities existing under the foregoing statutes or parts thereof on the date of the enactment of this act shall not be affected thereby.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

WAIVER OF TRIAL BY JURY

The bill (H. R. 12056) providing for the waiver of trial by jury in the district courts of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over. That completes the calendar.

MOTOR-BUS TRANSPORTATION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10288) to regulate the transportation of persons in interstate and foreign commerce by motor carriers operating on the public highways.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk (Harvey A. Welsh) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	King	Shortridge
Barkley	Frazier	La Follette	Simmons
Bingham	George	McGill	Smith
Black	Gillett	McKellar	Smoot
Blaine	Glenn	McMaster	Stelwer
Blease	Goff	McNary	Stephens
Borah	Goldsborough	Morrow	Swanson
Brock	Gould	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Greene	Norbeck	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Hale	Norris	Townsend
Bulkeley	Harris	Nye	Trammell
Capper	Harrison	Oddie	Tydings
Caraway	Hastings	Overman	Vandenberg
Carey	Hatfield	Patterson	Wagner
Connally	Hayden	Phipps	Walcott
Copeland	Hebert	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Howell	Reed	Waterman
Dale	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Davis	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Deneen	Kean	Schall	Williamson
Dill	Kendrick	Sheppard	
Fess	Keyes	Shipstead	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] about the date found on page 12?

Mr. COUZENS. My intention is to ask the Senate to agree to the date of December 1.

Mr. COPELAND. Is the Senator proposing that amendment now?

Mr. COUZENS. I shall propose it, but I was waiting until we had practically concluded the bill, because I did not know how long its consideration might take.

Mr. COPELAND. I hope the Senator will move the amendment, because it was the date I had in mind in case the bill is promptly passed.

Mr. COUZENS. I am ready and willing to do it, but I think we had better get through with the other amendments first.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. GLENN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, which, I understand, is acceptable to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS]. The amendment adds a proviso at the end of line 25, on page 20 of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois be reported.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of line 25, on page 20, it is proposed to insert the proviso:

Provided, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent railroad corporations from organizing or operating motor carriers where no consolidation, merger, or acquisition of control of motor carriers now existing is involved in such organization or operation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, while the Senator from Illinois and I disagree as to the necessity of the amendment just stated, I can not see any objection to it, and, so far as I am concerned, I am willing that it shall be accepted.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, my attention was momentarily diverted, and I ask that the amendment may again be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois will be again stated.

The legislative clerk again read the amendment proposed by Mr. GLENN.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me inquire what is the significance of the two words "now existing"?

Mr. GLENN. The idea involved in that language is that after the date of the passage of this measure the railroads will have the right not to buy existing bus lines or to merge or control existing bus lines, but to inaugurate new bus lines where none exist.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes; but the language of the proposed amendment is—

That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent railroad corporations from organizing or operating motor carriers where no consolidation, merger, or acquisition of control of motor carriers now existing is involved.

As it seems to me, that would mean that in the future bus lines could be absorbed by merger or other organization of a similar character. The words "now existing" in the amendment obviously refer to a merger.

Mr. GLENN. If the words "now existing" should be stricken from the amendment, how would the amendment then read?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The amendment, if so modified, would then read:

That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent railroad corporations from organizing or operating motor carriers where no consolidation, merger, or acquisition of control of motor carriers is involved in such organization or operation.

That would be quite all right.

Mr. GLENN. That would leave the language of the bill as it is now, I think.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is what I had in mind—that the words "now existing" are really the meat of the amendment as proposed by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. COUZENS. I think the Senator from Montana is correct, because if those words should remain in the amendment then in the future any bus line might be acquired.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. COUZENS. We ought to prevent that.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is to say, if after the passage of the bill a merger is organized that merger will be entitled to take within its scope a bus line either now existing or that may be established in the future.

Mr. GLENN. That was not the intention I had. What I desire is—and I do not care what the language may be; the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] and I are in accord—to permit railroad corporations to inaugurate new bus lines where none now exist. It is the idea of the Senator from Michigan that the bill in its present form, if enacted, would permit that to be done. I am not at all satisfied that it would do so.

Mr. COUZENS. I believe the amendment is unnecessary. I think railroads would be permitted under the present form of the proposed act to take such action without the amendment now proposed by the Senator from Illinois; but the Senator differs with me, and, so long as the intention is not to change the purport of the bill as it now stands, I do not see any objection to the proposed proviso. I do see objection, however, to using the words "now existing," because it is possible under that language that in the future bus lines might be consolidated or merged with railroad companies.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, pending the private discussion of this matter by Senators, I should like to submit a question of some general significance to the chairman of the committee. The question is whether his committee considered the inclusion of trucks within the provisions of this bill, and, if not, why they were not included?

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] asked that question yesterday. The best explanation I could give of it was that some years ago the owners of both passenger busses and trucks engaged in the freight business appeared before the committee and discussed proposed legislation. However, they were unable to agree as between the passenger and the freight business, and we could not get anywhere. There seems to be less need for the regulation of busses engaged in the freight-carrying business, because they were mostly contract carriers rather than common carriers.

When this bill was introduced in the House by the chairman of the committee in that body and in the Senate by me it was proposed in pursuance of an agreement reached by the operators of passenger motor busses. They agreed among themselves upon legislation, but they could not get together with the operators of the trucks. Since that time no one has appeared before the committee to ask for legislation to regulate trucks engaged in the freight business.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The opportunity has not been afforded me to make that careful study of the subject to which it is entitled before legislation concerning it is enacted; but I think every Senator knows that under present conditions there is quite as much necessity, if not a greater necessity, for the regulation of the trucks that are being operated in the carriage of freight as there is for the regulation of motor busses used for carrying passengers. Anyone who takes a trip by automobile through several States will see lines of freight busses being operated. In numerous instances they carry loads that tax the capacity of the bridges on the public highways. Within 10 days a motor-propelled truck on a highway that runs to the South—a national highway, one of the most important in the Nation—carrying a load, according to the press, of 21,000 pounds, attempted to pass over a bridge on the highway. The bridge broke down; the driver of the truck was killed; and passenger traffic was for an indefinite period diverted over an almost impossible detour, the worst detour that I ever passed over in an automobile. In all probability that condition will continue for a prolonged period.

Now it occurs to me that while we are dealing with this subject it is a mistake not to include trucks used in the hauling or carriage of freight. I merely make that statement to the Senator with a view to ascertaining whether, in his opinion, it is practicable to deal with the question in this bill.

Mr. COUZENS. I hardly think so, because no hearings have been held and no one has been given an opportunity to be heard with respect to the regulation of trucks engaged

in carrying freight. Furthermore, if the Senator will permit me, I think that the question of the weight of loads is one subject to regulation by the States if the States desire to regulate it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Without doubt, and my information is that in the instance cited the State had announced the capacity of the bridge as approximately one-third of the weight carried by the freight truck.

Mr. COUZENS. We have not attempted in any way to usurp any police powers of any State by this bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I understand that, but the point I am trying to make is that the circumstances which call for the regulation of motor vehicles used in the carriage of passengers apply with equal, if not with greater force, to trucks used in the carriage of freight—at least it seems so to me.

Mr. COUZENS. Nothing has been presented to the committee, I may say to the Senator, but the committee is perfectly willing to go ahead and consider any legislation which may be proposed for the regulation of motor trucks engaged in the carrying of freight. I think, however, that would be a subject which could not be dealt with in this particular bill by way of amendment, because, as I have said, no hearings have been held and no consideration has been given to the question of the regulation of the carriage of freight by trucks in interstate commerce.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Senator from Arkansas has said about the necessity for some sort of regulation of interstate freight busses is undoubtedly correct. The railroads have been compelled to discontinue many of their local passenger trains because of the operation of bus lines, and likewise they have been compelled to discontinue what are known as local freight trains in some sections of the country because of the motor-truck freight business. Yet it takes a little different type of regulation, I think, for the truck business than for the passenger business.

When the bill came over from the House it contained no provision affecting carriage of freight by trucks, and in view of the emergency that seemed to exist at the time the committee voted this bill out; it was not thought wise to try to include legislation that might have to be different in type from that included in the bill. However, the same analogy applies to the situation in the truck-freight business as applies in the passenger-bus business, and sooner or later Congress will have to regulate the operation of motor trucks.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. They both occupy the whole highway; they crowd into the ditches the lighter vehicles, and frequently they are recklessly driven. I saw in coming to Washington within 10 days the wrecks of three automobiles that were said to have been caused by collisions with trucks.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had one myself.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I had not expected to make a personal matter of it with the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to state to the Senator from Illinois that before the amendment offered by him can be considered the vote by which the amendment to which it is an amendment was agreed to will have to be reconsidered. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment in line 18, on page 20, was adopted will be reconsidered. The Chair hears no objection. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois is now in order.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, referring to the amendment which I offered a moment ago to the committee amendment, I accept the views expressed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and the chairman of the committee [Mr. COUZENS], and I ask that the words "now existing" be stricken from the amendment as reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois proposes the following amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent railroad corporations from organizing or operating motor carriers where no consolidation, merger, or acquisition of control of motor carriers is involved in such organization or operation.

Mr. GLENN. I desire to reserve the right hereafter to renew my effort to obtain complete rights for the railroads to engage in the bus business. In other words, I do not want to be understood as agreeing to the action that has been taken.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, what I am interested in this bill is the fact that in my opinion it simply means taking away the control of the highways from the States and placing it in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The bill provides that these people shall regulate who shall drive busses and trucks, the condition of the truck, the size of the truck, and so forth. If that power is placed in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission, certainly that is depriving the States of the right to control their highways as they see fit.

In South Carolina we post at each bridge a sign reading "Capacity, so much," which is notice to all people that if they have a load heavier than that they should not drive on that bridge. Then we have laws there for prosecuting people who violate these State highway laws.

I notice another provision in this bill, that if a bus goes through any part of another State—for instance, if a man leaves a town with his bus and has to drive through any part of another State, probably just a mile or two, in making his trip—that places him under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That certainly is depriving his State of the right to regulate that matter.

As to rates, it does seem to me that we should legislate sometimes for the people. This bill is simply a regulation for the benefit of the railroads. Why should the railroads be forbidden to purchase a bus line and then be permitted to establish a bus line running right along by the side of one already in existence and force that man out of business?

If the railroad is going to establish a bus line from Asheville, N. C., to Columbia, S. C., and there are already two or three bus lines there—I think there are two now—why should the railroad be permitted to force out of business the bus line now in existence by establishing a new bus line instead of buying out the bus line if it can be bought at a reasonable price?

Those are the things about this bill that it seems to me are going to create a conflict between the State railroad commissions and the Interstate Commerce Commission in the handling of highways.

Within five years the railroads will own all of the bus lines and control both freight and passenger rates if this bill is passed and becomes the law of this country, and the Interstate Commerce Commission will have control of the highways over State authorities. The railroads will not reduce rates but will charge the same rates over both trains and busses.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BLEASE. With pleasure; yes, sir.

Mr. COUZENS. I think the illustration the Senator has made with respect to the line between Asheville and Columbia is not applicable, because in that case the railroad would have to have a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the Interstate Commerce Commission, and could not go in if there was adequate service. That is taken care of by the amendment which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] offered and which was adopted at the last session of Congress.

Mr. BLEASE. I understand; but it seems to me that with that amendment it will be necessary to appeal first to the Interstate Commerce Commission. That is the very objection I am making to the bill.

In my State we have just voted \$65,000,000 of bonds. We are already working, and are going to let out large contracts

again this month. We are improving our highways. I realize that what the Senator from Arkansas has said is absolutely true. I have seen myself not only freight busses but passenger busses absolutely take the road, drive a man out, not pay any attention to him, stay in the middle of the road; and if he is behind them and wants to pass, very often they remain right there. It does not make any difference how much you may sound your horn, they stay in the center of the road. I still hold, however, that that is a matter that should be corrected by the State authorities, and that we should not pass this bill and put these lines of transportation, either passenger or freight, in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is simply another attempt to create further Federal control and a further destruction of States' rights.

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

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

Mr. BLEASE. With pleasure.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator probably has a slight misapprehension as to the scope of this legislation. It is not intended to take away from the State any police power in the matter of the regulation of the weight of trucks or busses going over bridges that might destroy the highways. I will say also that the State utility commissions have been for five years petitioning Congress to pass this sort of legislation, because under the Constitution they can not regulate interstate passenger business. Practically all the States have set up machinery for the regulation of bus traffic within the State. These interstate bus lines are now subject to no regulation. The State can not regulate them and Congress has passed no law for the Nation to regulate them. The result is that the regulated intrastate bus business is in competition with the unregulated interstate bus business; and it has been largely due to the initiative and the agitation on the part of State utilities commissions that Congress has seen fit finally to attempt to bring about some regulation of the interstate bus business. I do not think, however, that this will interfere with the State highway commissions' control of bridges, as far as the weight of busses that go over bridges is concerned.

Mr. BLEASE. But if this bill passes, the large amounts of money that the Government has sent to the various States to aid in road building are just as sure to lead back to Government control as other bills that have been passed here, that looked as innocent as this one does, but that have done the same thing with regard to other corporations and other highways.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment and have it printed and lie on the table, to be considered at a later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DILL. I also want to say just a few words about the matter.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the request is that the amendment be printed and go over for the day?

Mr. DILL. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. May I suggest that, assuming that we shall reach a time in the debate when there will be a vote, the Senator then would be without remedy.

Mr. DILL. I have no objection to the amendment being taken up when it is reached.

Mr. President, this is the amendment that is proposed by the minority report of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. In brief, it proposes to take from this bill the requirement for a certificate of public convenience and necessity.

Those who may have read the minority report will learn, I think, very readily that the members of the committee who signed that report are not opposed to a proper regulation of interstate busses. In fact we are strongly in favor of such regulation. Our objection is to providing for a certificate of necessity from the very moment we begin to regulate these busses.

A study of the bill reveals the fact that it proposes to grant, by its adoption, automatically certificates of necessity to all existing bus lines; and any new lines that anyone may attempt to form must secure their certificate of necessity.

Everybody knows that the Interstate Commerce Commission is extremely burdened with work now—so heavily burdened, in fact, that applications for certificates of necessity for railroads are delayed for months and sometimes for years. When we add to their duties the burden of determining whether or not everybody who wants to establish a bus line in the United States shall have a certificate of necessity, we have practically granted a monopoly to existing bus lines for the next two or three years.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that if we strike from this bill the requirement for a certificate of necessity we still provide for all of the regulation that is really necessary. The testimony before the committee of the Senate and before the committee of the House showed that the real complaint against unregulated interstate bus business is based on the fact that there is a lack of responsibility on the part of those operating the busses. Objection is raised to the continuation of this condition on the ground that individuals and companies are running busses that are not financially responsible for the indemnification against injury of their passengers or citizens who may be injured by them. The objection is made that companies or individuals put on busses for a few weeks or a few months, take the cream of the traffic, and then drop out of existence, while the bus lines that run regularly are compelled to carry on the year around.

I think the committee is practically unanimous in believing that there should be regulation that would compel everybody operating in the interstate bus business to have such financial responsibility, either by carrying insurance or by having sufficient financial backing, that the citizens who ride in the busses or those who may be injured by the busses will have their right of damages in case of injury. I believe we are agreed also that every bus that runs in interstate business should be required to give bond, if necessary, to satisfy the commission that it will run on a regular schedule and that it will run the year around if other busses are able to run the year around. In other words, it is not the purpose of the minority members who signed this report to prevent regulation; but, on the other hand, we are opposed to granting by law a monopoly to the existing bus lines by providing for a certificate of necessity from the very moment we begin regulation.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DILL. I do.

Mr. KENDRICK. I desire to ask the Senator if he believes it is quite fair to place restrictions against the railroads that do not apply to other corporations or individuals?

Mr. DILL. The Senator is thinking of the fact that a railway must get a certificate of necessity?

Mr. KENDRICK. I am thinking of the restriction that would prevent railroads from buying out existing lines, whereas no such restriction is placed upon any other corporation or individual.

Mr. DILL. That, of course, covers another phase of the bill that I was not discussing. I will say to the Senator that I am not in favor of that provision.

Mr. KENDRICK. I am glad to hear the Senator say so.

Mr. DILL. I am not discussing that phase, however. I was trying to make clear the reason why the minority of the committee was opposed to this certificate of necessity being required before regulation has really been established.

I want to remind the Senate of this fact: We regulated the railroads in this country for nearly 40 years before we required certificates of necessity; and when Congress required certificates of necessity they gave to the commission the power to regulate and fix rates. This bill, however, does not give the power to fix rates. This bill gives to the commission the right to require a certificate of necessity, but gives it no right to fix rates.

Mr. KENDRICK. Does the Senator believe, if I may ask, that uniform laws in reference to fixing rates would correct the situation?

Mr. DILL. I will say to the Senator that I do not think we need at this time to give the commission the power to fix rates. I think it is sufficient to give to the commission the power to regulate these interstate busses to the extent of protecting the public and protecting the passengers, and requiring stable financial backing on the part of those who are operating bus lines. I do not believe we ought to try to enact as a system of regulation of a new business that is just developing the same system that we have built up after 40 or 50 years of Government regulation of the railroads.

Mr. KENDRICK. But the Senator does agree that any regulation should apply uniformly to all?

Mr. DILL. I think there should be regulations of these bus lines.

Mr. KENDRICK. One reason why we of the West should insist upon that condition is that in many places for hundreds of miles the highways are actually constructed within the railroad rights of way. Furthermore, the taxes paid by the railroads to the States represent almost or quite all of the States' contribution to the Federal highways.

Mr. DILL. That is true.

Mr. KENDRICK. It would seem, therefore, that the burden of cost of the highways over which these bus lines must operate is borne almost entirely by the railroads. Under such a situation the Congress should, as a matter of simple equity and justice, refuse to place restrictions in this bill that would deny to the railroads equal rights with other corporations to the use of the highways built largely with the railroads' money.

Mr. DILL. And I want to remind the Senate of another fact. These highways are not private property. They have been built from the taxes collected on the property of all the people, and for my part I am unwilling to grant by law, in effect, to certain bus lines now in existence, a monopoly of the use of those highways for bus purposes. I do not believe it can be defended from the standpoint of the public. That is why I am insisting that we should take out of this bill anything which grants anybody a monopoly of the bus business when it is still in the stage of development. That is why the minority members of the committee have written and signed this report, and I have offered this amendment.

I shall not enlarge upon the discussion. I wanted to say this much in order to call the attention of the Senate to the matter in order that Senators might know what was coming up.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator state how many minority members of the committee signed the report?

Mr. DILL. Six.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will not the Senator indicate who signed the report, for the record?

Mr. DILL. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. PINE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] to the committee amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would be very glad to have the Senator from Illinois state the significance of this amendment, what it seeks to accomplish, and what particularly is in his mind with respect to curing, if I may use that expression, the bill which is before us. I would like to ask the Senator whether it applies in any way to railways or seeks to eliminate from the bill the provision which prohibits railways under certain circumstances from operating bus lines or acquiring bus lines.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I have just come into the Chamber. I assume the Senator from Utah is referring to the amendment which I offered this morning to the committee amendment on page 20.

Mr. KING. The amendment now before the Senate is the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment.

Mr. GLENN. I had stepped out of the Chamber for the moment. The purpose of the amendment is this: It is my idea that the provisions of the bill as reported by the committee to the Senate were unsound in this, as I understand the bill, that they prohibited railroads from engaging in the motor-carrier business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] does not so understand the bill. It is his idea that the bill as reported to the Senate only prevents carloads from acquiring, buying up, we will say, bus lines which are operating in various vicinities, but that it would not prevent a railroad from inaugurating an entirely new bus line. That is his idea. I think there is some doubt about it. In the first place, it is my idea that there should be no discrimination against the railroads in the motor-bus business. I think it is in the public interest that the specialists, the experts, those experienced in the transportation business, should at least be allowed to compete with other people for that business. In other words, I think it is to the interest of the public generally that those who know the transportation business be allowed to engage in it and that the main interest of the public is in safe and adequate transportation of their persons rather than in some small possibility of a difference in rates. In other words, I think it is better for those handling the railroads of this country, as they are handled with great ability, to be allowed to complete their transportation business by likewise conducting a motor-carrier transport.

That is not the idea of the Senator from Michigan at all. His idea is, as I understand it—and I am sorry he is not in the Chamber—that the more motor-bus companies there are traveling between two fixed points the better it is for the people; that it is not enough to have a railroad and a railroad with a motor-bus line in connection with it, or two motor-bus lines operating, say, between Chicago and Detroit, but that if there are 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10, there will be a tendency, on account of the very severe competition, to reduce rates and to keep rates down. That is his idea, with which I wholly disagree.

I think it is an outrage upon the public to have great numbers of unnecessary busses in competition with each other traversing the highways, almost monopolizing the highways, and driving the private driver with his automobile or his truck into the ditch, as was described rather graphically an hour or so ago by the distinguished leader on the other side, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

We had a vote upon my amendment. The amendment which I proposed at the last session would have taken away all restrictions upon the railroads; that is, it would have left the railroads upon the same basis with any other citizen or corporation of the country. They could engage in the bus business, they could buy up other bus lines the same as any other corporation could. But that amendment was defeated here by a vote of 27 to 21, and seeking to do the best I can in this situation, I have sought now to amend the committee amendment so that the bill will read that railroads can at least inaugurate new bus lines in virgin territory. That is the purpose of my amendment. It does not satisfy me, but I think perhaps at this time it is the best I can do in the situation.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. GLENN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. If this amendment which the Senator offered when the bill was under consideration before, which was defeated, should finally be adopted, I could not see the necessity of adhering to this amendment.

Mr. GLENN. If the amendment which I offered at the last session, and which was voted down by 27 to 21, shall finally be adopted—and I expect to press it later—it would obviate the necessity of the pending amendment.

Mr. KING. I presume the Senator at some stage of the proceedings, before the bill is finally passed or rejected, will offer for the consideration of the Senate the amendment which was rejected at the last session.

Mr. GLENN. To be frank with the Senator from Utah, I hope that if the bill is sent to conference, some satisfactory solution will be reached of the immediate question before us. If that is not done, when the bill is reported back I expect to endeavor to bring this matter again to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator—and I do not need to, because he is familiar with the rule—that he will have opportunity in the Senate, before the vote is finally taken, to have another vote on this question.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I want to remind the Senator from Utah that the consideration of measures by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole has been abolished, and, therefore, there will be no such opportunity in the Senate.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio. That had escaped my mind for the moment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. GLENN. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I understood the Senator from Michigan, who is temporarily absent getting his luncheon now, to say that he would agree, if anyone desired, to allow another vote to be taken on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. That is the only way we can get it up unless somebody should move a reconsideration, and it is too late for that now.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Illinois, before we conclude the consideration of the bill, will ask unanimous consent, if that is the only way by which we can revive the question which was before the Senate, to offer his original amendment.

Mr. GLENN. I understood the Senator from Michigan to say that he would offer no objection.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator will ask for a reconsideration of the amendment.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I am in entire disagreement with the Senator from Illinois on this question of whether the railroads should be permitted to go into the bus-transportation business. The amendment he has offered here would give them certain limited rights in that direction. I am opposed to that. I am much more opposed to extending the rights that he has suggested.

Mr. President, we have had plenty of experience with the railroads in other classes of transportation. In reference to the river transportation, they put rates into effect which killed off the river transportation, they were so low, and then, after they had successfully destroyed that competition, the rates were raised. That was worked systematically for the destruction of the inland-waterway transportation.

In 1923 I had direct experience with that proposition when I was on the special committee of the Senate to investigate the Lakes to the Gulf waterway. When we reached Memphis going down the Mississippi River, the Illinois Central Railroad attached a private car to our train. We went out to Muscle Shoals and back to Vicksburg. They had fine dinners and all those things, and entertained us royally. After we got down to New Orleans, the upshot of it all was that we should turn the Government barge line over to the Illinois Central Railroad. My suggestion was that we might just as well take it out in the Gulf and sink it. I think the railroads have the same purpose in wanting to go into the bus business. It is not to develop this great new system of transportation that has surely come into our country, but to throttle and destroy it. They have enough to tend to if they attend to their railway transportation. Bus transportation may reduce their passenger service somewhat on the short runs but not on the long ones. That will be increased by the general development of the country.

I am therefore opposed to giving the railroads any right to go into the bus business at all, except possibly for feeder

lines that will not be in competition with any bus line or paralleling their own rail lines. For this reason I oppose the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, and I more strongly oppose the other proposal for extending the general right to the railroads to go into this sort of transportation business.

The Senator from Illinois mentioned how efficiently the railroads of the United States have handled their business. I have made some study of that efficiency. I am ready to meet him—or, for that matter, anybody else—with some facts. The railroads of the United States have been the most efficient organization that has ever been presented in the world for taking money out of the pockets of the people of the country in high rates. They have not only done that, but they have been efficient in advertising to the country that their rates were low when in fact they were the highest in all the world. For the same service we are paying the highest freight rates now that are paid for railroad service in the world. There is not a single country in which a similar service is not given at cheaper rates.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROOKHART. I yield.

Mr. GLENN. We are paying the highest wages to labor to perform that service, too, are we not?

Mr. BROOKHART. Right across the Canadian line the Canadian railroads under Government operation are maintaining the wage scale of the United States.

Mr. GLENN. They are not paying any taxes to the Government, though, and it is natural that they should have lower rates where they pay no taxes to the Government.

Mr. BROOKHART. To what extent does that tax figure in the rates of the railroads?

Mr. GLENN. It amounts to more than \$1,000,000 a day in the United States.

Mr. BROOKHART. What does that amount to in the \$6,500,000,000 of revenue collected from the people of the country?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROOKHART. The lower Canadian rates on farm products amount to ten times the difference in the taxes.

I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator happen to know how much in the way of losses is charged up by the national railroads against the Canadian Government?

It must be recalled that the Canadian railroads and the American railroads are not at all on the same basis. In Canada the freight on wheat is maintained by a constitutional arrangement for giving low rates. As a matter of fact, in maintaining that cheap freight rate on grain there is a great loss charged up against the Canadian Government. This amounted, two or three years ago, to \$67,000,000. I do not have the figures of last year. That great sum is a charge against the taxpayers of Canada. In our country the entire burden is carried by the railroads.

Mr. BROOKHART. Yes; private ownership of those same roads entirely broke down. It was unable to continue the operation of the roads. The Canadian Government took over the roads and reduced and entirely ended the deficit. I think there is no deficit now in the operation of those roads. It reduced the rates, but has maintained the wage scale.

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

Mr. BROOKHART. Certainly.

Mr. GLENN. Does the Senator contend that all the railroads in Canada are operated by the Government?

Mr. BROOKHART. All but one.

Mr. GLENN. That is a nation-wide competing railroad?

Mr. BROOKHART. Yes.

Mr. GLENN. It is operating at as low rates as the Government railroads.

Mr. BROOKHART. Yes; it has to compete. It would be out of business if it did not. It is complaining constantly about that condition, although it got nearly \$1,000,000,000 of subsidy from the Canadian Government.

The American railroads, with all their so-called efficiency, first came to the Government and got 158,000,000 acres of public lands. That is four and one-half times the size of the State of Illinois. They got one-seventh of the State of Iowa. I do not remember the proportion of the State of Illinois, but they got some of it, too. They were very efficient in taking that from the people of the country. Then they got other enormous grants in taxes and bond issues for the construction of their roads. I have no total figure for the railroads of the United States upon that, but it was an enormous amount.

Then when the transportation act of 1920 came along they were so efficient that they got a valuation of \$18,900,000,000 when their market value at the same moment was about \$11,750,000,000. The Congress of the United States bought those railroads for the people of the United States practically by the value they fixed, and the value or price they fixed on them was \$18,900,000,000 when the market value was about \$11,750,000,000. That is high efficiency, but it is efficiency for the robbery of the people of the United States, and at the same time it is efficiency for reducing the wages of railroad employees. It is efficiency only for the capital organization of the railroads.

That is not all they did in this efficient operation of the railroads either. In the transportation act of 1920 they got a guaranty for their war-time profits for the first six months after they were turned back from Government operation, and that was to come out of the Treasury of the United States. That is the same six months in which another agency of the Government of the United States deflated the other business of the country which the Manufacturers Record stated amounted to \$32,000,000,000 on the farmers and \$18,000,000,000 on the other business of the country. They got this guaranty for the war-time profits over and above their operating expenses. During the period of Government operation we had a director general appointed by the Government, but under the director general we had the same old private managers of the railroads. They proved tremendously efficient in padding their expense accounts during Government operation for the purpose of discrediting Government operation. That is why it was done. It amounted in the last year of their operation by the Government to \$200,000,000 or \$300,000,000 of padded expenses. I could give details. I have a whole volume of them.

Then over and above all that they got this guaranty for their war-time profits—not losses. We paid all the losses and a good deal more, too, during Government operation, but for their war-time profits for six months after they were turned back into private ownership they received this guaranty, and that six months' period ended about two years after the war was over. As soon as they got that guaranty, then they got efficient again and increased their operating expenses in 1920 by \$1,485,000,000. About \$400,000,000 or \$500,000,000—they claimed \$600,000,000—of that was due to increase of wages. That item I want to allow as just and proper, but the other \$900,000,000 or \$1,000,000,000 was what?

That was efficiency in taking money out of the Treasury of the United States in this case as well as out of the pockets of the people in rates. That enormous increase in operating expenses in 1920 created a deficit in the guaranty covering the six months, and then we wrote checks on the Treasury of the United States for \$529,000,000 to pay that deficit under our guaranty.

Mr. President, I have given a brief picture of the efficiency of the railroad systems in the United States that are now fighting the development of the inland waterways system because they want a monopoly of all transportation and which are seeking, through this bill, to get authority to fight the development of the public-road transportation

of the United States. I do not want to develop any more of that kind of transportation efficiency. I say that it is costing the people of the country more than \$1,000,000,000 a year right now in excess rates. It has held down the wages of railroad employees and increased the charges to the general public in that way. For these reasons I am going to oppose any amendment and vote against the bill if it leaves any privilege in it whereby the railroads might control all or any portion of highway transportation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, may we have the amendment to the amendment read again?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let it be reported for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 25, after the word "railroad" and before the period, insert:

Provided, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent railroad corporations from organizing or operating motor carriers where no consolidation, merger, or acquisition of control of motor carriers is involved in such organization or operation.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COUZENS. I move to amend, on page 13, line 3, by striking out "April 1, 1930," and inserting in lieu thereof "December 1, 1930."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the amendment be reported.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, line 3, strike out "April 1, 1930" and insert in lieu thereof "December 1, 1930."

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will prevail. When the first date was fixed it was thought the bill would be passed last spring. Of course, it is only fair that the change should be made.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the committee a question? I ask for information, because some of us who are not members of the committee have had no opportunity to read the bill and may not be acquainted with its provisions and its implications. Is there anything in the bill which prohibits a State from imposing a fair and just tax upon motor transportation organizations or systems that may operate within and through other States?

Mr. COUZENS. I do not find any such provision, any more than there is a prohibition against taxing the railroads in the States.

Mr. KING. Then the Senator is of the opinion that if busses operate in interstate commerce through the State of Michigan, say, from New York to Chicago or farther west, the State of Michigan could impose a reasonable tax, perhaps a franchise tax or intangible tax, as well as a tax upon physical property of the operating company?

Mr. COUZENS. The State of Michigan now taxes the railroads engaged in interstate commerce, and I see no difference in their right to tax bus lines engaged in interstate commerce. There is no such prohibition.

Mr. KING. I can see no rational ground for differentiating between one kind of transportation system and another.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, unfortunately during the major part of the discussion of the proposed legislation I could not be present as a member of the committee. I do not feel that I would discharge my duty to myself and my colleagues and to the public if before the vote is taken on the bill I did not submit some observations which are the result of my study of this question.

I do not think we have taken into consideration the radical difference there is in the methods of transportation between the internal-combustion engine and the steam engine. It is sufficient, perhaps, for me just to refer to the two for Senators' minds immediately to appreciate that the railroads as we know them have to have a specially constructed track at enormous cost and monopolized entirely by

the vehicles which use that track. The cost of the inauguration of such an enterprise is prohibitive as to the ordinary individual. It invites and requires a combination of capital. The roadbed itself must be particularly graded and kept up by skilled laborers in that particular field of railroad construction. It is impossible to operate a railroad without the issuance of a tremendous amount of obligations in the shape of stock and bonds. A railroad is limited as to where it may go by the stupendous cost which is involved in its construction. It is in its particular field an absolute monopoly. The construction and operation of railroads was early recognized as being a monopoly by those who invested capital in them, and the monopolistic power that was inherent in them was used to its fullest extent in the development of the railroads of our country. It is stated in the article written by the ex-President of the United States in the morning press that the railroads have recognized their tremendous power.

After all these years of the utilization of steam transportation for long distances and heavy traffic and for ordinary rapid transit, the genius of mankind has discovered another method of transportation, equal in its speed to the railroads; not equal, however, in its individual tonnage-carrying capacity, but capable of carrying quite a large volume of freight. Now, it seems to me that the thing which concerns the Senate, the thing which concerns the Congress, is what are the benefits from the autobus and the autotruck to the public; not what is their relation to the railroads, but what is their relation to the public.

Of course, none of us want to see the railroads destroyed or made inefficient; but at the same time we do not want to deprive the public of a splendid means of transportation for passengers and freight which in its initial cost is so small compared to the investment required to operate a railroad that almost any individual may acquire and operate a passenger bus or a freight truck. I hailed with delight the fact that we were capable of building a system of highways, each State contributing its part and the Federal Government its part, over which the new discovery might operate effectively. We now have such a system of highways; and, in place of a great corporation having to be organized and enormous capital to be invested in order to accommodate the public with rapid transportation both for passengers and freight, we have solved the problem, particularly in its relation to short distances and comparatively small tonnages, by the use of the internal-combustion engine. Any man of reasonable means may invest in one and serve his community or several communities; he can carry passengers; he can carry freight; and he can use the highway that is common property. It is not necessary that he shall exercise any right of eminent domain or invoke the law of condemnation; no; he uses the public highway. This democratic machine is at the service of all the people.

What would happen if a man were to invest in an autotruck and charge such a rate for service that the enterprise did not pay? There would be no shock to the community; no bondholders or stockholders would be hurt; he would simply lose his investment in his machine; that is all.

The same thing is true also as to the autobus. Yet, say what we will, we are proposing legislation here now which will invite a monopoly in this wonderfully democratic enterprise which will parallel in its ultimate effect the present railroad monopoly. The minute it shall be provided under the pending measure, should it become a law, that it shall be necessary to take out a certificate of convenience and necessity in order to operate a bus line, every one of us by experience knows from the operation of the clause in the present railroad law what will be the result. Certain individuals will secure the right to establish truck lines, while others will be denied that right. It would almost be analogous to our providing by law who shall own automobiles to traverse the highways, the common highways. Hitch hikers are numerous; on nearly every mile of road there is some one asking for transportation. It would be almost as reasonable to enact a law that no man shall stop his machine and, as a friendly act, pick up a passenger

and transport him as to say that one must obtain a certificate of convenience and necessity before he may engage in this wonderfully democratic means of universal and common transportation.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator from South Carolina is aware that in many States—I do not know the number—commissions have been set up for the purpose of granting permits to individuals or corporations to operate intrastate trucks and motor busses?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does not the argument of the Senator attack that undemocratic policy, to use the Senator's expression, by requiring this democratic means of transportation to submit to a certificate of reasonable necessity?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, no. I have not been advised as to the number of States which require a certificate of convenience and necessity. They require licenses, they require a certain tax, just as in the case of my automobile. They require a little larger tax on the autotruck, because it is a little harder on the road, and more benefits accrue from its use; but they do not require a certificate of convenience and necessity. The Senator knows that the moment such power is granted others are shut out who might wish to compete. A certificate of convenience and necessity! Who is going to define the interest of the public and the right of the individual in so cheap and common and democratic thing as transportation by auto bus or automobile? It would be just as appropriate under the old order of things to tax the man who ran a stage coach with his horses.

Mr. President, there is not a Senator on this floor who has worked any harder than have I—of course, others have worked with better results—in the effort to preserve the competency and efficiency of our railroads. I have been a Member of the Senate for 22 years, and I do not think there is a single utterance of mine either on the floor of the Senate or in committee that can be construed as being antagonistic to the railroads. They built this country; they made possible the coming together in intimate commercial and social relations of the East and the West; but because they rendered such a service when there was no other form of transportation is that any reason in the world why we should now deny the people of this country the fullest freedom in using the autotruck and the autobus, and deny them not in the interest of the public but in the interest of the preservation of the railroads? I can not understand such a suggestion.

There has not been very much discussion of the pending bill, but I have sat here and listened and I have heard very little reference made to how efficiently the public may be served by as nearly as possible unlimited freedom of use of our splendid highway system by the autobus and the autotruck. Whom does such use injure? Does it injure the public? To repeat myself, it costs very little to invest in an autotruck or an autobus, and the only sufferer in case the venture does not succeed will be the man who does not know what to charge or how to run his business.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HOWELL. Is not the whole purpose of this bill to limit competition?

Mr. SMITH. I can not see anything else in it. Who is going to be hurt? What part of the public is going to suffer by virtue of the roads being filled with autotrucks and autobusses? Who is going to be hurt so far as the general public is concerned? Wherein are they going to suffer?

The autotruck has tremendous advantages over the railroads as the railroads have great advantages over the autotrucks. Let us define the province of each, and by wise legislation restrict each one to its particular field.

All of us are familiar with the great fight that was made in reference to section 4 of the interstate commerce act. The railroads complained that they could not compete with water competition; that they could not meet water competition on the rivers and harbors. Here was a natural means of transportation both for passengers and freight, but limited geographically to a fixed, definite, and eternal place. They came here and asked to have their rates lowered so as to meet the competition of water. It was granted. Of course, they had to recoup themselves in those territories where the citizens did not have any water transportation. Now they are met with another competitor that can go wherever they can go, and at much less cost. Now we are asked, not to lower the rates all through the country, but to put such rates, fares, and charges on this great, democratic, universally possible means of transportation as will enable the railroads to maintain their present rates.

We were asked to destroy water competition. We did. Now we are asked to destroy our bus and truck competition. It is useless for us to try to gainsay that position. Had we not better wait a while until we find just the lines along which this new method of freight and passenger transportation will ultimately define itself? Can we not trust the States to find a modus vivendi amongst themselves, to have reciprocity as to the use of the roads that the States build by those from other States, and to adjust themselves so that we will not have a foreign element stating what shall be the conditions under which I shall travel, in South Carolina, on South Carolina roads?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. KING. If I understand the Senator's able argument, would not the situation be somewhat clarified if Congress should simply pass a joint resolution or a bill saying that, so far as concerns the power of the Federal Government to control motor transportation in interstate commerce, the States shall have full authority and power to enact such reasonable regulations as they see fit for the protection of the public and those who may be passengers upon interstate busses or those who may be engaged in interstate transportation?

Mr. SMITH. I think, at this stage of development, the Senator has put it finely. In other words, we have the constitutional right to regulate them. Is it wise to do it?

Mr. KING. Why not remit it to the States?

Mr. SMITH. That is right. This method of transportation is just in its incipiency. The Federal Government is cooperating with the States in building highways. It does not go into my State and supervise the building of the roads. It lays down certain conditions and leaves their carrying out entirely to the State.

In my opinion, it would have been much wiser for us to have passed a joint resolution along the line the Senator has indicated, if any legislation at all is necessary. We now have a means of the closest relation that the world ever saw. We have annihilated time and space on the public highway. Transportation used to be limited to the railroads at tremendous cost. Now it is easy for anyone to go long distances. It is 500 miles from here to my home. A Congressman and I ate lunch at my home, left at 1 o'clock, and arrived in Washington that night at 1 o'clock in our own vehicle, taking our own time, without anybody punching a ticket, without anybody interfering as to whether or not we had a certificate of convenience and necessity, without anybody saying, "You have crossed the North Carolina line. Have you subscribed to the Federal law in regard to traveling interstate?" We were in a common country, with common freedom, and traveled to Washington without let or hindrance.

I will guarantee the assertion that we passed two score trucks and auto busses between Florence, S. C., and Washington, D. C. They did not inconvenience us. We traveled a common highway, for the common good. I passed men walking. I passed men driving buggies. I passed men in

wagons. I passed men on bicycles. It was a common highway, for the common people, from the auto truck and the auto bus down to the little flivver that we were in. We are just in the dawn of this wonderful solution of the problem of mass transportation, available for everybody, bringing the groceries to my door without my going to the depot, carrying the children from out of the "sticks" into the common school place, where they touch elbows with every variety and scale of society, the gift of God to mankind to leaven up and level up the great mass of our people.

The spiritual value of good roads and good transportation can not be measured by Congress or any living man or set of men. Yet, gentlemen of the Senate, we are taking the gifts of God and the discoveries of genius and making them a curse to mankind. We are taking these wonderful forces that have been concentrated and made available and creating them into a Juggernaut car that is driving ruthlessly over the hopes and over the homes of millions. We have taken a machine age which goes under the name of the incorporation of labor-saving devices and destroyed labor with them. We have taken the wonderful facilities of mass production and made them a mass destroyer. We have taken the inventions of genius and bankrupted America with them. We have taken the gifts of God and turned them into a curse.

The man who owns a machine that can do the work of a hundred men owns the equivalent of a hundred men. The slave owners of the South never had one-tenth the power that the machine owners of America have. We fought the war to destroy competition between slave labor and free labor. What prophet will deny that we may yet have to fight a war for the right of free people to enjoy machine labor?

No sooner had this gift of God to mankind been made manifest in its power to serve the public than we rush here with legislation to divert it into a small channel, to pay the greatest dividends to a little handful. What harm is it doing anybody? Who has spoken here for the interests of the public, who are just beginning to appreciate the wonderful benefits of this new method of transportation?

The railroads are a necessity, and they will be here in spite of all this competition. We should be infinitely wiser to leave the railroads ultimately to discover what is their function under the new order of things, and then, as wise men, protect them in that function and give them adequate support to perform that function, find what is the function of the autotruck and the autobus, and throw the protection of common sense and statesmanship around them and give them their territory. But in the midst of this confusion, without the province of either one being clearly defined, we propose to come in here and throttle the development of this wonderful discovery in the interest of the masses? No; but because it is temporarily jeopardizing the revenue of the railroads. That is what we are doing. That is what this legislation is for.

It is ill-advised, Mr. President. We ought not now to attempt to interfere by Federal legislation. The States are solving this problem wonderfully. They are building these roads at tremendous cost. My State has just gotten through bonding itself in the sum of \$65,000,000 to perfect a system of hard-surfaced roads in the State of South Carolina, to do what? To enjoy to the fullest extent the benefit of this wonderful discovery; and here we are about to pass legislation that will do what? Will it give my State, which spends the money and builds the roads, the right to determine what will be a just return for the use of these splendid facilities? No; but it turns over the matter to a commission to determine convenience and necessity!

Mr. President, it is very well for us all to know who inspires legislation. Very often we get a slant on it in that way that may be very helpful in our deliberations. Where did this thing come from? I say here and now, if a railroad wants to put an autotruck or an autobus out in competition with anybody else's vehicle, under the same conditions, let it go and do it. Do not compel the railroads to come here and ask for the privilege of putting

out an autobus or an autotruck. Just let them do it. If they want to carry me for nothing, let them do it. That is about where they have most of the farmers. We have to give them what we make and pay them a little boot to take it. I should like to have that turned around just a bit.

We are trying to confuse two radically different things. The relationship of modern internal-combustion engine operation to the public and the railroad's relation to it are just as different as the horse and buggy and the passenger train. I for one, Senators, as a member of the committee, can not get the consent of my mind to go back and state to my people that I, by my vote, injected Federal interference into a problem that the State can solve to the benefit of every man, woman, and child in the State. No; I can not do that. The best thing for us to do is just to wait until the function of the railroad is fully defined in the light of the operation of these so-called competitors and then see what these competitors may do.

Gentlemen of the Senate, the first consideration and the only consideration that this and the other body should have is, What is the greatest good to the public?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SMITH. I do.

Mr. BLACK. As I understand, the original Interstate Commerce Commission law was passed to protect the public from the monopoly of railroads.

Mr. SMITH. That is true.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is on the committee, and I will ask him whether it is claimed that the object of this bill is to protect the people from monopolies of railroads or busses?

Mr. SMITH. No; it is to protect the monopolies against restriction.

Mr. BLACK. It was not claimed, as far as the Senator knows, in the hearings before the committee, that the passage of this bus bill would protect the people from monopoly?

Mr. SMITH. No. There is no use in our referring to it, but the history of early railroading was not a very happy chapter in our national history, and since the appointment of the Interstate Commerce Commission it has not been altogether very happy.

The Senator has put his finger on the very crux of the matter and made the point better than I could have made it. We appointed the Interstate Commerce Commission to protect us against monopoly. Now, the offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission are being invoked to protect monopoly.

Mr. President, I had hoped that I would not be called upon to have anything to say. Most anyone can invest in one of these individual vehicles, and if he fails nobody is hurt but himself. If a railroad fails, consider the host of bondholders and stockholders who lose. If I remember correctly, one of the great panics of this country was caused by certain conditions in the railroad industry. If an autotruck fails, hardly anybody knows about it.

Not so long ago I was going along the road and saw one of the finest autotrucks down in a ditch. I did not go many miles before I saw another. If a railroad is wrecked, the whole country is adversely affected. There is no comparison between the two. We have no right to hook them up together. Let one of them perform the functions the other never would perform. Tremendous concentrated tonnage in hundreds of big cars pulled by super engines—no autotruck can ever take the place of that.

When it comes to the convenience of long-distance travel nothing in sight yet will take the place of the through train and the Pullman and the dining car. Let each one in its own sphere serve the public, but in the name of the God who has made us all and united us in one country, let us have the good of the people at heart, and not the protection of a corporation, and all the arguments I have heard here have been as to the effect this would have on the railroads. What effect will it have on the people? What effect

would this restriction have on the masses of the American people who to-day are the beneficiaries of this revolution of transportation? Thank God there is no such thing now as "backwoods." As a result of good roads, automobiles, radios, and airplanes, there is no longer any such thing as "backwoods." The man who lives out in the sticks now is as cosmopolitan as the man who walks the city streets, and why should we now attempt to restrict the blessings God has vouchsafed him?

Mr. President, as a member of the committee I shall content myself, for the present at least, with voting against any restrictive legislation other than that which the States, in their relation to each other, may see fit to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is, Shall the bill be engrossed and read the third time?

Mr. HARRISON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	King	Shortridge
Barkley	Frazier	La Follette	Simmons
Bingham	George	McGill	Smith
Black	Gillett	McKellar	Smoot
Blaine	Glenn	McMaster	Steiwer
Blease	Goff	McNary	Stephens
Borah	Goldsbrough	Morrow	Swanson
Brock	Gould	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Greene	Norbeck	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Hale	Norris	Townsend
Bulkley	Harris	Nye	Trammell
Capper	Harrison	Oddie	Tydings
Caraway	Hastings	Overman	Vandenbergh
Carey	Hatfield	Patterson	Wagner
Connally	Hayden	Phipps	Walcott
Copeland	Hebert	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Howell	Reed	Waterman
Dale	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Davis	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Deneen	Kean	Schall	Williamson
Dill	Kendrick	Sheppard	
Fess	Keyes	Shipstead	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Wisconsin offers the following amendment: On page 26, strike out all of line 23, after the semicolon, and all of lines 24 and 25, and in lieu thereof insert:

And notwithstanding the provisions of this act and any provision of the Federal highway act, the laws enacted by any State and the regulations thereunder that relate to the maintenance, protection, safety, or use of the highways therein, and which laws and regulations thereunder are made equally applicable to intrastate and interstate commerce or use of such highways, shall not be deemed to be a burden upon or an obstruction or impediment to interstate commerce, and the power to enact such laws and promulgate regulations thereunder is hereby expressly reserved to the respective States under their police powers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin. [Putting the question.] The yeas seem to have it.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I presume the amendment is subject to debate, and I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this amendment is intended to preserve the rights of the respective States in the regulation and use of the highways. The highways of this country are built out of funds obtained from taxation in the respective States.

Yesterday the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] introduced two or three schedules which are very enlightening with respect to the contributions which are made by the Federal Government to the States for highway aid and construction.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I voted for the Senator's amendment a moment ago, and I just rise to inquire whether or not the vote taken was a decisive vote, or whether or not the Senator rose in time to have another vote taken later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair's understanding is that the Senator rose in time. A conclusive vote has not been announced.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, if Senators will observe the tables submitted by the Senator from Iowa, they will find that the Federal Government contributes a mere bagatelle toward the construction of our highways. My own State is illustrative of what is true of every State in the Union.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. I will ask the Senator if he will point out the difference, concretely, between his amendment and the provision in the bill with respect to State rights?

Mr. BLAINE. I will come to that in just a moment. The taxes to which I referred, represented by disbursements, amounted to \$21,000,000 for State highways, as disclosed by the schedule on page 49 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On page 50 of the RECORD it is shown that the grand total of disbursements by local road authorities was \$30,000,000. Toward these expenditures the Federal Government contributed a trifle more than \$2,400,000, and yet it is proposed by the bill now before us to turn over to the motor-bus transportation companies, which will mean within a very short time after the passage of the bill turning over to the railroad companies of the country, the use of our highways, built out of money raised in taxation so far as our local roads are concerned, and to a large extent through taxation so far as our State trunk highway systems are concerned. It is proposed by this legislation that the railroad corporations eventually and within a short time shall have the free use of these highways.

Mr. President, there is no saving clause in the bill that will adequately reserve to the States the police powers of the States. There is nothing in the bill that will adequately protect the States in their right as sovereign States to regulate the proper use of the highways. There is nothing in the bill that reserves to States the right to enact laws that may determine the length of the busses, the weight of the busses, and many other considerations which enter into the legislation. Results will follow that will mean the destruction of our highways, built at the expense of the taxpayers of the country, because we know that bus transportation upon the highways to-day causes primarily the destruction of our roads and that it costs millions upon millions of dollars in any State of appreciable size to maintain and repair those highways. All of that must be done by the taxpayers of our respective States, and here we are attempting to shear the States of the power to determine the type of vehicle that may operate upon their highways, the character of that operation, and many other elements which we may not now be able to anticipate because of the tremendous impetus that is given to the improvement of motor transportation. We do not know what the limit will be. There is no provision in the bill which reserves to the States the proper power to regulate and control these transportation companies.

I want to read that portion of the bill which purports to reserve to the States the proper power.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to ask the Senator how the Congress could take away from the States the full control of anything in the nature of intrastate commerce or use of vehicles engaged in intrastate commerce?

Mr. BLAINE. But this bill affects interstate commerce, and it is with respect to that interstate commerce and the regulation thereof of which the States are shorn of their power.

Mr. BORAH. I do not understand how the States could be shorn of it by an act of Congress.

Mr. BLAINE. Interstate commerce?

Mr. BORAH. Interstate commerce; but if it is interstate commerce the States could not exercise that power anyway.

Mr. BLAINE. I beg to differ with the Senator. The States in the absence of Federal restrictions may regulate so far as interstate commerce is concerned with respect to the use of our highways. There is no one who has the right to use the highways, either intrastate or interstate, without permission of the sovereign power that built those highways. That is the rule and that is the law. The State may even deprive its own citizens, as it does to a certain extent, of the right to use the highways. The State may deprive interstate commerce under circumstances identical with the deprivation of intrastate commerce with respect to the use of those highways.

Mr. BORAH. And Congress can not take that power away from the States.

Mr. BLAINE. When Congress once enters upon the field in the regulation of interstate commerce without any reservation to the State, the National Government enters that field exclusive of State jurisdiction. That has been demonstrated time and time again under the transportation act regulating the railroads. The Interstate Commerce Commission, under the terms of this bill, having once granted a certificate of convenience and necessity, thereby excludes the State from any power to regulate that transportation if it is found that such regulation would be an obstruction to or impede interstate commerce.

Mr. BORAH. I agree with that proposition. The Supreme Court has held that if the regulation of intrastate commerce by the States interferes with interstate commerce the States can not regulate it; that is to say, if the intrastate regulation interferes with the proper regulation of interstate commerce the State can not exercise that power. That I understand to be true.

Mr. BLAINE. That is exactly the situation I am attempting to avoid by this amendment. My amendment proposes to reserve to the States the power to regulate under the general police power of the State reserved to the State, Congress saying to the Federal Government, "We will enter this jurisdiction only so far, and beyond that the Federal Government does not go. It does not propose to enter this field exclusive to the power of the State over its own highways."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Was it not left to the States to determine the intrastate rates under the interstate commerce act up until the time of the passage of the Esch-Cummins Act, which then granted the Interstate Commerce Commission power to determine what rate should be imposed, even though it was intrastate, if in the judgment of the commission it subtracted from or interfered with the revenues in interstate traffic?

Mr. BLAINE. That was the general consensus of opinion in the country.

Mr. SMITH. I know with what a shock it came to some members of the committee that for the first time we had arrogated or turned over to the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to determine an intrastate rate if in the judgment of the commission that wholly intrastate rate affected the revenues of the interstate agency or carrier. By the same token, if the law applies to the autobus or the autotruck and a certificate of convenience and necessity is granted, we put them under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Then if an intrastate vehicle may contribute some freight to an interstate truck under the same law, why would not the Interstate Commerce Commission have the right to go into my State and regulate rates on traffic that shall be carried wholly intrastate on the ground that those intrastate vehicles contribute to the freight that passes in interstate traffic?

Mr. BORAH. That is not the rule that has been laid down by the Supreme Court.

Mr. BLAINE. I have not any doubt that that probably would be the rule that would be effective. The Minnesota case, the Shreveport case, and the railroad transportation act of 1920 all go to the proposition that, the Federal Government having entered the field, it entered that field to the exclusion of all other jurisdiction, there having been no reservation made whatever for the protection of the States in their sovereign power to enact legislation under what we generally understand to be the police power of the States.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a brief suggestion?

Mr. BLAINE. Certainly.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am informed by members of the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission, and also by their counsel, that the result of the transportation act, so far as all practical purposes are concerned, has been to shear them entirely of all power to regulate effectively even intrastate rates because they are always met with the argument that it affects interstate business and therefore can not be maintained.

Mr. BORAH. I am not arguing against the amendment, because the principle or theory of it seems to be all right. All I am undertaking to say is that I am not myself going to concede that Congress can take from the States the regulation of intrastate highways or the regulation of intrastate transportation. Congress can not take it away from the States. That power is granted in another instrument, and that is the Constitution itself.

Mr. BLAINE. My proposal is to nail the thing down so there shall be no question on that point.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I suppose the Senator has intended to mention the difference between a railroad and a highway. The railroad is owned exclusively by the railroad company and used exclusively by the railroad company.

Mr. BLAINE. The right of way having been purchased by the railroad company, the roadbed and all the equipment, the rails and the ties, are the property entirely of the railroad company, while on the other hand the highway, the easement, and the title thereto are in the county or State.

Mr. TYDINGS. And open to everybody.

Mr. BLAINE. And built by the counties and States and local communities, and owned by every taxpayer and every citizen in the State under State sovereignty.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand the Senator's amendment, a great many States regulate the weight of the cargo which can be carried in a truck. In other words, the roads are built to carry a 12-ton load. The State of Maryland, for instance, provides that if the load exceeds 12 tons the driver or owner of the truck shall be subject to a fine. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it is for the purpose of giving additional support to the local regulations governing the speed and conduct of cargoes over the highway. Is that correct?

Mr. BLAINE. That is the purpose. The language I desire to strike out is on page 26, after the semicolon:

And motor carriers operating in interstate commerce shall be subject to the proper exercise by the State of its powers.

That language is very narrow. It expressly provides for the "proper exercise." What is meant by the "proper exercise"? The interpretation must be made in the light of the decisions and the rules that apply with respect to railroad companies under the transportation act. The phrase "proper exercise" will exclude from the State full power to pass legislation that will be protective of the State's highways, owned and built by the State, and its respective communities.

I propose to strike out that indefinite, narrow language and to substitute therefor language that is broad enough to protect the State in its sovereign capacity, to protect its highways from destruction, to protect the safety of the

travelers upon the highways, without any question or peradventure of doubt, leaving nothing to be interpreted, leaving nothing to be construed by the courts, but preserving to the States the power, as the language of the amendment provides, to enact laws and promulgate regulations thereunder that relate to the maintenance, protection, safety, or use of the highways therein; providing, however, that such laws and regulations thereunder are made equally applicable to intrastate and interstate commerce or use of such highways. In other words, subjecting interstate commerce to identically the same rules that apply to intrastate commerce—that is, within the State and subject to the laws of the State in relation thereto. I think this is very important.

The amendment further and expressly provides that the power to enact such laws and promulgate regulations thereunder is expressly reserved to the respective States under their police powers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am in sympathy with the Senator's amendment, but I wonder in what respect it differs from the language the Senator seeks to strike out, which seems to be aiming at the same thing but in more general terms? Is there really, in effect, any difference between them?

Mr. BLAINE. I think there is a very essential difference. As I pointed out, the language provided in the bill refers to "proper exercise." Now the term "proper exercise" is very broad. By interpretation of the courts in sustaining rules and regulations and orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the future, in all probability such language would preclude any legislation on behalf of the States for the protection of their highways and safety thereon. "Proper exercise" refers to the use of the police power, subject, however, to the rule that when the Federal Government enters a field without any reservation to the State the Federal Government enters that field exclusive of any other jurisdiction. It is that exclusive jurisdiction on the part of the Federal Government to which I object. That is the essential distinction between the language of the bill and the language of the proposed amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is undoubtedly correct with reference to—

Mr. BLAINE. I have explained the amendment, and I see no necessity for prolonging the discussion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. I was not quite through with my observation in response to the Senator's statement.

Mr. BLAINE. I yield the floor to the Senator, in order that he may conclude his observation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not need the whole floor. I merely want a little part of it.

What the Senator from Wisconsin has said is undoubtedly true with respect to the regulation of private concerns, private business, and private facilities such as railroads, but I am not so certain that the principle which he lays down goes far enough to include the regulation by the Federal Government of the conduct of the highways wholly within the control of a State which are already public property and have been dedicated to the public service.

I do not understand that the passage of this bill would, by implication, give the Federal Government or the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to regulate the construction of highways or in any way to invade the police powers of the States or the cities or the counties through which such bus lines might operate in the matter of the construction and regulation of the use of the highway itself.

I have no objection to the amendment of the Senator, but I did not want the contention to go unchallenged that the mere passage of an act regulating bus traffic over a highway which has been already dedicated under the laws of the State to public use would, by implication, give the Federal Government the right to regulate traffic on that highway.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE

A message from the President of the United States by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, communicated to the Senate nominations of members of the Federal Power Commission.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this morning the Senate adopted a resolution providing that nominations received from the President may be referred by the Chair. May I ask whether the nominations received to-day have been referred to the proper committees under that resolution, or will it be necessary to have an executive session?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations received have not been referred because they have not as yet been presented to the Presiding Officer. If the Senate desires an executive session, they can be presented and referred in such session.

Mr. McNARY. Then, Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate sundry executive messages from the President of the United States, which were read and referred to the appropriate committees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order. If there be no reports of committees, the calendar is in order.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate, as in legislative session, took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, December 4, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 3, 1930

SECRETARY OF LABOR

William N. Doak, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Labor, vice JAMES J. DAVIS, resigned.

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment to the offices to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, as follows:

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

J. Reuben Clark, jr., of Utah, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mexico.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY

Hoffman Philip, of New York, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

Nicholas Roosevelt, of New York, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Hungary.

J. Butler Wright, of Wyoming, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uruguay.

MINISTER RESIDENT AND CONSUL GENERAL

Charles E. Mitchell, of West Virginia, to be minister resident and consul general of the United States of America to Liberia.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS

The following-named Foreign Service officers to be diplomatic and consular officers of the grade to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, as follows:

SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Hayward G. Hill, of Louisiana.
Jay Walker, of the District of Columbia.
George D. La Mont, of New York.

Frederick P. Latimer, jr., of Connecticut.
 Julius Wadsworth, of Connecticut.
 Guy W. Ray, of Alabama.
 Thomas J. Maleady, of Massachusetts.
 David H. Buffum, of Maine.
 George Alexander Armstrong, of New York.
 Garret G. Ackerson, jr., of New Jersey.
 Henry P. Starrett, of Florida.
 Hervé J. L'Heureux, of New Hampshire.
 Edward G. Trueblood, of Illinois.
 Harold D. Finley, of New York.
 William H. Hunt, of New York.
 Felix Cole, of the District of Columbia.

(Not a recess appointment)

Robert English, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, and a vice consul of career, to be also a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

CONSULS GENERAL

Calvin M. Hitch, of Georgia.
 Harold D. Clum, of New York.
 Herbert S. Goold, of California.
 William C. Burdett, of Tennessee.

CONSULS

Roy E. B. Bower, of California.
 John E. Holler, of Pennsylvania.
 John McArdle, of Pennsylvania.
 Roy W. Baker, of New York.
 Ellis A. Bonnet, of Texas.
 Robert L. Buell, of New York.
 Leo J. Callanan, of Massachusetts.
 Augustus S. Chase, of Connecticut.
 Alexander P. Cruger, of New York.
 Julian C. Dorr, of New York.
 Frederick W. Hinke, of New York.
 Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas.
 Carlton Hurst, of the District of Columbia.
 Rufus H. Lane, jr., of Virginia.
 John H. Lord, of Massachusetts.
 John H. Morgan, of Massachusetts.
 James E. Parks, of North Carolina.
 William L. Peck, of Connecticut.
 George Tait, of Virginia.
 Howard C. Taylor, of South Dakota.
 William T. Turner, of Georgia.

VICE CONSULS OF CAREER

Hayward G. Hill, of Louisiana.
 Jay Walker, of the District of Columbia.
 David H. Buffum, of Maine.
 Thomas J. Maleady, of Massachusetts.
 Guy W. Ray, of Alabama.
 Hervé J. L'Heureux, of New Hampshire.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

The following-named persons to be Foreign Service officers of the United States of America of the class to which they were promoted during the last recess of the Senate, as follows:

From Foreign Service officer of class 2 to Foreign Service officer of class 1:

Frederick T. F. Dumont, of Pennsylvania.
 Arthur Garrels, of Missouri.
 Ransford S. Miller, of New York.
 Mahlon Fay Perkins, of California.
 G. Howland Shaw, of Massachusetts.
 Addison E. Southard, of Kentucky.
 John Campbell White, of Maryland.

From Foreign Service officer of class 3 to Foreign Service officer of class 2:

Thomas D. Bowman, of Missouri.
 George E. Chamberlin, of New York.
 Felix Cole, of the District of Columbia.
 John K. Davis, of Ohio.
 Carl F. Deichman, of Missouri.
 Cornelius Ferris, of Colorado.
 Arthur C. Frost, of Massachusetts.

John A. Gamon, of Illinois.
 Arminius T. Haeberle, of Missouri.
 Lewis W. Haskell, of South Carolina.
 Calvin M. Hitch, of Georgia.
 Philip Holland, of Tennessee.
 Hallett Johnson, of New Jersey.
 John E. Kehl, of Ohio.
 Keith Merrill, of Minnesota.
 Ely E. Palmer, of Rhode Island.
 Henry P. Starrett, of Florida.
 James B. Stewart, of New Mexico.
 Walter C. Thurston, of Arizona.
 North Winship, of Georgia.
 Will L. Lowrie, of Illinois.

From Foreign Service officer of class 4 to Foreign Service officer of class 3:

Walter A. Adams, of South Carolina.
 Joseph W. Ballantine, of Massachusetts.
 Pierre de L. Boel, of Pennsylvania.
 George A. Bucklin, of Oklahoma.
 Charles R. Cameron, of New York.
 Alfred W. Donegan, of Alabama.
 Eugene H. Dooman, of New York.
 W. Roderick Dorsey, of Maryland.
 Joseph E. Haven, of Illinois.
 Clarence B. Hewes, of Louisiana.
 John P. Hurley, of New York.
 Ernest L. Ives, of Virginia.
 Joseph E. Jacobs, of South Carolina.
 Herschel V. Johnson, of North Carolina.
 Wilbur Keblinger, of Virginia.
 Graham H. Kemper, of Kentucky.
 Walter A. Leonard, of Illinois.
 George A. Makinson, of California.
 O. Gaylord Marsh, of Washington.
 John R. Putnam, of Oregon.
 Emil Sauer, of Texas.
 Hugh H. Watson, of Vermont.
 Samuel W. Honaker, of Texas.

From Foreign Service officer of class 5 to Foreign Service officer of class 4:

Wainwright Abbott, of Pennsylvania.
 Walter F. Boyle, of Georgia.
 Parker W. Buhman, of Virginia.
 Algar E. Carleton, of Vermont.
 Dudley G. Dwyre, of Colorado.
 Joseph Flack, of Pennsylvania.
 George C. Hanson, of Connecticut.
 Frederick P. Hibbard, of Texas.
 Jay C. Huston, of California.
 Jesse B. Jackson, of Ohio.
 Edwin Carl Kemp, of Florida.
 Benjamin Muse, of Virginia.
 Lucien Memminger, of South Carolina.
 Edward I. Nathan, of Pennsylvania.
 Clarence J. Spiker, of the District of Columbia.
 Harold H. Tittmann, jr., of Missouri.
 Henry M. Wolcott, of New York.
 Leslie A. Davis, of New York.

From Foreign Service officer of class 6 to Foreign Service officer of class 5:

Robert R. Bradford, of Nebraska.
 Alfred T. Burri, of New York.
 James G. Carter, of Georgia.
 Arthur B. Cooke, of South Carolina.
 John Corrigan, of Georgia.
 Leonard G. Dawson, of Virginia.
 James Orr Denby, of Indiana.
 Maurice P. Dunlap, of Minnesota.
 Edward M. Groth, of New York.
 Robert W. Heingartner, of Ohio.
 Curtis C. Jordan, of California.
 Robert D. Longyear, of Massachusetts.
 John H. MacVeagh, of New York.
 H. Freeman Matthews, of Maryland.
 George Orr, of New Jersey.

Walter H. Schoellkopf, of New York.
 Richard L. Sprague, of Massachusetts.
 Paul C. Squire, of Massachusetts.
 Marshall M. Vance, of Ohio.
 Henry C. von Struve, of Texas.
 Egmont C. von Tresckow, of South Carolina.
 Henry S. Waterman, of Washington.
 Bartley F. Yost, of Kansas.
 Hooker A. Doolittle, of New York.
 From Foreign Service officer of class 7 to Foreign Service

officer of class 6:

Lee R. Blohm, of Arizona.
 Lawrence P. Briggs, of Michigan.
 Lewis V. Boyle, of California.
 Herbert S. Bursley, of the District of Columbia.
 John S. Calvert, of North Carolina.
 Reginald S. Castleman, of California.
 Stillman W. Eells, of New York.
 Leon H. Ellis, of Washington.
 Lynn W. Franklin, of Maryland.
 Gerhard Gade, of Illinois.
 Waldemar J. Gallman, of New York.
 Raymond H. Geist, of Ohio.
 Stuart E. Grummon, of New Jersey.
 William W. Heard, of Maryland.
 Charles H. Heisler, of Delaware.
 Trojan Kodding, of Pennsylvania.
 Andrew J. McConico, of Mississippi.
 Thomas McEnelly, of New York.
 Lester L. Schnare, of Georgia.
 Leo D. Sturgeon, of Illinois.
 Fletcher Warren, of Texas.
 Leroy Webber, of New York.
 Howard F. Withey, of Michigan.
 David C. Berger, of Virginia.

From Foreign Service officer of class 8 to Foreign Service officer of class 7:

George Atcheson, jr., of California.
 Ralph A. Boernstein, of the District of Columbia.
 Russell M. Brooks, of Oregon.
 George Gregg Fuller, of New York.
 Harvey T. Goodier, of New York.
 Ernest E. Evans, of New York.
 Leonard N. Green, of Minnesota.
 John N. Hamlin, of Oregon.
 Joel C. Hudson, of Missouri.
 George R. Hukill, of Delaware.
 Marcel E. Malige, of Idaho.
 John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island.
 Quincy F. Roberts, of Texas.
 William A. Smale, of California.
 Harry E. Stevens, of California.
 Frederik van den Arend, of North Carolina.

From Foreign Service officer, unclassified at \$3,000, to Foreign Service officer of class 8:

Roy W. Baker, of New York.
 Ellis A. Bonnet, of Texas.
 Robert L. Buell, of New York.
 Leo J. Callanan, of Massachusetts.
 Augustus S. Chase, of Connecticut.
 Alexander P. Cruger, of New York.
 Julian C. Dorr, of New York.
 Frederick W. Hinke, of New York.
 Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas.
 Carlton Hurst, of the District of Columbia.
 Rufus H. Lane, jr., of Virginia.
 John H. Lord, of Massachusetts.
 John H. Morgan, of Massachusetts.
 James E. Parks, of North Carolina.
 William L. Peck, of Connecticut.
 George Tait, of Virginia.
 Howard C. Taylor, of South Dakota.
 William T. Turner, of Georgia.
 Roy E. B. Bower, of California.
 John E. Holler, of Pennsylvania.
 John McArdle, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named persons to be Foreign Service officers, unclassified, of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Hayward G. Hill, of Louisiana.
 Jay Walker, of the District of Columbia.
 Guy W. Ray, of Alabama.
 Thomas J. Maleady, of Massachusetts.
 David H. Buffum, of Maine.
 Hervé J. L'Heureux, of New Hampshire.

MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Tariff Commission, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, for the terms herein designated, as follows:

For the term expiring June 16, 1936, Henry P. Fletcher, of Pennsylvania.
 For the term expiring June 16, 1935, Thomas W. Page, of Virginia.
 For the term expiring June 16, 1934, John Lee Coulter, of North Dakota.
 For the term expiring June 16, 1933, Alfred P. Dennis, of Maryland.
 For the term expiring June 16, 1932, Edgar Bernard Brosard, of Utah.
 For the term expiring June 16, 1931, Lincoln Dixon, of Indiana.

MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Power Commission for the terms herein designated, as follows:

For the term expiring June 22, 1935, George Otis Smith, of Maine.
 For the term expiring June 22, 1934, Frank R. McNinch, of North Carolina.
 For the term expiring June 22, 1933, Ralph B. Williamson, of Washington.
 For the term expiring June 22, 1932, Marcel Garsaud, of Louisiana.
 For the term expiring June 22, 1931, Claude L. Draper, of Wyoming.

MEMBERS OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Lawrence A. Glenn, of Illinois, for appointment as member of the Mississippi River Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1879, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a Mississippi River Commission for the improvement of said river from the Head of the Passes near its mouth to its headwaters," vice John W. Stipes, resigned.

Lieut. Col. George R. Spalding, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as member of the Mississippi River Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1879, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a Mississippi River Commission for the improvement of said river from the Head of the Passes near its mouth to its headwaters," vice Lieut. Col. Jarvis J. Bain, relieved.

MEMBERS OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The following-named persons for reappointment as members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, for terms expiring December 31, 1937, as follows:

Frank McManamy, of the District of Columbia.
 Charles D. Mahaffie, of the District of Columbia.
 Charles D. Mahaffie, of the District of Columbia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term expiring December 31, 1930, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Thomas F. Woodlock.

MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL FARM LOAN BOARD

Floyd R. Harrison, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Farm Loan Board for a term of eight years, expiring August 6, 1938. (Reappointment.)

Mr. Harrison is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Eugene Meyer, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Reserve Board, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, for the unexpired term of 10 years from August 10, 1928, vice Edmund Platt.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

David Burnet, of Ohio, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Robert H. Lucas, resigned.

Mr. Burnet is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

COMMISSIONER OF NARCOTICS

Harry J. Anslinger, of Pennsylvania, to be Commissioner of Narcotics. New office created by the act of Congress approved June 14, 1930.

Mr. Anslinger is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF MEDIATION

Samuel E. Winslow, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Board of Mediation for a term expiring five years after January 1, 1931. (Reappointment.)

EXAMINER IN CHIEF IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

James Walter Clift, of Michigan, now holding a recess appointment to the position of Examiner in Chief in the United States Patent Office for permanent appointment, vice George R. Ide, retired.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Elwyn T. Clark, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn., in place of Harvey P. Bissell, deceased.

Mr. Clark is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of Congress.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Randolph Bryant, of Texas, to be United States district judge, eastern district of Texas, to succeed W. Lee Estes, deceased.

DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Gudbrand J. Lomen, of Alaska, to be district judge, district of Alaska, division No. 2. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 16, 1930.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Paul H. Creswell, of Ohio, to be United States marshal, southern district of Ohio, to succeed George A. Reeves, appointed by the court.

Herbert E. L. Toombs, of Texas, to be United States marshal, southern district of Texas, to succeed Richard A. Harvin, whose term expired December 21, 1929.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

George W. Miller, of Oregon, to be register of the Land Office at The Dalles, Oreg., vice James W. Donnelly, deceased.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers in the Public Health Service:

Dr. Clinton T. Messner to be a senior dental surgeon in the grade of senior surgeon, to rank as such from July 23, 1930.

Dr. Robert L. Robinson to be a dental surgeon in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from July 23, 1930.

Ralph E. Tarbett to be a sanitary engineer in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from July 23, 1930.

Leslie C. Frank to be a sanitary engineer in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from July 23, 1930.

Edgar B. Scott to be assistant pharmacist in the grade of assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 23, 1930.

Edwin M. Holt to be assistant pharmacist in the grade of assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 23, 1930.

Sr. Surg. William C. Billings to be a medical director, to rank as such from July 25, 1930.

Surg. Gustave M. Corput to be a medical director, to rank as such from July 25, 1930.

Surg. John S. Boggess to be a medical director, to rank as such from July 25, 1930.

Surg. John T. Burkhalter to be a medical director, to rank as such from July 26, 1930.

Asst. Surg. Edward R. Pelikan to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 25, 1930.

Asst. Surg. Ralph B. Snavely to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 25, 1930.

Asst. Surg. Langdon R. White to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 25, 1930.

Asst. Surg. Joseph F. Van Ackeren to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from July 25, 1930.

Surg. Warren F. Draper to be a senior surgeon, to rank as such from August 7, 1930.

Surg. Lewis R. Thompson to be a senior surgeon, to rank as such from September 16, 1930.

Dr. William C. Parker to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the grade of passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 4, 1930.

Dr. James F. Lewis to be an assistant dental surgeon in the grade of assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 4, 1930.

Charles Wardell Stiles to be a medical director, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. William S. Terriberry to be a medical director, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Joseph A. LePrince to be a senior sanitary engineer in the grade of senior surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Thomas H. D. Griffiths to be a surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. William L. Smith to be a surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Oswald E. Denney to be a surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Oliver C. Wenger to be a surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Stephen A. De Martini to be a surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. John M. Lowrey to be a surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Egbert M. Townsend to be a surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Norman Y. Hooper to be a dental surgeon in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Alf Einar Nannestad to be a dental surgeon in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Robert C. Stewart to be a dental surgeon in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. William T. Wright, jr., to be a dental surgeon in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Frank C. Cady to be a dental surgeon in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Ozias Paquin, jr., to be a dental surgeon in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Daniel B. Newell to be a dental surgeon in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Charles W. Wekenman to be a dental surgeon in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Eugene C. Stamm to be a dental surgeon in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Stanmore P. Marshall to be a dental surgeon in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. William O. Boss to be a dental surgeon in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. H. Trendley Dean to be a dental surgeon in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Carl Pickett to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the grade of passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Frederick W. Harper to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the grade of passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Dr. Allen M. Perkins to be passed assistant dental surgeon in the grade of passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

John K. Hoskins to be a sanitary engineer in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Harold W. Streeter to be a sanitary engineer in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Harry R. Crohurst to be a sanitary engineer in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Harry B. Hommon to be a sanitary engineer in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Abraham W. Fuchs to be a sanitary engineer in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

William H. W. Komp to be a sanitary engineer in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Lawrence M. Fisher to be a sanitary engineer in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Howard N. Old to be a sanitary engineer in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Frank R. Shaw to be a sanitary engineer in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Leonard Greenburg to be a sanitary engineer in the grade of surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Arthur L. Dopmeyer to be a passed assistant sanitary engineer in the grade of passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Edmund C. Sullivan to be a passed assistant sanitary engineer in the grade of passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Arthur P. Miller to be a passed assistant sanitary engineer in the grade of passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Frederic J. Moss to be a passed assistant sanitary engineer in the grade of passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Asst. Surg. John R. Murdock to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 12, 1930.

Dr. Elmer A. Carberry to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 1, 1930.

Dr. Roy R. Jones to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 1, 1930.

Dr. Calvin C. Applewhite to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 1, 1930.

Dr. Roy E. Bodet to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 1, 1930.

Dr. Frank V. Meriwether to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 1, 1930.

Dr. Walter G. Nelson to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 1, 1930.

Asst. Surg. Hiram J. Bush to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 16, 1930.

Asst. Surg. Houston G. Foster to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 16, 1930.

Asst. Surg. Samuel J. Hall to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 16, 1930.

Asst. Surg. Edgar W. Norris to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 16, 1930.

Asst. Surg. Donald P. Ross to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 16, 1930.

Asst. Surg. Aubrey E. Snowe to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 16, 1930.

Asst. Surgeon Richard B. Holt to be a passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 20, 1930.

Henry A. Johnson to be a passed assistant sanitary engineer in the grade of passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Omar C. Hopkins to be assistant sanitary engineer in the grade of assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

William L. Stearns to be assistant pharmacist in the grade of assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Frank L. Gibson to be assistant pharmacist in the grade of assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Newton C. Comfort to be assistant pharmacist in the grade of assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Carl Stier to be assistant pharmacist in the grade of assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Clarence H. Bierman to be assistant pharmacist in the grade of assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Walter H. Keen to be assistant pharmacist in the grade of assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Raymond D. Kinsey to be assistant pharmacist in the grade of assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

Thomas C. Armstrong to be assistant pharmacist in the grade of assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 5, 1930.

These officers are now serving under temporary commissions issued during the recess of the Senate.

COAST GUARD

The following-named officers in the Coast Guard of the United States:

John T. Stanley to be a temporary ensign, to rank as such from July 28, 1930.

William I. Swanston to be a temporary ensign, to rank as such from July 30, 1930.

Clyde G. Tarkenton to be a temporary ensign, to rank as such from July 28, 1930.

Arthur M. Root, jr., to be a temporary ensign, to rank as such from July 28, 1930.

Chief Boatswain (Life Saving) Ward W. Bennett to be a district commander, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank as such from September 1, 1930, in place of Gus B. Lofberg, retired.

Harry N. Renshaw to be a temporary ensign, to rank as such from August 26, 1930.

William E. Creedon to be a temporary ensign, to rank as such from September 17, 1930.

District Commander, with the rank of lieutenant, Ralph T. Crowley to be a district commander, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank as such from September 10, 1930.

District Commander, with the rank of lieutenant, Martin W. Rasmussen, to be a district commander, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank as such from September 9, 1930.

Gunner John Ask to be a chief gunner, to rank as such from November 1, 1930.

Lieutenant (Junior Grade) Stewart P. Mehlman to be a lieutenant, to rank as such from October 10, 1930.

Henry A. Meyer to be a temporary ensign, to rank as such from November 3, 1930.

These officers are now serving under temporary commissions issued during the recess of the Senate.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY

To be general, while holding office as Chief of Staff of the Army, with rank from November 21, 1930, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 23, 1929

Maj. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, vice Gen. Charles P. Summerall, Chief of Staff, whose term of office expired November 20, 1930.

To be major general

Brig. Gen. George Van Horn Moseley, from September 1, 1930, vice Maj. Gen. Henry D. Todd, retired from active service August 31, 1930.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Manus McCloskey, Field Artillery, from September 1, 1930, vice Brig. Gen. George V. H. Moseley, who accepted appointment as major general September 1, 1930.

Col. Stanley Hamer Ford, Infantry, from September 1, 1930, vice Brig. Gen. William W. Harts, retired from active service August 31, 1930.

Col. Stanley Dunbar Embick, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 1, 1930, vice Brig. Gen. Herbert O. Williams, retired from active service August 31, 1930.

Col. Herbert Jay Brees, Cavalry, from November 1, 1930, vice Brig. Gen. Charles J. Symmonds, retired from active service October 31, 1930.

Col. James Kelly Parsons, Infantry, from December 1, 1930, vice Brig. Gen. Frank M. Caldwell, retired from active service November 30, 1930.

To be assistant to the Chief of Ordnance, with the rank of brigadier general, for the period of four years beginning September 1, 1930, with rank from September 1, 1930

Col. Edwin Dyson Bricker, Ordnance Department, vice Brig. Gen. Colden L.H. Ruggles, assistant to the Chief of Ordnance, retired from active service August 31, 1930.

To be professor of economics, government, and history at the United States Military Academy

Maj. Herman Beukema, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1930, vice Prof. Lucius H. Holt, resigned October 31, 1930.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be first lieutenants

First Lieut. Gustave Everett Ledfors, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from July 2, 1930.

First Lieut. Harry Boaz Ditmore, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Armin Walter Leuschner, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from September 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Ralph Vernon Plew, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from September 13, 1930.

First Lieut. Wayne Glassburn Brandstadt, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from September 15, 1930.

First Lieut. Edward James Kendricks, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Oliver Harold Waltrip, Medical Corps Reserve, with rank from October 1, 1930.

DENTAL CORPS

To be first lieutenants

First Lieut. James Simon Cathroe, Dental Corps Reserve, with rank from August 11, 1930.

First Lieut. Ingolf Bernardt Hauge, Dental Corps Reserve, with rank from September 1, 1930.

First Lieut. John LeRoy Carter, Dental Corps Reserve, with rank from November 4, 1930.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be second lieutenants

Second Lieut. Wesley Watson Bertz, Veterinary Corps Reserve, with rank from August 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Edgerton Lynn Watson, Veterinary Corps Reserve, with rank from August 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Austin Taylor Getz, Veterinary Corps Reserve, with rank from August 1, 1930.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be second lieutenants

Staff Sergt. Cecil Brooks, Medical Department, with rank from August 1, 1930.

Sergt. Homer Clarence McCullough, Medical Department, with rank from August 14, 1930.

Staff Sergt. Charles Boone Hanes, Medical Department, with rank from November 1, 1930.

Staff Sergt. Joseph Carmack, Medical Department, with rank from November 1, 1930.

CHAPLAIN

To be chaplain with the rank of first lieutenant

Maj. Frederick William Hagan, Chaplain Reserve, with rank from July 2, 1930.

REAPPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY

To be Surgeon General

Maj. Gen. Merritte Weber Ireland, Surgeon General, to be Surgeon General, with the rank of major general, for the period of four years, beginning October 30, 1930, with rank from October 4, 1918.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY

TO COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

First Lieut. Escalus Emmert Elliott, Field Artillery, August 14, 1930, with rank from November 23, 1925.

Second Lieut. Albert Eugene Dennis, Signal Corps, July 26, 1930, with rank from June 12, 1930.

TO INFANTRY

Lieut. Col. Thomas Norton Gimperling, Quartermaster Corps, July 28, 1930, with rank from November 1, 1928.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lieut. Leslie Earl Simon, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Ordnance Department), with rank from March 5, 1929.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lieut. James Keller DeArmond, Signal Corps (detailed in Air Corps), July 23, 1930, with rank from June 12, 1925.

Second Lieut. Laurence Sherman Kuter, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), July 23, 1930, with rank from June 14, 1927.

Second Lieut. George McCoy, jr., Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 14, 1927.

Second Lieut. David Peter Laubach, Corps of Engineers (detailed in Air Corps), July 23, 1930, with rank from June 9, 1928.

Second Lieut. James Elbert Briggs, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), July 23, 1930, with rank from June 9, 1928.

Second Lieut. Robert Loyal Easton, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), July 23, 1930, with rank from June 9, 1928.

Second Lieut. Richard Perry O'Keefe, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), July 23, 1930, with rank from June 9, 1928.

Second Lieut. Fred Obediah Tally, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), July 23, 1930, with rank from June 9, 1928.

Second Lieut. Delma Taft Spivey, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), July 23, 1930, with rank from June 9, 1928.

Second Lieut. William Columbus Sams, jr., Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), July 23, 1930, with rank from June 9, 1928.

Second Lieut. Don Zabriskie Zimmerman, Corps of Engineers (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Frederick Rodgers Dent, jr., Corps of Engineers (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Harold Huntley Bassett, Corps of Engineers (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Howard Moore, Corps of Engineers (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. James Lee Majors, Corps of Engineers (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Roger James Browne, Cavalry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Joseph Jennings Ladd, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Thomas Ludwell Bryan, jr., Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. John Knox Poole, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. John Coleman Horton, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Marshall Stanley Roth, Quartermaster Corps (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Rudolph Fink, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Robert Maurice Kraft, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Roy Garfield Cuno, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Frederic Harrison Smith, jr., Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Donald John Keirn, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Donald Wilbur Armagost, Cavalry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Dwight Bahney Schanep, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Robert Moffat Losey, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. John Jackson O'Hara, jr., Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Emery Scott Wetzel, Field Artillery (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. William Ernest Karnes, Cavalry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. William Gilmer Bowyer, Signal Corps (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Edward Auld Dodson, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. John William Stribling, jr., Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Thomas Benton McDonald, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Melie John Coutlee, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Daniel Campbell Doubleday, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Jerald Worden McCoy, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Pearl Harvey Robey, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Charles Glendon Williamson, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. George Putnam Moody, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Keene Watkins, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. John Nicholas Stone, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Phineas Kimball Morrill, jr., Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

Second Lieut. Thomas Richard Lynch, Infantry (detailed in Air Corps), with rank from June 13, 1929.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

To be colonels

Lieut. Col. Raymond Westcott Briggs, Field Artillery, from July 14, 1930.

Lieut. Col. James Lawrence Long, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Ralph Molyneux Mitchell, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Frederick Louis Dengler, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Richard Howard Williams, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Lewis Stoddard Ryan, Field Artillery, from September 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Tilman Campbell, Finance Department, from September 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Thomas Lilley Sherburne, Cavalry, from September 2, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Francis Hicks Lincoln, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. William Henry Wilson, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Augustus Bennett Warfield, Quartermaster Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Edward Dennis Powers, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Howard Lee Landers, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. William Henry Burt, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Arthur Leonard Fuller, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. John Sherman Chambers, Quartermaster Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Laurin Leonard Lawson, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Morris Ernest Locke, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. James Regan, Quartermaster Corps, from November 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Gilbert McKee Allen, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. John Randolph, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. William Hume Clendenin, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Edgar Lee Field, Infantry, from July 14, 1930.

Maj. Jere Baxter, Infantry, from August 1, 1930.

Maj. Frank Kirby Chapin, Cavalry, from September 1, 1930.

Maj. Lloyd Ralston Fredendall, Infantry, from September 1, 1930.

Maj. Rowan Palmer Lemly, Infantry, from September 1, 1930.

Maj. Frank Thorp, jr., Field Artillery, from September 1, 1930.

Maj. Leroy Pierce Collins, Field Artillery, from September 1, 1930.

Maj. Ballard Lyerly, Field Artillery, from September 1, 1930.

Maj. George Albert Wildrick, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 2, 1930.

Maj. Allen Kimberly, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Maj. Thomas Aquila Clark, Ordnance Department, from October 1, 1930.

Maj. Phillip Woodfin Booker, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1930.

Maj. James Alexander O'Connor, Corps of Engineers, from October 1, 1930.

Maj. Lewis Hayes Watkins, Corps of Engineers, from October 1, 1930.

Maj. Richard Park, Corps of Engineers, from October 1, 1930.

Maj. Daniel Isom Sultan, Corps of Engineers, from October 1, 1930, subject to examination required by law.

Maj. John Boursiquat Rose, Ordnance Department, from October 1, 1930.

Maj. Charles Tillman Harris, jr., Ordnance Department, from October 1, 1930.

Maj. Maxwell Murray, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1930.

Maj. William Edgar Shedd, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Maj. Royal Kemp Greene, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Maj. Howard Kendall Loughry, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1930.

Maj. Robert Price Glassburn, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1930.

Maj. Harry Keneth Rutherford, Ordnance Department, from November 1, 1930.

Maj. Paul Jones Horton, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1930.

Maj. Fred Taylor Cruse, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1930, subject to examination required by law.

Maj. James Preston Marley, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1930.

Maj. Robert Arthur, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1930.

Maj. Lucian Dent Booth, Ordnance Department, from November 1, 1930.

Maj. Waldo Charles Potter, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1930.

Maj. Henry Henderson Pfeil, The Adjutant General's Department, from November 1, 1930.

Maj. Clyde Leslie Eastman, Signal Corps, from November 1, 1930.

To be majors

Capt. George Ralph Barker, Infantry, from July 14, 1930.

Capt. John Waldemar Thompson, Infantry, from August 1, 1930.

Capt. Philip Overstreet, Infantry, from August 2, 1930.

Capt. Archie Arrington Farmer, Signal Corps, from September 1, 1930.

Capt. Charles Sabin Ferrin, Field Artillery, from September 1, 1930.

Capt. Edward Lodge McKee, jr., Infantry, from September 1, 1930.

Capt. Joseph Henry Dent, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1930.

Capt. Hugh Williams, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1930.

Capt. John Moultrie Ward, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1930.

Capt. William Tecumseh Haldeman, Cavalry, from September 1, 1930.

Capt. James Michael Grey, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1930.

Capt. Arnold Melville Reeve, Quartermaster Corps, from September 2, 1930.

Capt. William Charles Ocker, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Capt. William Frederick Vollandt, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Capt. Alexander Newton Stark, jr., Infantry, from October 1, 1930.

Capt. Roger Hilsman, Infantry, from October 1, 1930.

Capt. Holmes Ely Dager, Infantry, from October 1, 1930.

Capt. Harry Elmer Fischer, Infantry, from October 1, 1930.

Capt. Roger Williams, jr., Infantry, from October 1, 1930.

Capt. Harry Brandley Hildebrand, Infantry, from October 1, 1930.

Capt. Louis Whorley Hasslock, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1930.

Capt. Henry Alfred Schwarz, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1930.

Capt. Frederick Stone Matthews, Infantry, from October 1, 1930.

Capt. William E. Kepner, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Capt. William Ogden Johnson, Cavalry, from October 1, 1930.

Capt. Marcus Aurelius Smith Ming, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1930.

Capt. Walter Raymond Graham, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Capt. Albert Hovey Peyton, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Capt. James Patrick Murphy, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Capt. Jacob Edward Bechtold, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Capt. Neal Creighton Johnson, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Capt. Norman Pyle Groff, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Capt. Glenn Adelbert Ross, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Capt. Francis Augustus Woolfley, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Capt. Nelson Dingley, 3d, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1930.

Capt. Richard Marshall Winfield, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Capt. Claudius Miller Easley, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Capt. Richard Weaver Hocker, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1930.

To be captains

First Lieut. George Stainback Deaderick, Infantry, from July 3, 1930.

First Lieut. Arthur Dana Elliot, Ordnance Department, from July 14, 1930.

First Lieut. Virgil Hine, Air Corps, from July 14, 1930.

First Lieut. John Paul Richter, Air Corps, from July 19, 1930.

First Lieut. Rene Raimond Studler, Ordnance Department, from July 23, 1930.

First Lieut. Howard Burdette Nurse, Quartermaster Corps, from July 31, 1930.

First Lieut. Oscar Mitchell Massey, Cavalry, from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. John Montgomery Heath, Signal Corps, from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Robert George Howie, Infantry, from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Ralph Wiltamuth, Infantry, from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Einar Nelson Schjerven, Cavalry, from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. John William Irwin, Infantry, from August 2, 1930.

First Lieut. Robert LeRoy Nesbit, Infantry, from August 11, 1930.

First Lieut. Joseph Kahler Evans, Infantry, from August 12, 1930.

First Lieut. Lawrence Haley Caruthers, Field Artillery, from August 13, 1930.

First Lieut. Frank La Rue, Infantry, from September 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Thomas Henry Mills, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Louis Clifford Webster, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1930.

First Lieut. John Beveridge, jr., Air Corps, from September 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Julian Dayton, Infantry, from September 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Elmer Hostetter, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Michael Everett McHugo, Air Corps, from September 1, 1930.

First Lieut. William Mason Wright, jr., Field Artillery, from September 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Glen Dison Gorton, Quartermaster Corps, from September 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Philip Whalley Allison, Field Artillery, from September 1, 1930.

First Lieut. James Lionel Grisham, Air Corps, from September 2, 1930.

First Lieut. Joseph Worthen Proctor, Ordnance Department, from September 17, 1930.

First Lieut. Earl Seeley Hoag, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Vincent James Meloy, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Charles Egbert Branshaw, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Edward Whiting Raley, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Earle Hayden Tonkin, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. James Troy Hutchison, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Ivan Leon Foster, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Edwin Randolph Page, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Abraham Bernard Thumel, Quartermaster Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Harvey Hodges Holland, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Russell Lowell Maughan, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Walter Miller, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. John William Slattery, Ordnance Department, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Charles Emile Stafford, Quartermaster Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Oliver Perry Gothlin, jr., Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Eugene Benjamin Bayley, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Dache McClain Reeves, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Leo Fred Post, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. John Carroll Kennedy, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Oscar George Fegan, Quartermaster Corps, from October 1, 1930.

First Lieut. William Albert Hayward, Air Corps, from November 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Thomas Jefferson Davis, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Edmund Pendleton Gaines, Air Corps, from November 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Harvey William Prosser, Air Corps, from November 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Clayton Lawrence Bissell, Air Corps, from November 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Horace Simpson Kenyon, jr., Air Corps, from November 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Eugene Robert Cowles, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Philip Henry Kron, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

First Lieut. John Francis Alcure, Quartermaster Corps, from November 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Zane Irwin Adair, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Robert Clyde Sanders, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Joseph Henry Hussing, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Wallace Marmaduke Allison, Quartermaster Corps, from November 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Leland Charles Hurd, Air Corps, from November 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Robert Victor Ignico, Air Corps, from November 11, 1930.

First Lieut. Rutledge Maurice Lawson, Infantry, from November 19, 1930.

First Lieut. Leland Ross Hewitt, Air Corps, from November 20, 1930.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Howard Hunt Couch, Air Corps, from July 3, 1930.

Second Lieut. Wilfred Joseph Paul, Air Corps, from July 14, 1930.

Second Lieut. Glenn L. Davasher, Air Corps, from July 14, 1930.

Second Lieut. Charles Stowe Stodter, Signal Corps, from July 16, 1930.

Second Lieut. Charles Henry Barth, jr., Corps of Engineers, from July 19, 1930.

Second Lieut. Standish Weston, Corps of Engineers, from July 23, 1930.

Second Lieut. Raymond Burkholder Oxrieder, Corps of Engineers from July 29, 1930, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Gerald Edward Galloway, Corps of Engineers, from July 31, 1930.

Second Lieut. Harrod George Miller, Signal Corps, from August 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Charles Hare Mason, Corps of Engineers, from August 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Carl Rueben Dutton, Coast Artillery Corps, from August 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. George Kenyon Withers, Corps of Engineers, from August 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Arleigh Todd Bell, Corps of Engineers, from August 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Thomas Leonard Harrold, Cavalry, from August 2, 1930.

Second Lieut. Kenneth William Treacy, Field Artillery, from August 11, 1930.

Second Lieut. Vincent Joseph Esposito, Corps of Engineers, from August 12, 1930.

Second Lieut. Robert Lee Howze, jr., Cavalry, from August 13, 1930.

Second Lieut. Leland Berrel Kuhre, Corps of Engineers, from September 1, 1930, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Colby Maxwell Myers, Corps of Engineers, from September 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Ralph Tibbs Garver, Cavalry, from September 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. William Ludlow Ritchie, Air Corps (transferred from Field Artillery during the recess of the Senate), from September 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Amos Tappan Akerman, Corps of Engineers, from September 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Olive Cass Torbett, Corps of Engineers, from September 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Rogers Alan Gardner, Cavalry, from September 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Albert Harvey Burton, Corps of Engineers, from September 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Bruce Cooper Clarke, Corps of Engineers, from September 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Carl William Meyer, Corps of Engineers, from September 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. John Henry Dulligan, Air Corps, from September 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. David Henry Tulley, Corps of Engineers, from September 2, 1930.

Second Lieut. Walter Grant Bryte, jr., Air Corps, from September 4, 1930.

Second Lieut. Kyril Leighton-Faxford de Gravelines, Coast Artillery Corps, from September 12, 1930.

Second Lieut. Warren Nourse Underwood, Corps of Engineers, from September 17, 1930.

Second Lieut. Miles Merrill Dawson, Corps of Engineers, from September 18, 1930.

Second Lieut. Charles Parsons Nicholas, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Russell Edward Randall, Air Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Carl Warren Holcomb, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Armand Hopkins, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Timothy Lawrence Mulligan, Corps of Engineers, from October 1, 1930, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Finis Ewing Dunaway, jr., Corps of Engineers, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Benjamin Cobb Fowlkes, jr., Corps of Engineers, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. John Wilson Huyssoon, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Frank Gilbert Fraser, Cavalry, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Stanley James Horn, Corps of Engineers, from October 1, 1930, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Frank Andrew Pettit, Corps of Engineers, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. William O'Connor Heacock, Cavalry, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Walter William Hodge, Corps of Engineers, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. William Henry Nutter, Cavalry, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Oscar Carl Maier, Signal Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Ralph Augustus Lincoln, Corps of Engineers, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Gilbert Edward Linkswiler, Corps of Engineers, from October 1, 1930, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Aubrey Strode Newman, Infantry, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Ernest Victor Holmes, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. William Frank Steer, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Wiley Thomas Moore, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Ronald Montgomery Shaw, Cavalry, from October 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Conrad Stanton Babcock, Cavalry, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Thomas Elton Smith, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Alvin Truett Bowers, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. William Henry Bigelow, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Lewis Ackley Riggins, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Willard Lamborn Wright, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. John Frederick Gamber, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Ernest Andrew Barlow, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. John Loomis Chamberlain, jr., Field Artillery, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Frank John Hierholzer, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Carl Frederick Tischbein, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. John Salisbury Fisher, Infantry, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Charles Pearre Cabell, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. James Joseph Deery, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Allen Ward De Wees, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Archer Frank Freund, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Roland Ainslee Browne, Cavalry, from November 1, 1930.

Second Lieut. Milo Howard Matteson, Cavalry, from November 8, 1930.

Second Lieut. William John Carne, Infantry, from November 11, 1930.

Second Lieut. John Stephan Henn, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 19, 1930.

Second Lieut. Henry Randolph Westphalinger, Cavalry, from November 20, 1930.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lieut. Col. Howard Houghton Baily, Medical Corps, from July 8, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Paul Lamar Freeman, Medical Corps, from July 8, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Edgar William Miller, Medical Corps, from July 8, 1930.

To be majors

Capt. Leland Elder Dashiell, Medical Corps, from July 4, 1930.

Capt. George William Reyer, Medical Corps, from July 4, 1930.

Capt. Oscar Thweatt Kirksey, Medical Corps, from July 6, 1930.

Capt. Byron Johnson Peters, Medical Corps, from July 13, 1930.

Capt. Joseph Rogers Darnall, Medical Corps, from July 15, 1930.

Capt. Harold Arthur Kirkham, Medical Corps, from July 20, 1930.

Capt. Henry William Meisch, Medical Corps, from July 24, 1930.

Capt. Leland Oliver Walter Moore, Medical Corps, from July 26, 1930.

Capt. Lewis Bradley Bibb, Medical Corps, from July 30, 1930.

Capt. Arthur Wheeler Drew, Medical Corps, from August 7, 1930.

Capt. Alexander Palmer Kelly, Medical Corps, from August 19, 1930.

Capt. Francis William Gustites, Medical Corps, from August 31, 1930.

Capt. William Samuel Prout, Medical Corps, from September 1, 1930.

Capt. Walter Fleming Hamilton, Medical Corps, from September 3, 1930.

Capt. Elgen Clayton Pratt, Medical Corps, from September 4, 1930.

Capt. Frank Tenny Chamberlin, Medical Corps, from September 6, 1930.

Capt. Harry Ripley Melton, Medical Corps, from September 8, 1930.

Capt. James Martin Miller, Medical Corps, from September 9, 1930.

Capt. Howard Joseph Hutter, Medical Corps, from September 21, 1930.

Capt. Charles Vincent Hart, Medical Corps, from September 22, 1930.

Capt. Irwin Bradfield Smock, Medical Corps, from September 27, 1930.

Capt. David Loran Robeson, Medical Corps, from October 8, 1930.

Capt. Joseph Ignatius Martin, Medical Corps, from October 8, 1930.

Capt. Thomas Randolph McCarley, Medical Corps, from October 12, 1930.

Capt. Alfred Mordecai, Medical Corps, from October 23, 1930.

Capt. William Presley Dingle, Medical Corps, from October 23, 1930.

Capt. James Frank Brooke, Medical Corps, from October 23, 1930.

Capt. Lester Eastwood Beringer, Medical Corps, from October 24, 1930.

Capt. David Lloyd Stewart, Medical Corps, from October 30, 1930.

Capt. John Moorhaj Tamraz, Medical Corps, from November 2, 1930.

Capt. Joseph Aaron Mendelson, Medical Corps, from November 15, 1930.

To be captains

First Lieut. James Patrick Cooney, Medical Corps, from July 17, 1930.

First Lieut. Harvey Francis Hendrickson, Medical Corps, from July 17, 1930.

First Lieut. Louis Holmes Ginn, jr., Medical Corps, from July 17, 1930.

First Lieut. Seth Gayle, jr., Medical Corps, from July 17, 1930.

First Lieut. Howard Sterling McConkie, Medical Corps, from July 23, 1930.

First Lieut. Sam Foster Seeley, Medical Corps, from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. William Draper North, Medical Corps, from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Clifford Veryl Morgan, Medical Corps, from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. William Henry Lawton, Medical Corps, from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. James Elmo Yarbrough, Medical Corps, from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. John Daniel Brumbaugh, Medical Corps, from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Abner Zehm, Medical Corps, from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Walter Frederick Heine, Medical Corps, from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Charles McCabe Downs, Medical Corps, from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. John Winchester Rich, Medical Corps, from August 18, 1930.

First Lieut. Thomas Brown Murphy, Medical Corps, from August 18, 1930.

First Lieut. Huston J. Banton, Medical Corps, from August 18, 1930, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Hervey Burson Porter, Medical Corps, from August 18, 1930.

DENTAL CORPS

To be majors

Capt. John Samuel Ross, Dental Corps, from July 4, 1930.

Capt. Elmer Henry Nicklies, Dental Corps, from July 13, 1930.

Capt. Clarence Walter Johnson, Dental Corps, from August 7, 1930.

Capt. Walter Duncan Love, Dental Corps, from August 14, 1930.

Capt. Egbert Wesley van Delden Cowan, Dental Corps, from September 3, 1930.

Capt. Arthur Edmon Brown, Dental Corps, from September 8, 1930.

Capt. Robert Clyde Craven, Dental Corps, from September 18, 1930.

Capt. Melville Alexander Sanderson, Dental Corps, from September 19, 1930.

Capt. Earl George Gebhardt, Dental Corps, from September 20, 1930.

Capt. Frank Alf Crane, Dental Corps, from September 22, 1930.

Capt. Arne Sorum, Dental Corps, from September 23, 1930.

Capt. Vivian Z. Brown, Dental Corps, from November 1, 1930.

Capt. Henry Allen Winslow, Dental Corps, from November 14, 1930.

Capt. Ernest Frank Sharp, Dental Corps, from November 17, 1930.

Capt. Clarence Roy Benney, Dental Corps, from November 21, 1930.

To be captains

First Lieut. Clarence Price Canby, Dental Corps, from July 15, 1930.

First Lieut. Roger Giles Miller, Dental Corps, from August 15, 1930.

First Lieut. Grant Arthur Selby, Dental Corps, from September 25, 1930.

First Lieut. Leland Stanford Mabry, Dental Corps, from October 26, 1930.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Charles Stunkard Greer, Veterinary Corps, from October 10, 1930.

Second Lieut. John Lloyd Owens, Veterinary Corps, from October 29, 1930.

CHAPLAINS

To be chaplains with the rank of major

Chaplain Edmond Joseph Griffin, from July 3, 1930.

Chaplain Ora Jason Cohee, from October 4, 1930.

To be chaplain with the rank of captain

Chaplain Edward Robert Martin, from October 6, 1930.

PROMOTION IN THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

To be captain

First Lieut. John Willett Smith, Philippine Scouts, from November 1, 1930.

REAPPOINTMENT IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY

GENERAL OFFICER

To be major general, reserves

Maj. Gen. John Francis O'Ryan, reserves, from December 15, 1930.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY

GENERAL OFFICERS

To be brigadier generals, reserves

Brig. Gen. Diller Snyder Myers, Illinois National Guard, from December 1, 1930.

Brig. Gen. John Cecil Persons, Alabama National Guard, from September 23, 1930.

Brig. Gen. Oscar Edwin Roberts, Texas National Guard, from August 18, 1930.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. Ben H. Fuller to be the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps for a period of four years, with rank from July 9, 1930.

Brig. Gen. Rufus H. Lane, the adjutant and inspector, to be the adjutant and inspector of the Marine Corps, with the

rank of brigadier general, for a period of four years from January 2, 1931, with rank from January 2, 1923.

Col. Randolph C. Berkeley to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps from July 9, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Frederick A. Ramsey to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from July 9, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Walter E. Noa, assistant quartermaster, to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps with the rank of colonel from August 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Thomas C. Turner to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from September 1, 1930.

Lieut. Col. Raymond B. Sullivan to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from October 1, 1930.

Maj. Holland M. Smith to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from July 9, 1930.

Maj. John R. Henley to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from August 1, 1930.

Maj. Ralph S. Keyser to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from September 1, 1930.

Maj. Howard W. Stone to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from September 29, 1930.

Maj. Maurice E. Shearer to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from October 1, 1930.

Capt. Peter C. Geyer to be a major in the Marine Corps from July 1, 1930.

Capt. James E. Davis to be a major in the Marine Corps from July 9, 1930.

Capt. Lloyd L. Leech to be a major in the Marine Corps from August 1, 1930.

Capt. Raphael Griffin to be a major in the Marine Corps from September 1, 1930.

Capt. Karl I. Buse to be a major in the Marine Corps from September 29, 1930.

Capt. Harold S. Fassett to be a major in the Marine Corps from October 1, 1930.

Capt. Arthur Kingston to be a major in the Marine Corps from November 5, 1930.

The following captains to be captains in the Marine Corps to correct the dates from which they take rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Alfred C. Cottrell from May 12, 1929.

John T. Selden from May 13, 1929.

Elmer E. Hall from May 16, 1929.

Henry A. Carr from June 1, 1929.

Orrel A. Inman from June 2, 1929.

Frank S. Flack from June 30, 1929.

Henry F. Adams from November 12, 1929.

Charles W. Henkle from November 27, 1929.

Solon C. Kemon from December 26, 1929.

Harry B. Liversedge from December 28, 1929.

Merton J. Batchelder from January 17, 1930.

George E. Monson from February 10, 1930.

Arthur D. Challacombe from March 1, 1930.

William J. Mosher from March 2, 1930.

Harry W. Bacon from June 29, 1930.

First Lieut. Howard M. Peter to be a captain in the Marine Corps from November 5, 1929.

First Lieut. George A. Plambeck to be a captain in the Marine Corps from November 6, 1929.

First Lieut. Joseph F. Burke to be a captain in the Marine Corps from April 2, 1930.

First Lieut. Marvin Scott to be a captain in the Marine Corps from May 12, 1930.

First Lieut. James W. Flett to be a captain in the Marine Corps from June 1, 1930.

First Lieut. William C. Hall to be a captain in the Marine Corps from June 30, 1930.

First Lieut. Arnold C. Larsen to be a captain in the Marine Corps from July 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Rees Skinner to be a captain in the Marine Corps from July 9, 1930.

First Lieut. William J. Wallace to be a captain in the Marine Corps from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. William F. Brown to be a captain in the Marine Corps from August 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Amor LeR. Sims to be a captain in the Marine Corps from September 1, 1930.

First Lieut. Moses J. Gould to be a captain in the Marine Corps from September 2, 1930.

Second Lieut. Charles G. Meints to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from November 27, 1929.

Second Lieut. Alexander W. Kreiser, jr., to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from December 26, 1929.

Second Lieut. Thomas J. McQuade to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from January 16, 1930.

Marine Gunner Fred O. Brown to be a chief marine gunner in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant from October 18, 1929.

Marine Gunner Horace Talbot to be a chief marine gunner in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant from March 9, 1930.

Quartermaster Clerk Edward F. Connors to be a chief quartermaster clerk in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant from May 14, 1930.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

George W. Hall to be postmaster at Calhoun, Ala. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

James R. Beall to be postmaster at Coffeeville, Ala. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Sister Mary Stephen to be postmaster at Holy Trinity, Ala., in place of Sister Mary Loreto, resigned.

Edith J. Ray to be postmaster at Munford, Ala. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Ethel M. Fowler to be postmaster at Theodore, Ala. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

ALASKA

Josephine C. Spickett to be postmaster at Juneau, Alaska, in place of J. C. Spickett. Incumbent's commission expired May 14, 1930.

Lillian H. White to be postmaster at Kodiak, Alaska. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

ARIZONA

William P. Shrodt to be postmaster at Ashfork, Ariz., in place of Winchester Dickerson, resigned.

ARKANSAS

James A. Morris, jr., to be postmaster at Dermott, Ark., in place of C. G. Nielsen, deceased.

Ted M. Anderson to be postmaster at Evening Shade, Ark. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Urelle O. Thomasson to be postmaster at Leachville, Ark., in place of C. W. Swihart, deceased.

Jerry T. Baxter to be postmaster at Melbourne, Ark., in place of R. B. Landers. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1930.

Benjamin B. Horton to be postmaster at Montrose, Ark. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Louis D. Bledsoe to be postmaster at Mountain Pine, Ark. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

John H. McPherson to be postmaster at Paragould, Ark., in place of Herschel Neely. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1930.

Vernon C. Paul to be postmaster at Parkin, Ark., in place of I. L. Carter, removed.

William H. Taylor to be postmaster at Van Buren, Ark., in place of W. H. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1930.

Jesse C. Bogy to be postmaster at Wabbaseka, Ark., in place of F. W. Whitner, resigned.

William Smith to be postmaster at Wilmot, Ark., in place of N. E. deYampert. Incumbent's commission expired June 14, 1930.

CALIFORNIA

Cornelius van Kaathoven to be postmaster at Aptos, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Edith W. Chambles to be postmaster at Arvin, Calif., in place of J. E. Stroud, removed.

Louis C. De Armond to be postmaster at Blairsden, Calif., in place of L. C. De Armond. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Alton W. Jeffus to be postmaster at Brawley, Calif., in place of Nellie Pellet. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1930.

Mildred O. Pickering to be postmaster at Greenfield, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

John A. Liggett to be postmaster at Korbelt, Calif., in place of J. A. Liggett. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Leonard P. Russell to be postmaster at Maricopa, Calif., in place of U. S. Bock, resigned.

Marie J. Smoot to be postmaster at Mendota, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Vin I. Renick to be postmaster at Owensmouth, Calif., in place of Frank Fesler. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Emma Kessler to be postmaster at San Lorenzo, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Franklin B. Holder to be postmaster at Santee, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

James E. Pharr to be postmaster at Scotia, Calif., in place of J. E. Pharr. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Rosa A. Printz to be postmaster at Simi, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Daisy L. Plant to be postmaster at Spreckels, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Theodore W. Cox to be postmaster at Westmoreland, Calif., in place of M. K. Cummings, deceased.

COLORADO

George F. Wilson to be postmaster at Phippsburg, Colo. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Fred M. Marsh to be postmaster at Wellington, Colo., in place of F. D. Aldridge, removed.

CONNECTICUT

James W. Gilson to be postmaster at Hartford, Conn., in place of H. K. Taylor, resigned.

Frank E. Collins to be postmaster at Rockfall, Conn. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Inez J. Standish to be postmaster at Somersville, Conn., in place of M. L. Van Camp, resigned.

FLORIDA

William B. Wingate to be postmaster at Callahan, Fla., in place of W. B. Wingate. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Isabelle H. Boyd to be postmaster at Clermont, Fla., in place of J. H. Boyd. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1930.

William T. Graves to be postmaster at Cottondale, Fla., in place of W. T. Graves. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1930.

Edgar M. Pyle to be postmaster at Dania, Fla., in place of I. C. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired April 10, 1930.

Pauline F. Colley to be postmaster at Florence Villa, Fla., in place of P. F. Colley. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Albertus A. Kurfiss to be postmaster at Groveland, Fla., in place of J. H. Trent, resigned.

Donald A. Flye to be postmaster at Haines City, Fla., in place of D. A. Flye. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1930.

Henry G. Nelson to be postmaster at Williston, Fla., in place of H. G. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1930.

Fred E. Hall to be postmaster at Winter Haven, Fla., in place of E. J. Yonally. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1930.

GEORGIA

Gladys E. Love to be postmaster at Marshallville, Ga., in place of J. V. Frederick, deceased.

IDAHO

Berkeley R. Sellers to be postmaster at Gibbs, Idaho. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

ILLINOIS

Ray R. Staubus to be postmaster at Cissna Park, Ill., in place of John Reineke. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

James E. Lee to be postmaster at Findlay, Ill., in place of W. W. Harbert, resigned.

Gustav C. Michael to be postmaster at Hoyleton, Ill., in place of L. F. Hake. Incumbent's commission expired May 14, 1930.

Archie A. Colby to be postmaster at Lee, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Oscar M. Phares to be postmaster at Le Roy, Ill., in place of P. D. Barnum. Incumbent's commission expired May 18, 1930.

Arlington B. Gittings to be postmaster at Lomax, Ill., in place of W. R. Gaddis, resigned.

Mary Smith to be postmaster at North Aurora, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Jacob A. Hirsbrunner to be postmaster at Olivet, Ill., in place of J. A. Hirsbrunner. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

George W. Martin to be postmaster at St. Anne, Ill., in place of G. F. Allain. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1930.

John Gray to be postmaster at Urbana, Ill., in place of O. L. Browder, resigned.

INDIANA

Harry C. Watts to be postmaster at Aurora, Ind., in place of H. C. Watts. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1930.

Charles W. Bard to be postmaster at Crothersville, Ind., in place of E. W. Krause, resigned.

Clyde H. Siekerman to be postmaster at Dillsboro, Ind., in place of C. H. Siekerman. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1930.

William C. Seng to be postmaster at Dubois, Ind. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Fred E. May to be postmaster at Haubstadt, Ind., in place of C. H. Magenheimer. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1930.

Claude B. Thomas to be postmaster at Moores Hill, Ind., in place of C. B. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Francis W. Homan to be postmaster at Reynolds, Ind., in place of J. W. Gardner, deceased.

Robert P. White to be postmaster at Sullivan, Ind., in place of R. P. White. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

IOWA

Leah F. Cookinham to be postmaster at Ayrshire, Iowa, in place of C. H. Cookinham, deceased.

Tena S. Healy to be postmaster at Britt, Iowa, in place of C. F. Wigton. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

Elsie Sierck to be postmaster at Everly, Iowa, in place of Elsie Sierck. Incumbent's commission expired June 30, 1930.

Raymond F. Sargent to be postmaster at Fonda, Iowa, in place of R. F. Sargent. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1930.

Alva M. Kepler to be postmaster at Kalona, Iowa, in place of F. E. Bourgeois. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1930.

Lera Hinzman to be postmaster at Riceville, Iowa, in place of F. E. Dunton, deceased.

Charles H. Swisher to be postmaster at Sully, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Cora J. Jacobsen to be postmaster at Wilton Junction, Iowa, in place of C. H. Jacobsen, resigned.

KANSAS

Otis N. Taylor to be postmaster at Kanorado, Kans., in place of L. F. Heston, resigned.

Tom W. Davis to be postmaster at Shawnee, Kans. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

KENTUCKY

Luther S. Safriet to be postmaster at Gatliff, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Phoebe Howard to be postmaster at Salyersville, Ky., in place of Phoebe Howard. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Lisle B. Hanna to be postmaster at Shelbyville, Ky., in place of S. C. Hedden. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Russell M. Tewell to be postmaster at Walton, Ky., in place of A. R. Edwards, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Richard E. Bynum to be postmaster at Arabi, La., in place of N. R. Mysing. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1930.

Isaac C. Fife to be postmaster at Bastrop, La., in place of Tina Collins. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1930.

Jay T. Boone to be postmaster at Boyce, La., in place of J. T. Boone. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Paul T. Thibodaux to be postmaster at Donaldsonville, La., in place of P. T. Thibodaux. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1930.

Irma M. Perret to be postmaster at Edgard, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Viola H. Reed to be postmaster at Epps, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Robert S. Butler to be postmaster at Port Allen, La., in place of Cherie Cazes. Incumbent's commission expired June 14, 1930.

Mary J. Goodwine to be postmaster at St. Joseph, La., in place of E. H. Biggs, resigned.

Robert E. Loudon to be postmaster at Zachary, La., in place of R. E. Loudon. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1930.

MAINE

Edward H. Snow to be postmaster at Blue Hill, Me., in place of H. A. Saunders, deceased.

Harland G. Hoffses to be postmaster at Jefferson, Me. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Nettie A. True to be postmaster at New Gloucester, Me. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

MASSACHUSETTS

Esther K. Whitcomb to be postmaster at Bolton, Mass., in place of C. M. Everett, resigned.

Alexander F. Gray to be postmaster at Charles River, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Margaret Poole to be postmaster at Island Creek, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Edward F. Earle to be postmaster at Rehoboth, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Hattie M. Crowell to be postmaster at South Yarmouth, Mass., in place of J. W. Crowell, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Roy Kanouse to be postmaster at Ashton, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

George P. Siagkris to be postmaster at Base Line, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Harry L. Hansen to be postmaster at Big Bay, Mich., in place of H. C. D. Ashford, resigned.

Thomas B. Townsend to be postmaster at Grand Ledge, Mich., in place of A. J. Bills. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1930.

Hans Kunow to be postmaster at Greenbush, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

George A. McNicol to be postmaster at Hillman, Mich., in place of G. A. McNicol. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1929.

Harry J. Skinner to be postmaster at McMillan, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Claude W. Till to be postmaster at Mears, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Bessie Dunbar to be postmaster at Potterville, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Merle E. Houghtby to be postmaster at Spring Arbor, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

MINNESOTA

Harold E. Bowers to be postmaster at Benson, Minn., in place of E. A. Hanson, deceased.

Vivy Johnson to be postmaster at Richville, Minn., in place of E. R. Tucker, removed.

MISSISSIPPI

William R. Anderson to be postmaster at Baldwyn, Miss., in place of T. J. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1929.

J. Rivers Burks to be postmaster at Byhalia, Miss., in place of G. D. Myers. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1930.

John R. Childress to be postmaster at Flora, Miss., in place of J. E. Lane. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1930.

Everett T. Batten to be postmaster at Hattiesburg, Miss., in place of E. A. Kernaghan. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1930.

Jefferson D. Fogg to be postmaster at Hernando, Miss., in place of J. D. Fogg. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1929.

George H. Flowers to be postmaster at Kilmichael, Miss., in place of G. H. Flowers. Incumbent's commission expired June 7, 1930.

Allan McCants to be postmaster at Meridian, Miss., in place of C. J. Hyde. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1930.

Benjamin C. Feigler to be postmaster at Philipp, Miss., in place of B. C. Feigler. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

William J. Peel to be postmaster at Shaw, Miss., in place of Elizabeth Collier, resigned.

Herbert G. Laudon to be postmaster at Waveland, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Ida M. Turnage to be postmaster at Zama, Miss., in place of I. M. Turnage. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

MISSOURI

Laura J. England to be postmaster at Glenwood, Mo. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Curtis N. Houston to be postmaster at Grain Valley, Mo., in place of R. C. Remley. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Henry E. Folluo to be postmaster at Manchester, Mo., in place of O. W. Kuehne, deceased.

Raymond J. Tomlinson to be postmaster at Morley, Mo., in place of Leonard Ford. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1930.

Amiel A. Weitkamp to be postmaster at Moscow Mills, Mo. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Lawrence L. Glover to be postmaster at Newark, Mo., in place of L. L. Glover. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1930.

MONTANA

Lyman E. Ferry to be postmaster at Somers, Mont., in place of A. M. Engle, removed.

Harrison M. Sperry to be postmaster at Townsend, Mont., in place of W. J. Hazelton, removed.

NEBRASKA

Irving E. Tilgner to be postmaster at Lewellen, Nebr., in place of L. O. Roblee, resigned.

NEVADA

Vincent J. Ruse to be postmaster at Goldfield, Nev., in place of B. M. Weaver, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Lena F. Carr to be postmaster at Bradford, N. H., in place of R. S. Moore, resigned.

Carroll N. Young to be postmaster at West Stewartstown, N. H., in place of F. H. Elliott, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Louis A. Streit to be postmaster at East Orange, N. J., in place of L. A. Streit. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1930.

Elizabeth MacBair to be postmaster at Essex Fells, N. J., in place of E. C. Woodworth, resigned.

Evelyn Cubberley to be postmaster at Hamilton Square, N. J., in place of M. E. Cubberley, deceased.

Horatio N. Denby to be postmaster at Laurel Springs, N. J., in place of E. D. McGarrey, resigned.

Caddie F. Olt to be postmaster at Marlton, N. J., in place of A. M. Harkness, removed.

Mary F. Beach to be postmaster at Montville, N. J. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Carl M. Ekholm to be postmaster at Neshanic Station, N. J., in place of D. C. R. Hoff, resigned.

Sanford W. Souders to be postmaster at Riegelsville, N. J. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

August A. Kleuser to be postmaster at Singac, N. J., in place of Robert Young, appointee, declined.

Lester L. Jacobus to be postmaster at Towaco, N. J. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

J. Wynne Kelley to be postmaster at Tuckerton, N. J., in place of C. R. Cox, resigned.

Tunis Sweetman to be postmaster at Wortendyke, N. J., in place of H. A. Depuy, resigned.

NEW MEXICO

Emmet Wirt to be postmaster at Dulce, N. Mex. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Gertrude W. Boyd to be postmaster at New Hobbs, N. Mex. Office became presidential October 1, 1930.

NEW YORK

Frank P. Redfield to be postmaster at Adams, N. Y., in place of D. F. Griggs, resigned.

M. Romiett Masten to be postmaster at Athens, N. Y., in place of C. L. Masten, deceased.

Fred A. Shoemaker to be postmaster at Averill Park, N. Y., in place of F. A. Shoemaker. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1930.

Caroline K. Lenz to be postmaster at Cheektowaga, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Ogden L. Harding to be postmaster at Chenango Bridge, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Ella E. Lewis to be postmaster at Clarkson, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Arthur N. Fero to be postmaster at Esperance, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Avery H. Wilcox to be postmaster at Gasport, N. Y., in place of G. D. Ackerson. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1930.

Leon A. Currey to be postmaster at Geneva, N. Y., in place of R. H. Gulvin. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

Mary E. Redman to be postmaster at Hamlin, N. Y., in place of M. E. Redman. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Robert A. Montague to be postmaster at Henderson, N. Y., in place of M. B. McCumber, deceased.

Joseph N. Atwater to be postmaster at King Ferry, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Edward L. Merritt to be postmaster at Kingston, N. Y., in place of W. P. Crane. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1928.

Wayne G. Vary to be postmaster at Lima, N. Y., in place of V. E. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1930.

Arnol G. H. Bryan to be postmaster at Loudonville, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Emery Jenkins to be postmaster at Margaretville, N. Y., in place of G. E. Gladstone, deceased.

Frank C. Percival to be postmaster at Mount Upton, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

George C. Smith to be postmaster at Pine Hill, N. Y., in place of H. A. Cole, deceased.

Minnie F. Anderson to be postmaster at Randolph, N. Y., in place of F. L. Seager, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Gail E. Wing to be postmaster at Camargo, Okla., in place of G. E. Wing. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

George Wehrenberg to be postmaster at Lovell, Okla. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

PENNSYLVANIA

Marshall Troutman to be postmaster at Clearville, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Alice B. Carrick to be postmaster at Loupurex, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Thomas McLeister to be postmaster at Philadelphia, Pa., in place of G. E. Kemp, resigned.

John H. Watson to be postmaster at Turtle Creek, Pa. Office established July 1, 1929.

RHODE ISLAND

Oscar R. Parr to be postmaster at Chepachet, R. I. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

James F. Harrod to be postmaster at Wallum Lake, R. I. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Grace S. Croome to be postmaster at West Kingston, R. I. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

SOUTH CAROLINA

George E. Munn to be postmaster at Lake City, S. C., in place of E. L. Isenhower, resigned.

Mary E. Morris to be postmaster at Pickens, S. C., in place of E. D. Kirksey. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1930.

Ira S. Holden to be postmaster at Walhalla, S. C., in place of W. B. Aull. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1930.

TENNESSEE

Charles H. Bewley to be postmaster at Greeneville, Tenn., in place of C. H. Bewley. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1930.

Alexander H. Hill to be postmaster at Harrogate, Tenn., in place of John Herd. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1930.

Oren B. Zachry to be postmaster at Livingston, Tenn., in place of T. F. Stephens, deceased.

TEXAS

Austin Davis to be postmaster at Cushing, Tex., in place of W. B. McCrary, deceased.

James Flanagan to be postmaster at Mabank, Tex., in place of Lee Gray. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

Ruel D. Dunn to be postmaster at Plano, Tex., in place of C. D. Razor, removed.

Mamie Dyer to be postmaster at Tolar, Tex., in place of Mamie Dyer. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1930.

WASHINGTON

Charles T. LeWarne to be postmaster at Bellevue, Wash., in place of R. E. Blackwood, resigned.

Walter M. Hubbell to be postmaster at Spokane, Wash., in place of T. J. Smith, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Edgar Leissring to be postmaster at New Butler, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock, noon.

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

O Infinite Power of Love, we praise Thee that a new day is full of sublime significance. It is the breath of God flowing out of one eternity into another. Let to-day smile to greet us with new opportunities for doing good and being good. Thou who knowest the unexpressed desires of every heart, grant us the things that are good and helpful. Give us the power of realizing more of that which belongs to our

spiritual natures; let us feel the tremulous touches of heavenly joy. Always may character and conscience have their ways in the defense of the Republic and in the perpetuity of righteous government. In the name of 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 the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 343

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES F. CURRY, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate Resolution 344

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN FRANCIS QUAYLE, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate Resolution 345

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES M. STEDMAN, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate Resolution 346

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM C. HAMMER, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate Resolution 347

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. OTIS WINGO, late a Representative from the State of Arkansas.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now adjourn.

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD

Mr. KORELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the tariff.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the tariff. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent election was in many respects unique. Since my return to Washington I have found that many of my colleagues are inquisitive to learn about the particular issues that were stressed in the congressional campaigns throughout the country. Accordingly, under leave to extend my remarks, I will restate the substance of several talks that I made in the course of my own campaign in the third Oregon congressional district.

THE TARIFF

After months of painstaking study on the part of a great many statesmen and after a great deal of debate the tariff bill has been passed and has become the law of the land.

Perhaps never in the history of the Republic has a tariff bill been subject to such bitter attack, to so much vituperation and misrepresentation. All sorts of arguments were brought against the proposed bill, and the attacks in many of the metropolitan newspapers of the East, inspired by various interests, continued down to the day the bill was signed by President Hoover. Many charges were misleading

and made out of whole cloth; many of the arguments advanced by the free traders were contradictory.

For instance, they told the farmers that the bill would not protect them, that it would not bring them more money for the farm products but would increase their cost of living, without compensation. Then they told the workers in the city that the tariff on farm products would make prices of foodstuffs in the city so high that the workers would no longer exist. They charged that our foreign trade would shrivel and die, that foreign nations would refuse to buy our goods and would make all sorts of retaliatory measures against us.

Most of these arguments, however, are as old as the free trade fallacy itself, and they had little weight on the Republican majority in Congress. For the free traders are fond of predicting calamities. It is their favorite occupation. When the tariff bill of 1922 was passed they told us our foreign trade would die, that Europe would be unable to pay anything on its debts. Page advertisements were run in many newspapers predicting that the tariff would make the cost of clothing so high the ordinary man would be unable to buy a suit when the one on his back had worn out. Now, what happened after 1922? We entered on one of the greatest periods of prosperity in our entire history. Our foreign trade grew by leaps and bounds, and the cost of living commenced going downward so that the dollar of the worker and the farmer would year after year buy more and more of the necessities of life.

The calamity howlings of the free traders, as usual finding shelter in the Democratic Party, proved untrue again, just as they have proved untrue since the days of the founding of the Republic, when it was argued by free traders that we ought not to start any factories in America because this would interfere with farming.

Every time there is a proposal to revise the tariff the free traders rallying around the Democratic Party, and the Democratic press, become very solicitous about European trade and the welfare of Europe. They seem to think that this international view makes them broad minded. Well, it may make them broad minded, but it does not give them any depth.

And so they charged that this abominable tariff bill of 1930 was the highest in all history, so high that it would dry up our foreign trade and bring us the enmity of the rest of the world. Now, what are the facts about this tariff? Does it build a tariff wall which shuts us off from the rest of the world?

It is pretty generally agreed that the tariff law of 1922 was no longer protective in many schedules. Yet of the 3,295 items in the old tariff law, 2,170 were left unchanged. Duties were increased on only 890 articles; they were decreased on 235. Duties collected on all items in the tariff schedules average about 16 per cent as compared with 14 per cent under the tariff of 1922 and 23 per cent under the McKinley law. And then stop for a moment to consider that under the Wilson tariff law—that masterpiece of Democratic statesmanship back in Coxey's army days—the duties collected averaged 21 per cent, or 5 per cent more than under the iniquitous tariff law of 1930!

Of the tariff laws passed in the past 40 years, only two have had lower average tariffs than this—the Underwood law and the law of 1922, which has just been repealed by the new act.

Furthermore, the percentage of our imports entering duty free under the new law will be about the same as under the law of 1922, and this is about 64 per cent. Only about a third of our imports pay duty, anyhow. So much for this high wall which the Republican administration has erected to shut us off from the outside world.

The new tariff law will help America, not by erecting an unscalable wall, but by giving to the farmer and the other producers who needed it an additional protection by putting them on equal terms with the producers in the rest of the world.

Then there has been great agony among our free-trade Democratic brethren because we are imposing handicaps

against the business men of other lands. These foreign producers are philanthropists. They keep their labor ground down to a starvation wage just for the purpose of reselling us goods at low prices. And they are grievously pained that we are unfeeling enough to erect any tariff barriers seeking to protect the standard of living of our American producers, so they would have us believe. Yet, what are the facts? You will be surprised to hear them. Official Government figures covering imports last year show that Uncle Sam collects less than half as much per capita in tariffs as does "free trade" Great Britain, less than half as much as "abused Argentina," less than half as much as Norway, and less than other nations our Democratic friends have been pitying so much. We have heard a great deal of how Canada will suffer because of the barriers erected by our new tariff. Yet mark this: Under our new tariff we will collect just about one-fourth as much tariff per capita as Canada collects and about one-fourth as much as Australia.

The official figures of our Government show that under the new tariff law based on 1928 imports we will collect about \$5.17 per capita. Now in 1928 Australia collected \$22.65 per capita, Canada \$20.46 per capita, Norway \$10.49 per capita, Argentina \$11.68 per capita, and the United Kingdom \$12.86 per capita.

Under the new tariff law, based on 1928 import figures, our tariff collections will be 15.43 per cent of the value of our total imports, while Australia's collections will be 20.31 per cent of the total value of her imports as of June 30, 1928, but much higher under the Australian tariff law now prevailing. Canada's collections will be 15.84 per cent of the total value of her imports; Argentina's 16.13 per cent; Poland's 13.31 per cent; Italy's 11.8 per cent; Norway's 10.79 per cent; United Kingdom's 10.08 per cent; and Spain's tariff law is twice as high as that of the United States. Our country seems to have, under the law of 1930, less than the average world tariff, though it is the only country with so high a wage standard, therefore, having real need for a protective tariff based on its higher standard of living while Europe does not.

It is to be remembered, too, that European countries have many methods of handicapping foreign as compared with domestic commerce, and these practices are not in vogue in the United States. Yet we will have all this propaganda about retaliation by foreign nations who already restrict foreign commerce more than we do.

If these foreign nations want to induce us to lower our tariffs, let them raise the wages of their workmen to the American standard so that we will not need protection. They will then find, too, that they have created a real market at home just as have the producers in the United States. But they will not do it.

In view of the facts, why have we then had this vicious misrepresentation of our new tariff? The reason is not hard to find. The simon-pure theoretical free-traders are no longer numerous enough or powerful enough to do it. The attack has come not only from importers, anxious to dominate the great American market, but from American internationalist capitalists who have now invested so much money abroad in European industries and European production that they are chiefly interested in a return on their foreign investments and are willing to turn the rich American market over to the poorly paid laborer of Europe and the pauper labor of the Orient in order to get dividends from abroad.

They will not be successful, but if they were they would only be killing the goose which laid the golden egg; for the destruction of American production by foreign competition would also destroy the great American market which is created by our prosperous people, and there would then be no great buying power in America for the internationalist capitalists to exploit with their cheaply made foreign goods. If European interests could only see it, they would realize that their market in America depends not on idle American factories but on a prosperous American people who are able to buy American-made goods and oriental and tropical lux-

uries and necessities only because they are well employed at a high wage. That this is true is evidenced by the fact that since the industrial slump in America this year our purchases of foreign goods have greatly fallen off. Our foreign trade increases only when our people are busy and prosperous.

The argument that the tariff increases the cost of living was proved fallacious by the results of the 1922 tariff, which gave us protection following the Democratic Underwood law. Living costs declined, and declined because production and competition were stimulated at home. And, strange to say, the increases in prices which came were in nearly every instance on commodities which came in duty free. Take rubber and coffee, for instances. In these two commodities foreign interests were able to regulate the price and charge Americans what they pleased. The reason was that Uncle Sam could not produce these articles for himself and was at the mercy of foreign production. The question of tariff did not enter in. We all remember the crude-rubber combination which was checkmated by these wise policies of President Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce.

The theory that our protective policies interfere with foreign trade was disproved, too, by the tariff of 1922. Our foreign commerce flourished and grew on protection. The old argument that we must buy from each individual nation as much as we sell is outworn. Foreign trade is no longer a question of trade between any two nations. For instance, we may sell more to Great Britain than we buy from her. On the other hand, Great Britain may sell more to Brazil than she buys from Brazil, and we, in turn, may buy more from Brazil than we sell to her. And so all around the world. It is true that our exports have steadily exceeded our imports. Yet we have not succeeded in acquiring all the gold in the world. For there is an invisible flow of wealth from America. Each year our tourists spend millions upon millions in foreign lands and aliens in America send back to the old countries additional millions to relatives and friends. So when the year is over the books just about balance, and the old Democratic theory of how our protective tariff upsets the balance of world trade proves to be just so much more bunk.

And, above all, it is to be remembered that practically 90 per cent of our production is consumed in the United States. Why should we, then, in a vain and elusive effort to increase the 10 per cent, let go of the 90 per cent, comprising the greatest and richest market in the history of the world? To do so would be about on a par with the action of the stupid mastiff who saw his reflection in the water and dropped the piece of meat he was carrying in a vain effort to get a bigger one.

The fact is that the productive theories of America and Europe are different. We produce primarily for home consumption, because we have a great market of more than 120,000,000 prosperous people. We believe that by paying high wages and constantly increasing the standard of living we increase the demand for our goods at home and make our people happier and more prosperous, giving them constantly more and more of the good things of life. In Europe production is based on foreign trade. The home market is neglected and everything is designed to sell abroad. Consequently the great aim is cheapness in order to undersell the other fellow. And to produce cheapness there must be the lowest wage scale possible with human existence. We believe our theory is the better one and we do not intend to risk it by lowering the barriers to permit an inflow of goods produced at starvation wages in Europe.

Now, do not misunderstand me. I am not decrying foreign trade. We must and will increase our foreign trade, but not at the sacrifice of the home market. We will be able to compete abroad because our tremendous output, designed to supply the great purchasing power in America, will enable us to compete with our European friends.

But, after all, the great future of our foreign trade is not in Europe. It is in Latin America, in Japan and China, Australia and the Orient. Here is the great market of the future, and in developing it along sound, constructive lines

our ports on the Atlantic and the Pacific will become bigger, better, and finer in every way.

In spite of the protective tariff law of 1922, the Nation last year ran into a business recession. The reason is not hard to find. With the increasing wage scale in America and the increasing efficiency of production in Europe, the time came when the rates in the law of 1922 were no longer sufficient to give the American producer an even chance in our market in the face of mounting European production. This was true not only of manufacturing but in an equal or greater degree of agriculture.

The proof of this statement is not hard to find. Go into any store and examine the goods sold in the various departments. Note how much of it has been manufactured in Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, in Germany, or in Japan. All of these wares signify American workmen out of jobs and American money flowing into Europe. Small wonder, then, that at last business slumped and a new tariff law was necessary. Indeed, the necessity was envisioned long before the slump came, and had the new tariff law been passed as expeditiously as it should have been passed, the depression would have been lessened and we would have got on to the high road of recovery much sooner. This holding up of the tariff remedy was not due to the Republican administration, my friends, but to the organized minority in Congress, aided and abetted by the free-trade press, the importers, and the American international capitalists who have of late been investing their money in European production.

In the past seven years our imports from Germany and Czechoslovakia more than doubled, from Italy the increase was 83 per cent, from Belgium 37½ per cent, from Spain 25 per cent, from Switzerland 25 per cent, and from France 20 per cent. This in spite of the charge of the Democrats that our 1922 tariff would kill our foreign trade. No wonder, then, that in 1930 tariff adjustments were badly needed.

Now, will the new tariff help the producer in the city and the producer in the agricultural districts? There is no doubt that it will. During the long months of the tariff fight great quantities of foreign goods were imported in anticipation of high tariff rates on certain commodities. As soon as this surplus is absorbed there will be a quickening of our own industry. Indeed the signs are already noticeable. Slowly but gradually business is beginning the long pull upward again. Take the case of the American pottery industry, for instance. For years it has been unable to compete with the cheap wages of Germany and other countries of central Europe. But the new tariff law has afforded the pottery industry some relief, and according to officials in the industry there is already a quickening in the business, and plants, long idle, are beginning to resume activities and give jobs to hundreds and thousands of American workmen who have been idle for months. The reason why protection is needed may be given by citing this pottery industry as an example. To run a pottery tunnel kiln in an American plant requires 10 men at an average wage of \$5 per day. In Germany such a kiln is manned by two men at \$1.25 each a day and 10 women at 50 cents each per day, or a total of \$7.50 a day. There are three solutions to this problem. The American plants must close down, must reduce wages to the European level, or must get a tariff equalizing the cost of production at home and abroad. The Republican way is to raise the tariff, keep the mills open, create jobs for American workers who can in turn buy the products of other American industries, and the beef, butter, eggs, and fruit raised by the American farmer.

What is true of the pottery industry is true of many others. Using the year 1913 as a basis, with its figure 100, our industrial wages had risen by 1926 to 229 and were still increasing, so adding to the purchasing power and standard of living of the American worker. Union wages had advanced to 260. European wages, always below those of America, have advanced comparatively little at the same time, and the wages in Japan and the Orient are still lower. Either American wage earners must be protected, or they must sink to the level of European standards of living.

Now, how about the farmer? Our Democratic free trade brethren claim that he is compelled to buy in a protected market and sell in a world market, and they have shed many alligator tears over this statement. Yet it is not entirely true. Everything which is used exclusively on the farm is on the free list and has been for years. The farmer has long been given favored treatment in this respect.

Wheat is always cited by the free traders as the product which the farmer must sell on the world market. It is true that when the American farmer raises a big surplus of wheat, the price he receives for it is governed by the European market. And yet, according to data furnished by the United States Tariff Commission, from 1921 to 1929 the American farmer on the average received 18 cents more per bushel for the same quality of wheat than his Canadian neighbor. And in the price of livestock and meats the comparison has always been in favor of the American farmer. For example, the price of American wool in the Boston market from 1921 to 1930 has averaged from 16 to 19 cents per pound higher than the price in London, according to Tariff Commission figures. America has been importing too many agricultural products which should have been raised on the farms of America. Corn, meats, eggs, butter, cheese, vegetables, fruits—there are many of these. After the passage of the tariff of 1922 the imports of these products fell off appreciably. But they have increased until increases in the farm tariff were vitally necessary. These increases are provided for in the new tariff law. The farmers got all they asked for in the way of added protection.

But, our Democratic friends cry, some of the schedules are not exactly right. We may grant this. In the passage of a great measure covering every industry in the country, it is possible that errors have crept in. But it is not to be forgotten that under this same bill the President is authorized, through the Tariff Commission, to collect data and information on tariff schedules and to make adjustment of rates where these are necessary. What could be fairer than this?

Ah, my friends, the enemies of the protective tariff law in America are not looking for something fair. Hiding their real purpose behind a pseudo interest in what they call the "poor consumer," as if most consumers were not also producers in America, they are seeking to destroy the American standard of living, and to create a world level so that internationalism may at least take the place of the American idea which is founded on more than a century and a half of successful effort. All of the internationalists of every stripe, the debt cancellation, the League of Nations advocate, the free trader, the pacifist, will be found lined up against the American system of protection. I think their ideal has been expressed in a newspaper article I read the other day of a mythical but typical internationalist college professor. Here is the story:

One of those thousand college professors who recently joined 40 other unselfish foreign powers in protesting against any increase in the American protective tariff, the other morning threw off a sheet made in England by workmen receiving half the American wage, drew on a pair of socks made by French workmen receiving 40 per cent of the American wage, cotton underwear made by East Indian workmen at one-tenth the American wage, a pair of shoes made by Czechoslovakians working at one-fourth the American wage, put on a suit of clothes made of cloth woven by Scottish workmen receiving 30 per cent of the American wage, and a hat made in Italy by workmen receiving 25 per cent of the American wage, took up a walking stick made in China by coolies receiving one-tenth the American wage, and repaired to a store where he bought his wife a set of dishes made by Japanese toilers receiving one-eighth the American wage, then ordered up a few tons of Russian anthracite coal mined by soviet serfs working at 50 cents a day, and noticing on his way home a number of idle American textile workers, hosiers, pottery workers, shoe workers, hat makers, miners, and the like, sent in his membership to an organization engaged in securing social justice for American toilers, and started a learned brochure on The Cause and Cure of Unemployment in the United States.

FARM RELIEF

One of the questions we hear asked most frequently to-day is "What is the Government really doing for the farmer?" And it is a fair question. The farmer has suffered longer than any other class of our producers from the postwar deflation, and the end is not yet, although it is to be ex-

pected that as general conditions improve again the condition of the farmer will improve too.

The Government has always been diligent in helping the farmer, and never more diligent than it is to-day and has been since the present Republican administration went into effect. First, it is to be remembered that the greater part of our agricultural land to-day was distributed either free to the first settlers or sold at a price approximating a dollar and a quarter an acre. This indicates that the Government early appreciated the importance of building up a great agricultural and livestock industry in America. The brave men who received this land in the first place were, of course, entitled to it. Without them we could not have developed this great country which we have to-day. This fact is so evident that I think it hardly necessary to discuss it.

And in an increasing measure down through the decades, as our agriculture has developed, the efforts of the Government to assist it have redoubled. I need not remind you that one of the greatest and the busiest, as well as the most effective of the Government agencies at Washington, is the Agricultural Department. Its efforts to help agriculture are widespread. It assists in the developing not only of the farming industry but of the livestock, the fruit-growing and similar industries. It is constantly experimenting to provide better seed and better fertilizers for the farmer. It sends its agents all over the world in search of crops which will be adapted to increasing the profits of the American farmer. It constantly experiments in its efforts to improve farming methods. It seeks to assist in the marketing and distribution of crops by promoting better highways, and agricultural agents all over the world are seeking to gain information on foreign crops that will better enable the American farmer to direct his production along proper lines.

In short, the activities of the Department of Agriculture have been divided into seven classes—research, extension, information, eradication or control of plant and animal diseases and pests, service activities such as weather and crop reporting, the administration of forest and wild-life refuges, and the development of market-road programs. And in its various activities the department cooperates with other governmental agencies which can in any way assist in improving the status of the farmer.

For example, the Government is now setting up in various parts of the world crop-reporting stations. This is the result of work of a special committee appointed by the new Federal Farm Board to study the foreign needs of the Department of Agriculture. The committee, composed of eminent men, decided that one of the greatest needs was permanent foreign market reporting stations. The committee found that at least 10 foreign posts would be needed to keep the American farmer informed on the world condition of important crops. These posts as suggested will be at London, Berlin, Marseilles, Copenhagen, Bucharest, Buenos Aires, Melbourne, Johannesburg, and Shanghai.

The committee points out that the farmers need this service for several crops which meet foreign competition. For instance, the wheat farmer should have real inside information about the wheat crops in Canada, Argentina, Australia, and other important wheat-producing countries. He should know about the quality as well as quantity of foreign wheat. American apples and other fruits, as well as cotton and tobacco, meet foreign competition, and our apple growers, as well as our wheat growers in our own Northwest, will benefit from this new service. So will the farmers who produce the stock that goes into our meat products.

But, you may say, this is fine, and the Department of Agriculture has been widening and extending its service for years. What has the present administration, of which you are a part, done for the farmer? I think the question is a fair one, and I will endeavor to answer it as fairly as I can in the brief time at my disposal.

I think it will be admitted that one of the farmer's chief problems is the financing and orderly marketing of his crops. Loans have been made possible in the past to farmers at low rates of interest, and these have been of great

benefit, but I believe that the agricultural marketing act, passed by Congress in this administration and signed by the President, is, perhaps, the most important piece of legislation ever enacted by our Government for the farmer. But to summarize briefly: This administration, in keeping its pledges for farm relief, has taken four steps. First, it has created the Federal Farm Board to assist the farmer's own marketing organizations and has enacted other legislation to govern the distribution of perishable farm products. Again, it has helped the farmer by affording him more tariff protection. Again, it has launched a program for the improvement of inland waterways so as to provide cheaper transportation for the farmer's produce to primary markets. And, lastly, it has increased the Federal appropriations for improved Federal highways.

The new act has provided the Federal Farm Board with a revolving fund of a half a billion dollars to help the farmer-controlled marketing institutions provide for a wise marketing of the crops. The farm marketing agencies are being reorganized and consolidated and made into national institutions to handle the marketing of wheat, cotton, wool, and other great American commodities.

Already a great deal has been accomplished in this respect, but a great deal more remains to be done. It is unfortunate for immediate results that the new system was put into effect necessarily at a time when the various nations of the world were in a state of business depression, but I am confident that my statement made to you a few moments ago, as to the importance of this act to the farmers, will in time be fully demonstrated. Broadly speaking, the purpose of the act is, through the Farm Board, to minimize speculation in agricultural products, promote efficient and less wasteful methods of distribution, encourage the organization of cooperative marketing associations as a price-stabilizing factor, and to help prevent surpluses in orderly distribution and production, so eliminating so far as possible undue fluctuations in prices. In concluding my remarks concerning this Federal farm aid act, let me remind you, in the words of one of the pioneers in this movement, that this effort to organize the industry which feeds and clothes America is a pioneer movement just begun. In conformity with the expressed purposes of the law, the Federal Farm Board has laid down a forward-looking program which contemplates the cooperative organization of agriculture by commodity groups. And while this act will eventually maintain a fair and just price level, assuring the farmer a proper return on what he raises, let me state to my hearers who live in the city that this act does not contemplate an increased cost of living but an increase in the buying and earning power of the American farmer, without whose prosperity our industry and labor must suffer.

I think it is unnecessary for me to dwell upon the development of inland waterways and market highways. The value of these developments is too well known to need more than mention here. Sufficient to say that this administration has greatly enlarged the program for inland waterways and for highway improvement.

Now, let me say a few words about the relation of the new tariff to the farmer. Broadly speaking, the rates on farm products in the new law are the rates asked by the representatives of the farmers themselves. Rates on farm commodities, on the whole, were increased 51.6 per cent, while the increase in industrial products was but 14.6 per cent. Not only is this true but it remains equally true that all things which are used exclusively by the farmer on the farm continue on the free list. In the light of these facts the old Democratic cry that the tariff does not help the farmer seems a trifle far-fetched, to say the least.

If you are one of those who do not believe that the tariff can help the farmer, just consider that the new law provides increased duties on agricultural commodities, of which we imported in 1928, \$287,000,000 worth in the raw state and \$333,800,000 worth in what is called the first processed form. In other words, we imported agricultural products in the sum of \$620,000,000, on which the new tariff will give the farmer additional protection.

Among the important agricultural products on which duties have been raised are cattle, meats and meat products, hides, wool, flaxseed, soybeans, butter, cheese, milk, casein, eggs and egg products, a large variety of fresh fruits and fresh vegetables.

And it is no argument to say that what he gains has been nullified by higher prices that he must pay on things he buys. In the first place, prices are no higher now than before the passage of the tariff bill. Sugar is a case in point. It is now selling at the lowest price since the foundation of the Government, and that in the face of an increase in the sugar tariff. But even aside from that, the statistics show that 50 per cent of the things the farmer purchases are commodities produced by American agriculture itself; 39 per cent of what he purchases, including practically everything used exclusively by farmers, is on the free list. This leaves only 11 per cent of his expenditures for commodities which are affected by a tariff and of which he is not a producer.

MERCHANT MARINE

Our growing merchant marine is an institution which is dear to the heart of every patriotic and far-sighted American. Although for a long period it had almost disappeared from the high seas, our merchant marine is a historic institution. It originated in colonial times, and indeed one of the chief causes of difference between the colonies and the mother country during the stormy days before the Revolution was that of a shipping policy. England wanted to keep the shipping business for English vessels, while the colonists were determined to have shipping of their own.

After the Revolution and up to the time that steam became a principal motive power on the seas the American merchant marine grew steadily. This was one of the happiest periods of our marine career. The Yankee clipper ships were the pride and joy of every American heart. They sailed every sea, manned by hardy and venturesome Yankee sailors, and they unfurled Old Glory to the breezes in every clime. Then came the Civil War, a time when the efforts of the Federal Government had to be directed entirely to the task of saving the Union. Confederate privateers built in England and France preyed upon Union commerce, and during those four dark years of civil strife the American merchant marine seemed to have had its deathblow.

In the years of reconstruction nothing was done to build up our merchant marine. Occasionally prophetic voices would be heard in the Halls of Congress predicting dire disaster unless something was done toward reconstructing our merchant marine. But nothing was done, and it took a great World War to bring us to our senses in this respect. Then the need of a big American merchant marine was immediately visualized, at a time when it was almost too late. Feverishly the National Government went to work to build a marine. Hundreds of millions were spent, and costly mistakes were made, some of them almost ghastly errors. Who, indeed, has forgotten the fiasco of the wooden fleet which was to do great things but proved only to be a costly mistake?

When the war closed and we began to count the cost, it seemed that our young merchant marine, built by the Government itself at so great a cost during the days of the war, was to disappear again. But there was wise statesmanship in the Republican administration of reconstruction days that determined that this must not be so and that Uncle Sam should have a real merchant marine which should be privately owned and operated, with whatever assistance the Federal Government should legitimately give it. And so private shipping companies were encouraged, new trade and mail routes were created, and our merchant ships were sold to private shipping lines flying the American flag as rapidly as this could be done.

This brings us down almost to the present. The last platform of the Republican Party, adopted at Kansas City in 1928, said:

The Republican Party stands for the American-built, American-owned, and American-operated merchant marine. The enactment of the White-Jones bill is in line with a policy which the party has long advocated.

Under this measure substantial aid and encouragement are offered for the building in American yards of new and modern ships which will carry the American flag.

The Jones-White bill is the most constructive bit of merchant-marine legislation which has been enacted in the United States in a century, and its functioning has been made more efficient by President Hoover in appointing an intradepartmental committee of Cabinet officers and the Shipping Board. As a result great progress has been made in the forming and mapping out of overseas steamship mail routes, and in stimulating ship construction in the United States. Seventeen routes have been established since the Hoover administration went into office, and these require the construction of 51 new ships of 467,500 gross tons and a cost of nearly \$200,000,000. These ships are to be built within the next five or six years and in the fleet will be some of the largest and fastest ocean liners in the world. And the additional cost of mail contracts which makes all these additions to our merchant marine possible is only something like \$5,000,000. In its policy of selling Government-owned ships to private ownership the Shipping Board is continuing its constructive work, and during the past year and a half has disposed of 189 ships for more than \$12,000,000, the vessels going to shippers who promise to operate them under the American flag.

Now, what is this Jones-White shipping bill? It seems hardly necessary to answer this question for a ship-minded audience of Portland citizens. By the establishment of mail routes and the letting of long-time mail contracts and by long-time loans to shipbuilders it has brought about this tremendous revival in the American merchant marine.

The figures of our marine development are astonishing and ought to bring pride to every American heart.

In 1914 six American-flag ships of 70,000 gross tons were in operation in the European trade. At the present time 230 American ships of a million and a half gross tons are employed in European service. In the South American trade in 1914 we had 5 flag ships of 23,000 gross tons and now have 90 ships of 550,000 gross tons. In 1914 we had no ships going to Africa, and now we have 22 vessels of 125,000 gross tons in the African trade. On the Pacific coast we have developed from a total of 5 ships, so that now 140 ships of a million gross tons are employed in our foreign trade.

At this time American companies are operating 83 regular-line services employing 671 ships of 3,866,000 gross tons, and there is also in operation the American-flag tanker fleet of 259 vessels of 1,712,000 tons, so that we now have a total fleet of 940 vessels of more than five and a half million gross tons operating in foreign and noncontiguous trade service.

Now, one may well ask, Just what is the benefit of a big merchant marine to our country, anyway, and why should the Government assist its development? The answer is not hard to find. A merchant marine, big and active, is of vital necessity to the welfare of the Nation in time of peace as well as in time of war.

The merchant marine is essential in time of war, because it acts as an auxiliary service to our Navy, a service without which the efficiency of the Navy would be reduced to a minimum. Our national safety, therefore, demands an efficient and sizeable merchant marine.

But the demands of peace are fully as important. We need a merchant marine to encourage and develop our foreign trade, to prevent our suffering in time of world-wide ship shortage due to war, in which we may be a neutral power, and to prevent unfair shipping rates.

Of course, British and German ships will be glad to carry our commodities to all parts of the world. But British and German marine officers are naturally and justly interested in their own countries first and will seek to promote the foreign trade of their home countries to the detriment of ours. We, therefore, need marine officers who will look after the interests of our producers first. The soundness of this argument is proved by the fact that since the war and the development of our new merchant marine, while our foreign trade with Europe has increased 50 per cent, our trade with South America has increased 200 per cent; with

Africa, 325 per cent; and with Asia, 380 per cent. In this conjunction let it be remembered that before the war 90 per cent of our foreign trade was carried in foreign ships. During the past 10 years 35 per cent of our foreign trade has been carried on American ships, and the percentage is steadily increasing. It will soon reach 50 per cent.

Now, in case of a world shipping crisis brought on by a foreign war in which we have no part, foreign shipowners would naturally look after the interests of their own countries first. Had we no merchant shipping of our own, it might easily turn out, therefore, that the products of our own farms and factories might be left rotting on the wharves while foreign ships were looking after the requirements of their own countries. With a big merchant marine of our own such a calamity would be impossible.

Again, it is easily possible, were there no American merchant marine, for a combination of foreign shipping interests to gouge the shippers and producers of our own country by means of high rates. This idea is not as visionary as it sounds. We remember what the foreign rubber interests tried to do to us a few years ago. We broke the combination by cutting down our use of rubber. But the same remedy would not apply in the case of Shipping Trust, because refraining from foreign trade to beat the foreign ship combination would be a disastrous procedure. The best way to prevent such a condition of affairs is to keep developing our own merchant marine.

There is one other phase of the situation important to us, and that is that the development of our marine promotes the shipbuilding industry on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. This has already been brought about, and reports of the United States Shipping Board show that never before in peace times has there been so great a development of our shipbuilding industry as at present. And increased activity in our shipyards, it is to be remembered, brings increased activity to other industries all over the country, for nearly every State in the Union is called on to contribute materials which go into the building of our ships.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

During the past few months the United States has been going through a major economic depression, the first we have been called on to undergo for nearly 10 years. During the past seven years, up until last fall, we had been in the midst of unparalleled prosperity. It is unnecessary for me to recite the history of the depression which struck us, unexpectedly in most instances, just about a year ago.

This depression, in which we now seem to be in the final stages, differs somewhat from many of the depressions in the past, in that its causes are to be found in part outside the United States. In other words, the depression and the slump in commodity prices is world-wide.

In fact, with the single exception of France, the United States was the last nation to feel the depression. That the depression is world-wide is evidenced by an examination of conditions in other countries. The two greatest trading nations in Europe, perhaps, are Great Britain and Germany. And we find that in these countries conditions are much worse than in the United States, and have been for a long time. France is just now beginning to feel the full effects of the world-wide let-down in business, although its business has been steadily declining for months.

The slump in commodity prices came in most countries early in 1929, and this was followed in each instance by a slump in foreign trade. For example, in January, 1929, Great Britain exported 383,000,000 square yards of cotton goods. Then the slump hit her, and the exports went steadily down until in July of this year they amounted to barely 200,000,000 yards. Unemployment in Great Britain and Germany has been steadily growing. In the Western Hemisphere we are not the only nation to feel the effects of the slump. Canada reached its high point in January, 1929, and then commenced to slump, months before the depression was noticeable in the United States. Conditions in Cuba and the nations of South America have steadily grown worse, too.

The effects of the depression have been political as well as economic, and have in many instances resulted in revolution. In Great Britain the same labor government is still in the saddle, but principally because, perhaps, no other party now wants the responsibility of government. In Germany the hard times have resulted in a great increase in the Fascist vote, so that Adolph Hitler and his National-Socialist Party are now second in strength in the Parliament and are now crying loudly for a revision of the war settlements.

There has been unrest in Spain, Rumania, and many other European countries, an upset of the government in Austria, and many crises in the Balkans. Turning to South America we find even more tangible results of this world-wide depression. First came the downfall of President Leguia, dictator of Peru, an extraordinarily able man, who was sacrificed, however, to the revolutionary spirit of the times. Then came the revolution in Argentina, with a complete overthrow of government, and lastly the present revolution or civil war in Brazil, the end of which is not yet. In each instance the trouble was the result of bad economic conditions. The situation is serious in Cuba, too, where many of the constitutional guaranties have been suspended by the government.

Now, in America we do not change our Government by revolution when hard times come upon us. But a great many of the unthinking ones this year have sought to place the blame for this world-wide depression upon President Hoover and the Republican administration. The attempt is ridiculous and illogical, although it seems to be inevitable in a political nation like our own.

Some of the Democratic leaders have not only blamed the administration but have gone further and blamed the new tariff, although this was not enacted until months after the depression was fully upon us; not, in fact, until the bottom of the business slump had been reached.

The truth, of course, is that had it not been for the quick and decisive action of President Hoover when the slump came into full fruition with the stock-market crash conditions would be much worse than they are to-day.

The President, it will be remembered, immediately called to Washington the representatives of the great railroads, the great manufacturing industries, the great utilities and labor organizations of the country, and organized the Nation so that it might so far as possible survive the shock and throw off its effects without undue delay. The business heads promised to go forward with constructive programs and not to reduce wages. The labor leaders agreed that there would be no strikes for higher wages during the critical days. And the national, State, and local governments agreed to cooperate in pushing great public works during the depression in order to keep as many men employed as possible. Income-tax cuts were made to restore confidence and ease the burdens of business.

Everyone has cooperated, with the result that we have gotten along much better than might have been anticipated. I do not say that we have not had hard times, or that we do not have great unemployment, but I do say that we are infinitely better off than any other nation in the world, and that we would have been much worse off had it not been for the decisive action of President Hoover during those critical days and the fine cooperation which he received. I agree with Secretary of Labor Davis who said recently:

The old sweeping lay-offs and wage slashes have not been resorted to in this period of depression. The leading employers and the leaders of labor called into conference by President Hoover agreed to maintain employment and institute no new wage demands. It was a mighty effort at stabilization, and while it did not stave off some measure of the depression it did prevent the country from hitting the bottom as it has in every instance before. In due time this application of wisdom and effort must bring a return to normal conditions. But until that occurs we must exercise patience, we must share each others' burdens, and we must pull together for the common end.

Of late a wave of pessimism has swept over the land. Many of us have become just as unreasonably pessimistic as we were optimistic a year ago, when some people seemed to believe that the rise of values would never end. Now there are apparently as many who believe that values will

never rise again. Let us remember, therefore, that we have the same country, the same resources, the same energetic, intelligent people, the same potential buying power that we had a year ago, when it seemed that we could never be stopped. Now, what is to prevent us from once more getting on the high road and resuming the march of progress and prosperity?

Our friends, the Democrats, may rail against President Hoover and the present administration, blaming him for an economic condition which is world-wide and due to inevitable postwar deflation; they may even blame President Hoover and Congress for the great drought which has stricken so many parts of the country and added to the general depression. But until they offer some constructive remedy of their own—a thing which they have not done up to this time—we will have the right to put their wailing down to the requirements of political strategy. The Republican Party never has based its hope of victory on calamity. It has always been a constructive force and has left the criticism to the opposition. It does not claim now that everyone is prosperous and happy. But it does believe that the way of President Hoover in organizing and securing cooperation and promoting confidence is a better way to end depression than the Democratic way of sitting back and gleefully pointing to the unemployment figures as though some great political enjoyment were to be derived from national misfortune.

There are some good reasons for believing that the worst of the depression is over. Retail buying is picking up, car loadings are increasing, and there is more building of homes now than for many months. Most important of all, commodity prices seem to be stabilizing themselves and building a foundation from which there can be an advance in the near future.

In the meantime we can all pull together and vote to support the President in his constructive efforts, looking calmly into the future, relying upon the fine patriotism and progressive spirit of the American people.

IMMIGRATION

Ever since the Republican Party came into power nationally, after the close of the World War, one of its policies has been the progressive application of the principle of restricted immigration. That such a policy has been not only constructive but, in light of recent events, essential to the well-being of our country can be easily demonstrated. In starting out on the subject, however, it might be well for a moment to review the history of our immigration from the founding of the Republic. Some of the Colonies had immigration restriction, based principally on religious issues, but it is safe to say that during the first century of our national history, following the Revolution, immigration was for all practical purposes unrestricted.

Before the year 1820 no official record of our new citizens from foreign lands was kept at Washington, but it is conservatively estimated that from 1783 until 1820 approximately 250,000 immigrants came to the United States; certainly not a great number for a period of nearly 40 years. And, indeed, immigration from 1820 to 1840, though steadily increasing, was moderate, never reaching the figure of a hundred thousand a year. But after the latter date immigration increased rapidly. The potato famine in Ireland in 1846 was followed by a tremendous wave of immigration from that country, and revolutionary and political troubles in Germany brought successive waves of Teutonic immigration. During this period many families came from England, Ireland, Scotland, and Germany, whose sons were in later years to loom large and honorably in the history and in the development of our country.

Then the Civil War came, and immigration was temporarily interrupted, as it was to be interrupted later during the World War. But after the Union was restored immigration grew rapidly again and on an enlarged scale.

In short, there have been five waves of immigration to the United States. The first came from Great Britain and Ireland but was intermingled with a large percentage of Germans. The second consisted of subjects from the Brit-

ish Isles and Germany, with a mixture of Scandinavians. The third wave, which reached its crest early in the eighties and began to recede after 1892, was composed largely of British, Germans, and Scandinavians, with a mixture of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. The fourth wave, extending from 1903 to 1914, brought few people from the British Isles and northern Europe but a great wave of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. Immigration was again interrupted by the World War, but, following the close of this struggle, commenced the fifth and final wave, again principally from eastern and southern Europe. This wave doubtless would have become an overwhelming flood had it not been for the application of the principle of restrictive immigration.

The first attempt to restrict immigration came in 1882, when Congress passed two bills. The first was the Chinese exclusion act, still in force, and the second was the first general immigration law excluding foreign convicts, idiots, lunatics, and those who might become public charges. Then came the first quota immigration law in 1921, made necessary because it became apparent that with Europe impoverished by the World War we might soon be overwhelmed with a flood of immigration which would eventually impoverish us. That this law was necessary is indicated by the fact that European immigration jumped from 24,600 in 1919 to 625,000 in 1921. The law of 1921 was superseded by the present quota limit act of 1924, which limits the quota from all countries combined to 164,667.

Now, let me say a few words as to the good which has been done by these laws passed during the past decade. It may be necessary to quote a few figures, but I will be as brief as possible in order not to tire you.

Before the World War immigrants were coming at the rate of over a million a year, the total number admitted in 1914 being 1,218,480. Then following the World War the figures were again approaching the million mark with prospects of going much higher. In 1921, prior to the per centum limitation act, the total figure from all continents was 805,288. Following the passage of the act the number dropped to 309,556 in 1922.

In 1925, following the passage of the present quota law, the total number of alien immigrants admitted was 294,314, dropping from 706,896 the year previous. For it is to be remembered that immigration has not been restricted by quota so far as citizens of the nations of the Western Hemisphere are concerned. Of this total in 1925, 50 per cent came from European countries, nearly 43 per cent from northern and western Europe, and 7.9 per cent from southern and eastern Europe. The proportion of northern European immigration was greatly increased, while that of eastern and southern Europe decreased.

The total number of immigrant aliens during the last nine fiscal years, 1922 to 1930, was 3,301,981, or an annual average of 366,887. The yearly average for the three years 1922 to 1924 was 513,124, and during the last six years only 293,768.

Now, judging by the immigration figures of the pre-war years and of the year 1920, just previous to the passage of the first restrictive immigration act, it can safely be assumed that at least 6,000,000 immigrants would have come to the United States from Europe alone since 1921 instead of the 1,825,000 that actually have reached our shores. And not only has there been a decrease in immigrants since 1921, but the percentage of common or unskilled workers had dropped from 55 per cent in 1914 to 28.8 per cent in 1930, indicating that under our new laws the quality of immigration is increasing just as the quantity is decreasing.

It is not hard to visualize what would be the situation in our country to-day had unrestricted immigration been allowed to stand. We would have had at least 5,000,000 and perhaps 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 more idle workers in the country to-day than there are at present, when, for the time being, there are not jobs enough to go around. This is a picture which we do not like to visualize, and a situation which we do not like to dwell upon. Certainly the restrictive immigration act has been a blessing not only to our Ameri-

can workingmen but to the institutions of the country as well.

In fact, further immigration restriction now seems necessary, because of temporary economic conditions, and President Hoover recently very wisely took steps further to cut down immigration with a view to aiding the unemployment situation in our country. The President announced that the State Department, through its consular agents abroad, would refuse visas to alien laborers seeking work in this country. This action is to be taken on authority of the law which permits exclusion of immigrants who are liable to become public charges. In normal times the applicant for admission to the United States, who is an able-bodied person with means to support himself until he gets to the United States, is admitted, if he comes within the quota. But in abnormal times, like the present, when there is no reasonable prospect for employment, the visa will be refused.

The State Department has pointed out that by enforcing this section, and other sections of the law, immigration from Mexico, hitherto unrestricted, has been greatly reduced during the past year. I think you will agree with me that we do not need much immigration while there are American workers out of jobs.

I favor the enforcement of the restrictive immigration law and its strengthening wherever and whenever the wisdom of experience gained by its operation shows that it should be strengthened. In taking this stand I do not wish to be thought chauvinistic. I do believe that the United States is the finest country on the earth and that its civilization will match any other civilization in the honesty, industry, intelligence, and morality of its citizenship. I do not, however, want to be interpreted as asserting that we are better than the other nations of the earth. I am willing to concede that in the other civilized nations there are citizens just as fine and just as intelligent as those found in our own country, with high ideals and earnest purpose. I am fully cognizant of the splendid part which has been played by the immigrants and sons of immigrants who came to us during the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century. Without this new blood the development of our great resources would have been retarded.

But conditions have now changed. The country is filling up. And there can be no question that without restricted immigration we would ere this have been engulfed in a flood of alien immigration which it would have been difficult for America to absorb. Therefore, to protect the American ideals which have been developed in America, in part by some of our immigrants themselves during the past century and a half, to assure a continuance of our American system, and lastly to protect our American workers in their jobs and in their opportunity for prosperity and material advancement, I believe that the restrictive immigration system is necessary. For what good would it do to protect the American worker from foreign-made goods and then without restriction admit the foreign worker himself?

Nothing which the Republican Party has accomplished during its tenure of office, now approaching a decade, has been more constructively important than its building up and strengthening of our immigration laws.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

One of the fundamental duties of a government toward the people is national defense. This is a statement so evidently true that it can be accepted without argument and without proof. We are told in the preamble to our Constitution that one of the reasons for the adoption of that all-important document was to provide for the common defense.

When thinking of national defense our minds turn naturally toward the Army and Navy. In the United States, because we have thousands of miles of ocean width to the east and west of us, and for the further reason that we have friendly and less populous nations to the north and south of us, the Navy is commonly and properly regarded as our first line of defense. So long as our Navy is as good as any navy that floats we feel that we are reasonably free from attack by a foreign foe.

As a result it has been deemed best and most economical to the people to provide what might be called in civilian terms a skeletonized Army, but one capable of being quickly increased in numbers in case of national crisis. To explain how this system is worked out, it might be said briefly that the Army of the United States is composed of the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Organized Reserves. The Regular Army is a small, highly trained body of professional soldiers, much smaller than the regular army of any country half our size. Its size, relative to the population of the United States, might be compared to the police force of a modern city like Portland. The purpose of our Regular Army, as constituted, is to provide instructors for the other contingents and to constitute a first line of land defense, a nucleus around which a greater Army could speedily be developed in time of emergency.

The National Guard is a body of men whose military career is subordinate to their civil life. They are organized and equipped like the Regular Army, but are not so intensively trained, although they would form an important and effective addition to the Regular Army in case we were suddenly attacked.

The third branch of our Army defense is included in the Organized Reserves. The reserves provide the skeleton organizations into which would be fitted those able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 45, who, the Constitution of our country states, are liable for military service in the common defense. Now, we do not want to be caught unprepared as we were at the beginning of the World War, and for this reason we have established the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the function of which is to keep a supply of leaders, normally in civil pursuits, available for call in time of great emergency, and hence to provide for the common defense. This Officers' Reserve Corps is the very foundation of our comprehensive system of common defense. The pacifists, who oppose our defending ourselves as a nation, realize this, and that is why they oppose so vigorously military training in our schools and military training camps which are held each summer in various parts of the country. Fortunately, however, the attacks of our pacifists have failed in their purpose up to this time, and the training camps of the summer just past were the best in point of attendance and efficiency which have yet been held.

To sum up briefly this statement of our military defense in its three branches it may fairly be said that we have developed a fine system, free from the dangerous taints of militarism and the expense of a great standing army, under control of our citizens, and working toward good citizenship everywhere, a constructive force in time of peace as well as a defense in time of war.

In turning to our naval defense, our thoughts naturally center first on the naval limitation conferences held in Washington and London. In the Washington conference the great naval powers under the leadership of the United States agreed on a limitation of the number of battleships in which we were to have equal strength with Great Britain and a preponderance of strength over Japan in the ratio of 5 to 3.

In the London conference held only a few months ago the question of cruisers was paramount. After the conference seemed destined to end in failure an agreement was finally reached which gives us parity with Great Britain in the matter of armed cruisers and a preponderance over Japan and the other naval powers.

There is, however, one important difference. In the matter of battleships, in the Washington conference the United States "had the edge," so to speak, and in a few years under its program would have had by far the most powerful battle fleet in the world. When battleships were limited, therefore, Uncle Sam could and did stop work on battleships which were partially constructed in order to accomplish the required parity.

But the situation in the London conference with regard to cruisers was entirely different. After the Washington conference the United States eased up materially in its program of building cruisers under the belief that naval com-

petition was to end. It was a mistaken belief, however, as Great Britain and Japan, to say nothing of the other naval powers, embarked on great cruiser construction programs. As a result, by the time 1930 rolled around, we were in an inferior position regarding armed cruisers, which comprise a very vital arm of naval defense. Great Britain maintained that she could not cut her cruisers below a certain limit, and when the London parity agreement was reached it became necessary in order to maintain parity that we build up to parity.

Now, here is the real danger to our naval defense, and the danger does not lie in the result of the London conference which was an honest attempt to reach naval parity and to carry out the efforts of the American Government toward lightening the armaments of the world. The real danger lies in the chance that we as a nation will not build up to the cruiser strength allowed us in the treaty.

It has become apparent that certain professional pacifists and pacifist organizations who urged us to sign the treaty and obtain parity are now going to busy themselves in an effort to see that we do not build up to parity, but remain in a position inferior to Great Britain and Japan so far as cruisers are concerned. It is becoming evident that they are planning to bombard Congress with petitions to prevent the attainment of parity which the treaty undertook to guarantee. They will argue that now that there is no danger of war and that the naval-building program will be expensive and a waste of money.

The plans of replacement and construction prepared by our naval officers will call for an expenditure of about \$200,000,000 a year for the next five years. This looks like a big sum, but it is to be remembered that half of it is for replacements which have had to be made, anyhow, treaty or no treaty, so that the cost of new construction will be around \$100,000,000, or about 80 cents apiece for every American—surely not a great sum when we consider what is at stake.

But if you are disconcerted by the figures, let me say again that so much construction is necessary because since the Washington conference we have only laid down or appropriated for 11 ships, while Japan laid down or appropriated for 125; France, 119; Italy, 82; and Great Britain, 74. So it seems that we took naval limitation more seriously after the Washington conference than our naval rivals. And it is to be remembered that every dollar spent for naval replacement or construction will be spent in America and will give employment to American workers at American wages.

In their efforts to discourage our building of cruisers up to parity the pacifists will say that there is sentiment in Great Britain and Japan not to build new ships and that because of this we ought not to build. That is exactly the argument used by the pacifists after the Washington conference. Well, we tried the policy then and it did not work, as the figures I have just quoted on naval construction eloquently show.

When Uncle Sam stopped building cruisers after 1922 the other nations speeded up, and they showed no disposition to halt or to want limitation until the United States passed a bill providing for 15 new cruisers. Then they were willing to talk terms. Even the Labor government, which was in power during a considerable part of this time, approved of the construction of cruisers which would put John Bull ahead of Uncle Sam. It was only our determination to put on a building program that brought them to terms and to an agreement to cut down their programs.

It ought to be evident to everyone, therefore, that if we want to maintain parity and to be able to work for further limitation in the future, we will have to build up to the treaty limit so as to be in position to make ourselves effective when another conference is called, as well as to protect our people in the meantime.

Uncle Sam has been showing the way toward peace and limitation of armament ever since the close of the World War, and I believe that his record on that subject must be clear to all the world. We have reduced our Army to a minimum, although we have not sacrificed its efficiency or its mobility, and possibilities for expansion in time of trou-

ble, and we will not sacrifice these unless we fail or refuse to support the program of training camps and developments of reserve officers. We have agreed to naval parity when we could have had superiority.

Now the first arm of our defense is the Navy. In accordance to our wealth and population, we are entitled, to say the least, to a Navy as good as any other navy in the world. So far as I am concerned, I intend to lift my voice and direct my efforts wherever possible toward acquiring this parity under the naval treaty which was signed in solemn agreement at London. Not to build up to the treaty requirements would be failing to live up to the international agreement made in London, and it would be a serious mistake so far as the welfare and safety of the people of the United States are concerned—but it is a mistake which we are not going to make if we have the support of all real Americans for our program.

FOREIGN POLICY

The policy of this administration, as well as that of previous Republican administrations, with regard to foreign affairs, has been a helpful cooperation with other nations of the world in the interests of peace and general international welfare. At the same time it has been our policy, and will continue to be our policy, to avoid involving the United States in any entangling alliances or commitments of any kind. We have realized as a nation that the advice which George Washington gave us in his farewell address still holds good, that we want to win the peace and friendship of all nations without committing ourselves to any international policy or line of action in advance.

This was the policy of the Republic from its very beginning until the close of the World War. Then a tremendous effort was made to reverse our foreign policy and to induce the United States to enter into a program of helping to regulate the affairs of the whole world through membership in the League of Nations. It is not necessary for me to review the various phases and rehearse the arguments which were used for and against our league membership when the great fight over the question was waged in the United States Senate.

Sufficient it is to say that Republican leaders in the Senate waged the fight against the league and as a result defeated our entry. This verdict of the Senate was overwhelmingly approved by the people of America at the polls in the two succeeding national elections in which membership in the League of Nations was an issue.

Subsequent events have proved that those who advocated our remaining out of the league and out of European entanglements were correct. We have to do nothing more than to take a look around the world to-day to know that this is true. Everywhere there are mutterings of discontent. Europe is enduring a depression much worse than the one in the United States. There are millions of unemployed in Great Britain and in Germany and even in France prosperity seems to have passed its peak. There is unrest and disturbance in the Balkan nations and dictatorships are either in the saddle or are in the making. And in the East is the growing figure of Russia eager and anxious to take advantage of every opportunity to undermine and destroy the civilization of western Europe and of the New World.

And the political unrest is even greater than the economic unrest. On every side there are mutterings of discontent against certain phases of the Versailles treaty, or expressions of fear that efforts are about to be made to overturn the treaty. Italy feels that it lost many of the fruits of victory to which it was entitled. The Balkan countries are suspicious of Italy and Germany, and suspicious of each other. Germany looks with longing eyes on the Polish corridor, and Poland is determined to resist any change in the treaty even by force of arms if necessary, counting as she does on the active aid of France. And between France and Italy, two of the great powers of Europe, there are differences which may in time lead to an outbreak of hostilities. Lack of financing seems at present to be the greatest detriment to war in Europe.

Every American, as he gazes at this picture, ought to be thankful that he is a citizen of the United States and ought

to be thankful, too, that his Government is not committed in advance to settling these difficult questions as they come up, questions in which we can have nothing more than an academic interest.

But, the internationalist replies, it is a duty we owe to humanity to use our good offices wherever possible in the interests of peace and progress. With this statement we can have no complaint. But it has been the opinion of the Republican statesmen that we can best help Europe by retaining our freedom of action, by avoiding future commitments which might arouse suspicion in various countries, and so because of our very disinterestedness and detachment, being able to command the respect and confidence of the rest of the world when a crisis arises. In short, we have believed that we could do more for ourselves and the rest of the world with our hands untied than if they were tied to a special program by advance agreements.

Now the proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof, and I believe that our record in national affairs during the last nine years amply proves not only that we have done well for ourselves to keep out of Europe's business, but that we have done better by Europe, too. Our record of constructive achievement in the interest of world peace and progress is one of which we may well feel proud, as is ample refutation of the charges of the internationalists that we have built a well of selfish isolation around the United States.

The Republican Party, not only during this administration but for the past nine years, has had a policy of international conciliation and constructive effort. We made peace with Germany and Austria, took the lead in calling two great naval conferences in the interest of the limitation of naval armaments, in the first of which we made tremendous sacrifices, and have shown in other ways our devotion to the cause of peace.

Since the present administration took office our record on foreign relations is one of which every American can feel proud. Soon after his election President Hoover went on a good-will tour of Latin America and the results were of lasting benefit in promoting good will between our peoples and the nations to the south of us.

President Hoover has also had the good fortune to be able to proclaim into effect the Kellogg-Briand treaty for the renunciation of war. This document, inspired in America, means, in short, that the nations of the world renounce war as a national policy and agree to resort to it only as a matter of self-defense.

In clearing up the Tacna-Arica dispute between Chile and Peru the United States Government has performed a real step in the interest of peace. The dispute was a bone of contention of 40 years' standing which was having a constantly irritating effect on South American politics.

Our relations with Mexico are now on a friendlier footing than for many years, and the President has also taken a step to promote friendship among the western republics by appointing a committee to study the whole question of future relations between the United States and Haiti. And so much better have our relations with Nicaragua become as a result of the election held there under the supervision of United States marines that we have been invited to supervise another election in Nicaragua. Our relations with the United States of Colombia, too, are now on a more friendly basis than has been the case for a generation.

Constructive measures have been taken by this administration to clear up many other problems growing out of our participation in the World War. These have included proposed settlements of the French, German, and Austrian debts. Congress has ratified the French debt settlement, with an approximate total of \$4,000,000,000, and this brings the grand total of debts funded by allied governments under our Republican administration to something over eleven and a half billion dollars. Quite a sizable sum, this, in the face of dire predictions made by our internationalists a few years ago that we ought to cancel all of these obligations and load the debts onto the backs of American taxpayers. War debts and claims between the United States and Germany and the United States and Austria are being settled,

and material progress has been made in restoring to its owners property which was seized during the war by the Alien Property Custodian of the United States. Under our settlement with Germany we are to collect over a period of years the sum of \$250,000,000 on account of the costs of our portion of the army of occupation during the World War. In addition there is to be collected a half billion dollars on account of the awards of the Mixed Claims Commission in sums due to citizens of the United States growing out of various war claims.

Here is some evidence that our foreign policy, with its avoidance of entangling commitments, has not been a failure. We have promoted the cause of peace and disarmament, and we have settled one by one, satisfactorily to both parties, the great majority of the vexatious problems growing out of the World War.

We have done all of these things without joining the League of Nations or entering into any general European alliance for maintaining the status quo, and in our ability to maintain freedom of action to-day and to sail our own course lies the best chance of our own safety, our own peace and tranquillity, and lies also the best chance for our being of service in case of sudden difficulties in Europe in which we may become a friendly mediator.

I believe it can be fairly said, therefore, that the Republican international policy of the past nine years, which is in line with the best traditions of the American Republic, has been a success and deserves the approval of the American people.

RELATIONS WITH LATIN AND SOUTH AMERICA

I want to say a few words about our relations with the countries of Latin America and of the importance of our cultivating them even more closely than we have done in the past. It is a matter of satisfaction to all Americans that our relations with them are becoming constantly more cordial. The fact that this is true is all the more surprising in view of insidious efforts which have been made in the past to bring about ill feeling between the United States and Latin America.

This effort has been well organized and has extended over a period of years, and its inspiration has been not in the Western Hemisphere but in Europe. Any observing American who has traveled in the countries to the south of us has sensed this effort. European nations from the beginning have controlled the avenues of information not only between Europe and Latin America but between the United States and South America. As a result, for years most of the foreign news and information appearing in the newspapers of South America has been colored in an effort to estrange the sentiment between the two Americas. News from the United States has been distorted to show that we are a nation of idle rich and of money-grabbing traders, that we had no ideals except finance, and that our purpose toward Latin America was to exploit it whenever and wherever possible and to maintain an imperialistic attitude toward all the other nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Unfortunately these European propagandists were not without assistance in our country. There has been a group of so-called liberals in the United States which has been busy shouting imperialism against our Government whenever it has been necessary to intervene in Latin America, not only to protect the lives of our citizens and their property but in the interests of the people of the revolution-torn land itself.

So long as our own newspapers and our own people paid little attention to Latin America this anti-American propaganda, inspired in Europe, was permitted to go on without interruption. And let me say in passing that this propaganda was not inspired by pure malice toward the United States. It had a carefully planned objective. The purpose of keeping the relations cool between the United States and Latin America was to prevent Uncle Sam from getting his share of the trade with these countries. Up to the World War the scheme worked pretty well, but after the war our trade with Latin America grew by leaps and bounds in spite of the barriers placed against it. Now it is greater than

the trade of the three leading trade nations of Europe combined.

Writing upon this change in conditions, Dr. Thomas H. Healy, professor of foreign relations, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, recently stated in an interesting article appearing in the Washington Star:

Truly startling changes have been wrought in all of this within the last few years. Last year our trade with Latin America was approximately \$2,000,000,000, or approximately three times as great as it was 20 years ago. In both imports and exports we had a greater total than our three principal competitors—Great Britain, France, and Germany—combined. To-day we occupy first place in sales to every one of the Latin American countries without exception. Our financial investments in Latin America to-day are over \$5,500,000,000, or almost five times as great as they were 20 years ago. The capital that we have invested to-day in Venezuela is more than all the capital we had invested in the entire continent of South America 20 years ago. * * * A number of important press organizations and newspapers of the United States now have their own representatives in Latin America, reporting accurately and completely to the American public events and situations in Latin America; the space now devoted to such purposes in our magazines and newspapers is many times greater than it was even 10 years ago. From the telephones in any large city in the United States it is now possible to talk by telephone or radio-telephone to a number of the capitals of Latin America and in the space of a few minutes.

Increasing trade has brought a reawakened interest between the Northern and Southern Hemispheres. Newspapers of the United States and our press services are exchanging material with Latin America direct instead of permitting the news to go back and forth through London and Paris. There has been a greater exchange of visitors and tourists—in short, we are getting better acquainted with our neighbors. Another important fact is that the number of ship lines between the United States and Latin America is increasing, and as these lines and their direct commerce increase our relations will become more intimate and more cordial.

During the past year or so the friendship and mutual understanding has grown by leaps and bounds. It was given a great acceleration by the visit of President Hoover to Latin-America just before his inauguration. This visit made a lasting impression and it is being returned by high South American officials.

There are signs of increasing friendship on every hand. Nicaragua is now asking for American control of its next election. It is no longer afraid of the old cry of imperialism. Mexico and the United States have improved their mutual relations tremendously. The newspapers and statesmen of the United States of Colombia, formerly unfriendly with us, are now sounding the praises of Uncle Sam. Brazil is especially cordial, and Argentina has just gotten rid of a President who prided himself on his enmity to the United States.

All of which is entirely important, and for this reason I have dwelt upon it at some length. Now, why is it important? The reason is that a big trade between the United States and Latin America, and increasing friendliness and cooperation, are of supreme importance to the entire Western Hemisphere. Our trade with Europe has about reached its zenith. Europe is a continent grown old in its development. It is highly organized industrially as well as politically. As conditions improve and it adopts American methods of production it will have less and less use for American finished products, although it will still come to us for a part of its raw material. We must depend, therefore, for an increase in our foreign trade principally on Latin-America and the countries of the Orient. Already we have a larger trade with Japan than we have with France. The day is coming when stable government will settle over China once more, and we will then have another big customer in the Orient. All of which is for the future. But in the meantime our greatest chance for an improvement in commercial relations is with Latin America. Here is our opportunity. The people of Latin America, through their visiting here and through the moving picture, are getting some ideas of the comforts and luxuries enjoyed by the American people—and they are in the market for these.

And the case is far different from that of Europe. Latin America, certainly within this generation or the next, will

not become a manufacturing rival of the United States. Latin America can use our manufactured products and we can use their raw materials. The conditions for a beneficial exchange of goods are almost ideal. They have what we want and can not produce for ourselves. We have what they want and can not produce for themselves. We must have protection from a flood of European goods to save our own great market for the American producer. But most of the things we buy from Latin America can come in duty free, because they are not in conflict with American commodities. There are a few exceptions, of course, principally in Argentina, but in the other countries of South America the American protective tariff arouses little interest or apprehension.

Therefore the future tranquility and the future prosperity of the United States depends on cultivating closer relations between the Northern and Southern Hemispheres.

RECAPITULATION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Republican Party has always had a record of pledges kept. With but few intervening years it has had control of the Government at Washington since 1861. During this period, and for nearly 70 years, the United States has made greater progress than any nation has ever made during a similar period of time. From a State torn by factional strife which threatened its dissolution at a time when the Republican Party came into power it has grown to be the greatest and richest nation in the world. I might say, too, the most stable nation on the earth and the last remaining hope of those who believe in representative government as opposed to the rule of the single dictator or the rule of the mob.

Let me recount to you some of the things promised in the Republican national platform of 1928 and what steps have been taken to fulfill the promises by President Hoover and the Republican majority in Congress.

The Republican Party in 1928 pledged continued economy in the operation of government, and this has been accomplished. In the first year President Hoover held the national outlay to the figure provided for expenditures the year before by President Coolidge and at the same time found funds to provide for the expansion of our merchant marine and inland waterways, to say nothing of necessary increased activities in the Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor Departments.

The Republican Party promised further tax reduction, and this has been accomplished. It was here that the economy program showed its real results, and at the end of the first year of the Hoover administration there was a Treasury surplus of \$184,000,000, paving the way for the tax reduction which followed.

The Republican Party in 1928 promised to carry out its established policy of funding the foreign debts without cancellation, and the French debt was successfully funded by the Hoover administration, bringing the refunding total of foreign war debts up to more than \$11,500,000,000.

The Republican Party in its 1928 platform promised a foreign policy which, without in any way involving us in foreign entanglements, would promote the general peace of the world and, so far as possible, render war less likely. This pledge has been kept. The Kellogg-Briand peace pact by which the nations agree to abolish war as a foreign policy has been ratified by all the principal nations of the world. The London naval conference has done away with naval rivalry among the great powers, and yet has provided us with naval parity with Great Britain and a navy superior to that of Japan. Before taking office President Hoover made a tour of South America, with the result that our relations with the Latin American countries are now more friendly than ever before. All of this has been in response to the party platform pledge.

The Republican Party in 1928 promised to do what it could to help the farmer. The result has been additional legislation, the most important part of which perhaps was the farm relief act which, through its liberal expenditures and sweeping organization, seeks to assist the farmers in bringing about better marketing conditions and consequent

higher prices. The Farm Board has, of course, been handicapped by the economic depression, but in time its importance for farm relief will be fully demonstrated. Hardly less important than the farm relief act was the increase of tariff rates on foreign farm products coming into direct competition with the products of our own farmers. The administration, too, has tried to improve the marketing problem by further improvement of our inland waterways and our market highways.

The Republican Party in 1928 promised to bend its efforts to better law enforcement. The Prohibition Department has been placed under the Department of Justice. Agreements have been made with Canada to curtail so far as possible the exports of liquor from that country to the United States, and measures have been taken to speed up the administration of justice in the Federal criminal courts. The President, in order that the Nation might have the best information concerning the problem of crime, appointed a National Law Enforcement Commission, the members of which are experts in their lines, men nationally known and enjoying the public confidence. They have made an exhaustive survey and will soon make their report. This will be invaluable in the shaping of legislation for law enforcement in the future.

Last, but not least, the Republican Party promised in 1928 a strengthening of our tariff laws, and, as a result, after tremendous opposition on the part of our Democratic opponents, an opposition which delayed the enactment of the tariff bill for months, and hence has delayed the recovery of the country from depression, the administration succeeded this summer in enacting into law a tariff bill which gives much-needed protection to the farmer, the fruit grower, and to those industries which were feeling the blighting effect of cheap foreign competition. The farmer and the worker will both benefit from this. During the closing months of tariff debate the importers were busy getting into the country great quantities of cheap foreign commodities ahead of the new tariff. This is being absorbed more slowly than usual because of the depression, but it will soon be absorbed and the full benefits of the new tariff law will then be enjoyed.

These are some of the accomplishments of the present administration as compared with the platform pledges of 1928, and I believe that they warrant your support in the November election.

But I would be remiss in my duty if I stopped here. The Republican Party has been in power since 1921, and its record in all of that time, like its record in the present administration, is one sufficient to inspire your confidence and your support. The nearly 10 years of Republican rule have been a period of economy in government, of debt reduction, of protection to American workers and farmers, and of constantly increasing friendliness with foreign nations.

Tax reduction acts have been passed in 1921, in 1924, in 1926, in 1928, and in 1929. These reductions have constantly improved the economic structure of America. The results are incalculable. In the first year of the operation of the 1921 act the saving was \$663,000,000, in the first year of the 1924 act \$519,000,000, in the first year of the act of 1926, \$422,000,000, and in the first 12 months of the 1928 act \$222,000,000. It is estimated that the first year of the 1929 revenue act will mean a further saving of \$160,000,000 to the American taxpayers. Here are tangible results of the Republican administration of finances. During this same period our national debt has been reduced at the rate of nearly a billion dollars a year, being decreased from \$24,500,000,000 in round numbers, when the Republican administration took office in 1921, to approximately \$16,185,000,000 in June, 1930—a reduction of eight and a quarter billion dollars. No nation has ever equaled this achievement, and certainly no other political party has ever achieved a record of public-debt reduction like this. The decrease in interest alone on the debt amounts to more than \$400,000,000 annually.

The Republican Party early after it took office made treaties of peace with Germany and her allies, and since

then has led the way toward peace, initiating the Washington and London conferences and the Kellogg pact. It has cleared up the vexatious question of foreign debts, and has not listened to talk of cancellation. The amount funded, as I stated a moment ago, is more than eleven billions. And in commenting on this remarkable financial program it is not to be forgotten that in clearing up the financial wreckage of the war the Republican administration has not forgotten the veterans of the war. Liberal increases have been made in the benefits allowed soldiers, and the Government is now spending more than \$800,000,000 annually on this work.

Now, turning in conclusion for a moment again to this financial record of the Republican Party since it took over the reins of government in 1921, I feel justified in saying that the record of debt reduction, of tax decrease, of scientific reduction in expenditures justifies the confident statement that this same party will be able to steer the ship of state from the present depression, world-wide in its causes, and due to the failure of no governmental policy in America. For nearly 70 years the record of the Republican administration has been one of almost uninterrupted progress. During this same period the Democratic record has necessarily been one of negation. While the Republicans have been accomplishing, the Democrats, forced to the side lines, have been "viewing with alarm." They have sought to feed, not on constructive accomplishment but on calamity.

FIXING TIME FOR ASSEMBLING OF CONGRESS

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the measures that is on the agenda of the House that is demanded by the so-called insurgents is a vote on the so-called "lame duck" resolution, providing for a constitutional amendment to do away with hold-over sessions after congressional elections.

I am in sympathy with the purpose of that resolution. [Applause.] I am rather surprised that a vote has not heretofore been had in this Congress on that resolution. In no instance in the history of my 18 years of service in this body have I seen a greater need from a practical legislative standpoint of such a resolution being in effect. Some of the leaders of the House claim that the new Congress should not convene until a year hence because it will disturb business conditions.

The country has voted, they have expressed themselves upon the issues, and I can see no reason why after the country has expressed itself the Congress elect should not take up the responsibilities of legislation.

I do not think it is necessary in order to accomplish the end of doing away with the hold-over sessions to provide for a constitutional amendment. During the few spare moments that I have had since we last met—some of you know that I had a very hard contest for nomination and also for election, being opposed at the election by the Socialist nominee and a minor Democratic nominee—and I do not say minor because of his qualifications, but because he received so few votes, as my plurality over him was 17,000, although he coddled the Democratic congressional committee and got some money in order to try to make possible a victory for the Socialist. If they had used this good Democratic money in some other districts they might have gotten a clear majority of the House.

Now, on the question of the lame-duck session, as I have said, I do not think it is necessary in order to accomplish the end to pass a constitutional amendment.

Only last evening after the adjournment of the House I drafted the following bill. I would like to have favorable consideration of this bill, to which I have given considerable thought, to see whether the end in view could not be accomplished by a bill which only requires a majority of the two Houses, rather than a constitutional amendment, which, as the country knows, requires a two-thirds vote of the House

and Senate, and ratification by three-fourths of the legislatures of the States.

I will say parenthetically that I would like to have the parliamentary leader advise me when he is ready to go ahead with the regular legislative work.

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman is willing to suspend now, we can go on with the business and he can complete his statement later.

Mr. STAFFORD. I see my old friend, the executive clerk to the President, present, but I wish to read the bill I have drafted, so that you may consider the question of whether the end can not be accomplished by a bill rather than a constitutional amendment.

The bill is as follows:

That after the end of the present session, the next regular meeting of Congress shall be on the second Monday in November next, and in the event that Congress shall have adjourned before the 4th day of January following, it shall again assemble on said last-named date; and thereafter, beginning with the Seventy-third Congress, it shall assemble on the 6th day of March in each odd-numbered year; and again, in case Congress shall have adjourned before the second Monday in November of such years, it shall again assemble on said last-named date, and it shall also assemble, in the event it shall have adjourned before the 4th day of January following, on said 4th day of January in each even-numbered year, which session shall end, if it has not ended sooner, on the fourth Friday of October following.

In the event that any dates referred to in this section shall fall on a Sunday, then the next day shall be the date of assembling.

Sec. 2. Congress shall also assemble on the third Wednesday in February of each year that follows an election for President and Vice President, and on the day following the electoral vote shall be counted as provided by law.

The reason for that last provision is that there must be some meeting of the hold-over Congress every four years to consider the electoral vote. I thank you, gentlemen, for your respectful consideration of this proposal. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

THE BUDGET MESSAGE

The Chair laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have the honor to transmit herewith the Budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932. A comparison between the estimates of appropriations for 1932 and the appropriations for 1931 is set forth in the following table:

	Estimates, 1932	Appropriations, 1931 ¹
Legislative establishment:		
Senate.....	\$3,252,522.00	\$3,244,744.00
House of Representatives.....	8,182,298.00	8,176,754.00
Architect of the Capitol.....	10,336,609.00	8,472,417.53
Botanic Gardens.....	175,082.00	194,500.00
Library of Congress.....	2,457,722.00	3,767,742.00
Government Printing Office.....	4,294,000.00	3,270,000.00
Miscellaneous.....	185,050.00	185,050.00
Total, legislative establishment.....	28,883,283.00	27,311,267.03
Executive Office.....	473,400.00	422,320.00
Independent establishments:		
Alaska relief funds.....	15,000.00	15,000.00
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	304,250.00	1,000,000.00
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission.....	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00
Board of Mediation.....	318,545.00	328,380.00
Board of Tax Appeals.....	654,460.00	650,000.00
Bureau of Efficiency.....	201,470.00	224,330.00
Civil Service Commission.....	1,678,442.00	1,542,952.00
Commission of Fine Arts.....	9,995.00	9,080.00
Employees' Compensation Commission.....	4,736,390.00	4,210,000.00
Federal Board for Vocational Education.....	10,087,260.00	9,400,460.00
Federal Farm Board.....	101,900,000.00	1,900,000.00
Federal Oil Conservation Board.....	20,160.00	17,220.00
Federal Power Commission.....	319,270.00	299,170.00
Federal Radio Commission.....	466,820.00	450,000.00
Federal Reserve Board.....	1,609,200.00	2,560,336.00
Federal Trade Commission.....	1,625,986.00	1,580,000.00
General Accounting Office.....	4,353,320.00	4,193,500.00
George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission.....	800,000.00	

¹ Exclusive of the annual cost of the act approved July 3, 1930, amending the classification act of 1923, estimated at \$3,975,292.

	Estimates, 1932	Appropriations, 1931
Independent establishments—Continued.		
George Washington Bicentennial Commission.....	\$338,195.00	\$362,075.00
Housing Corporation.....	33,700.00	48,950.00
Individual records, civil-service retirements.....		150,000.00
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	11,975,593.00	10,329,963.00
Investigation of enforcement of prohibition and other laws.....		250,000.00
Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission.....		60,000.00
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	1,053,790.00	1,321,000.00
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	4,000,000.00	1,000,000.00
Personnel Classification Board.....	230,830.00	
Porto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission.....	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00
Protecting interests of the United States in oil leases and oil lands.....	20,000.00	
Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital.....	5,595,685.00	4,289,044.00
Public Buildings Commission.....	125,000.00	100,000.00
Smithsonian Institution.....	1,212,924.00	1,208,671.00
Supreme Court Building Commission.....	4,250,000.00	1,000,000.00
Tariff Commission.....	1,240,000.00	785,000.00
United States Geographic Board.....	9,538.00	15,760.00
United States Shipping Board and Merchant Fleet Corporation.....	39,405,000.00	6,346,000.00
Veterans' Administration.....	946,289,758.00	836,244,020.00
Yorktown Sesquicentennial Commission.....		8,000.00
Total, Executive Office and independent establishments.....	1,148,354,811.00	895,321,171.00
Department of Agriculture.....	225,537,476.00	173,145,474.50
Department of Commerce.....	54,638,226.00	54,619,485.00
Department of the Interior.....	85,345,211.73	83,875,323.74
Department of Justice.....	51,988,261.00	45,395,922.00
Department of Labor.....	13,446,400.00	12,230,170.00
Navy Department.....	349,628,298.00	382,505,193.26
Post Office Department:		
Postal Service payable from postal revenues.....	735,003,057.00	725,844,097.00
Postal deficiency payable from Treasury.....	114,041,000.00	111,202,200.00
State Department.....	17,731,306.34	17,816,022.14
Treasury Department.....	281,296,380.00	359,638,676.00
War Department, including Panama Canal.....	464,645,806.00	456,041,951.00
District of Columbia.....	47,796,047.00	48,397,432.00
Total, ordinary, including Postal Service.....	3,618,335,563.07	3,393,344,355.22
Reduction in principal of the public debt:		
Sinking fund.....	409,410,600.00	392,152,200.00
Other redemptions of the debt.....	59,099,305.00	48,846,000.00
Principal of the public debt.....	468,509,905.00	440,998,200.00
Interest on the public debt.....	581,000,000.00	603,000,000.00
Total, including Post Office Department and Postal Service.....	4,667,845,463.07	4,437,342,535.22
Deduct Postal Service payable from postal revenues.....	735,003,057.00	725,844,097.00
Total payable from the Treasury.....	3,932,842,411.07	3,711,498,438.22

Figures for 1931 include the appropriations transferred under the act of July 3, 1930, from the Interior Department (pensions) and the War Department (National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers).

Figures for 1931 include appropriations transferred under the acts of May 27, 1930, and June 17, 1930, from the Treasury Department (Prohibition Bureau and the U. S. Customs Court).

The total of the estimates of appropriations payable from the Treasury shown in the foregoing table is \$221,000,000 more than the appropriations for 1931. The estimates for 1932, however, contain \$100,000,000 for the revolving loan fund of the Federal Farm Board, for which no amount appears in the 1931 appropriations. Of other large items of increase the veterans' administration calls for \$110,000,000, the Shipping Board \$35,000,000, the road program \$51,500,000, while tax repayments are estimated at \$92,000,000 less. For the purposes of comparing the estimates for 1932 with the appropriations for 1931, the large items which involve either increase or decrease are set forth below:

	Increases	Decreases
Legislative establishment:		
House Office Building.....	\$2,300,000	
Senate Office Building.....	2,868,000	
Library of Congress Annex.....	1,000,000	
Enlarging Capitol Grounds.....		\$4,763,000
Library of Congress, Vollbehr collection.....		1,500,000
Government Printing Office Building.....	1,000,000	
Independent establishments:		
Federal Farm Board.....	100,000,000	
George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission.....	800,000	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	3,000,000	
Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital.....	1,300,000	

	Increases	Decreases
Independent establishments—Continued.		
United States Shipping Board and Merchant Fleet Corporation—		
Shipping fund.....		\$3,300,000
Construction loan fund.....	\$35,000,000	
United States Supreme Court Building.....	2,750,000	
Veterans' Administration—		
General administration and hospitalization.....	17,090,000	
Military and naval compensation.....	71,290,000	
Military and naval insurance.....	1,500,000	
Government life insurance.....	890,000	
Army and Navy pensions.....	9,500,000	
Hospital and domiciliary construction.....	9,350,000	
Total, Veterans' Administration.....	109,620,000	
Department of Agriculture:		
Forest Service.....	1,450,000	
Plant quarantine and control.....		1,730,000
Forest roads.....	1,500,000	
Federal-aid roads.....	50,000,000	
Mount Vernon Highway.....		2,000,000
Flood relief, roads.....		1,300,000
Department of Commerce:		
Aeronautics Branch.....	1,160,000	
Bureau of the Census.....		2,230,000
Bureau of Standards.....		870,000
Department of the Interior:		
Indian Service.....	1,390,000	
Indian trust funds.....		5,000,000
Bureau of Reclamation.....	4,420,000	
National parks, land purchases.....		1,820,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital, construction.....	1,150,000	
Department of Justice:		
Bureau of Prohibition.....	2,480,000	
Expenses, etc., United States courts.....	1,570,000	
Penal and correctional institutions.....	2,010,000	
Department of Labor:		
Navy Department:		
Bureau of Engineering.....		1,100,000
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.....		1,940,000
Bureau of Aeronautics.....		1,180,000
Major alterations of vessels.....		7,400,000
Increase of the Navy.....		21,100,000
Postal Service: Deficiency.....		2,830,000
Treasury Department:		
Refunding taxes illegally collected.....		92,000,000
Construction of public buildings.....	10,330,000	
Customs Service.....	1,000,000	
War Department:		
Buildings at military posts.....		1,410,000
Other Quartermaster Corps items.....		1,230,000
Air Corps.....	1,630,000	
Maintenance and improvement of rivers and harbors—		
Annual appropriation.....	5,000,000	
Permanent specific and indefinite appropriations.....	4,580,000	
District of Columbia:		
Municipal Center.....		3,000,000
Net increase other items.....	2,465,000	
Public debt:		
Reduction of principal.....	27,500,000	
Interest.....		22,000,000

There are certain items which affect these increases and decreases which I feel require special comment.

SHIPPING BOARD

The estimates for the Shipping Board contained in this Budget show a net increase of about \$33,000,000 over the appropriation for 1931. This increase is due to the estimate of \$35,000,000 for the construction-loan fund of the Shipping Board, which is a new item of appropriation. Heretofore all authorized loans for the construction of ships by private parties have been met by the receipts credited to the construction-loan fund of the Shipping Board arising from sales of ships or property and other sources. There will be required, however, a direct appropriation to the credit of this fund to provide for authorized loans during the fiscal year 1932. Decreases in the 1932 estimates of the Shipping Board for other purposes amount to approximately \$2,000,000, so that the net increase is \$33,000,000.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Under the authority contained in the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the President to consolidate and coordinate governmental activities affecting war veterans," approved July 3, 1930, there have been transferred to and consolidated in the Veterans' Administration the duties, powers, and functions which devolve by law upon the Bureau of Pensions of the Interior Department, the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and the United States Vet-

erans' Bureau. The activities of the War Department dealing with the payment of the annuities prescribed in the acts of Congress approved May 23, 1908, and February 28, 1929, and the furnishing of artificial limbs, trusses, and surgical appliances under the laws recited in chapter 5, title 38, United States Code, have also been transferred to the Veterans' Administration. For the first time there is presented in the estimates of one establishment the funds necessary to carry on the activities of the Government which deal directly with the administration of veterans' affairs. The total of the estimate is \$946,289,000, but not all of this pertains to veterans' affairs. Approximately \$21,000,000, which pertains generally to the civil-service retirement fund and the administration of the retirement law, has no application to veterans as such. This function was transferred to the Veterans' Administration because it formed a part of the duties of the Bureau of Pensions which was merged intact into the new establishment. The estimate for the Veterans' Administration contained in this Budget is approximately \$110,000,000 in excess of the appropriations for similar purposes for 1931. The principal items of increase are in general administration and hospitalization, \$17,428,000, which is due principally to enlarged operating costs occasioned by the increase in the number and capacity of hospitals and domiciliary facilities; military and naval compensation, \$71,300,000; construction of new hospitals and domiciliary facilities, \$9,350,000; and Civil War and Spanish-American War pensions, \$9,500,000. I feel confident that in the absence of the consolidation of veterans' affairs made possible by the act of Congress approved July 3, 1930, we would have required a larger appropriation for 1932 to serve the same purposes as are contemplated by the estimate contained in this Budget.

AGRICULTURE

The estimates for the Department of Agriculture for 1932 carry approximately \$56,740,000 in excess of the appropriations for the current fiscal year 1931. The major portion of this increase, \$51,500,000, is for the construction of roads in the Federal highway system and for forest roads and trails. Other increases are for agricultural research work, \$2,000,000, for service work for the general public, including the Weather Bureau service, \$2,440,000, and for enforcement of regulatory laws, \$800,000.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

In the estimates of the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1932 the principal item of decrease from the appropriations for the fiscal year 1931 is \$92,000,000 for refunding taxes illegally collected. On the other hand, the principal items of increase over 1931 are \$10,300,000 pertaining to the construction of public buildings and \$1,000,000 for the Customs Service. In total, the estimates for the Treasury Department for 1932, compared with the appropriations for 1931, show a decrease of \$78,342,000. This, however, is only an apparent reduction in so far as amounts available for expenditure within the respective fiscal years are concerned.

The appropriations for the Treasury Department include a number of double-year and no-year items. It is estimated that the result of operations under these appropriations will be a reduction in expenditures in 1931 of \$30,000,000, and an increase in the amount available in 1932 of \$59,400,000. On this basis the amount available in 1932 will be over \$11,000,000 in excess of 1931.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For the municipal government of the District of Columbia there is being requested \$47,796,000, which is a decrease of \$601,000 from the appropriations for 1931. However, the 1931 appropriations provided \$3,000,000 for the purchase of land and \$65,000 for the preparation of plans and designs of buildings for the municipal center, which are nonrecurring items. Deducting these amounts, the estimate for 1932 is \$2,465,000 in excess of the appropriation for 1931. I may add that the estimate for 1932 does not contain any amount for commencing actual construction for the municipal center for the reason that the preparation of plans, designs, and estimates of cost have not progressed to a point which

permits of a limit of total cost being expressed in the estimate. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia believe that approximately \$1,500,000 will be required to commence construction work and they are reserving that amount from the estimated revenues of the District of Columbia. In considering the amount available for appropriation for the District of Columbia this amount has been withheld from the estimates of 1932 solely with a view to later presentation when more complete information is available. I mention this so as to prevent any possible misunderstanding that the omission of the amount of \$1,500,000 from this Budget would leave excess funds of the District of Columbia available for appropriation for other purposes.

BUILDINGS

The progress made by the Treasury Department under the program to house Federal activities in Washington and throughout the country in Government-owned buildings has been greatly accelerated during the past year by a considerable enlargement of the program, expedition in acquiring sites, and the removal of restrictions on the employment of outside architectural services. The original public building act of May 25, 1926, authorized the expenditure of \$15,000,000, in addition to sums already provided, for the completion of 69 projects authorized prior to 1926. It also authorized the expenditure of \$50,000,000 for buildings in the District of Columbia, and \$100,000,000 for the country at large. An act approved February 24, 1928, amended the original act by increasing the authorization for buildings outside the District of Columbia \$100,000,000. A recent act, approved March 31, 1930, further amended the two prior acts by increasing the District of Columbia program for construction \$100,000,000, and the program outside the District \$115,000,000. The purchase of additional land in the District of Columbia at an aggregate cost of \$40,000,000 has also been authorized. The total public-buildings program, therefore, under present authorizations, amounts to \$520,000,000, to which should be added whatever amounts are derived from the sale of obsolete sites and buildings.

In furtherance of the purposes of this legislation specific authorizations have been made for 535 projects at limits of cost aggregating \$378,560,000. To finance the projects, on the basis of providing for maturing obligations, appropriations have been made to the amount of \$149,586,000. The total expenditures to October 31, 1930, amount to \$77,027,625.80, of which \$8,481,550.29 is chargeable to authorizations prior to 1926, leaving a balance available for further expenditure of \$72,558,379.09. The amount which will be expended during the remaining eight months of the current fiscal year is estimated at \$56,000,000. The appropriation balance then remaining, added to the \$60,000,000 carried in this Budget, will permit of expenditures somewhat in excess of \$76,500,000 during the fiscal year 1932. The expenditure program for the 20-month period from November 1, 1930, to June 30, 1932, therefore amounts to upward of \$132,500,000, and it is fully expected that this program will be carried out.

In addition to the building program as above outlined, appropriations amounting to \$23,680,000 have also been made under the authorization of \$40,000,000 for the purchase of additional land in the District of Columbia. The expenditures to October 31, 1930, amount to \$13,234,030.45, and approximately \$7,600,000 will be spent during the remainder of the current fiscal year. The expenditures during the fiscal year 1932 are estimated at upward of \$7,500,000, and for this purpose provision for an additional appropriation of \$5,000,000 is carried in this Budget.

The War Department is also carrying forward a building program, involving an ultimate expenditure of about \$160,000,000, for the housing of military personnel and utilities, made necessary by the need for replacing World War temporary construction and to provide generally for the increase in the pre-war strength of the Regular Army. There has already been appropriated for this purpose \$53,348,000, and \$14,700,000 is carried in the estimates for 1932, with authority to make contracts for \$3,000,000 additional. The estimates for 1932 also carry \$2,625,000 for technical buildings for the Air Service of the Army and \$1,530,000 for other

buildings for various purposes for the Army and the Panama Canal.

For buildings and structures for the Navy the Budget carries estimates aggregating \$9,542,500, of which \$50,000 is for the purchase of necessary land.

To complete the \$15,000,000 program for additional hospital facilities for the Veterans' Administration, \$7,950,000 is provided in this Budget for liquidating contracts previously authorized by the Congress and \$3,400,000 is provided for construction work at branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

A total of \$2,550,000 is estimated for new building construction for the Indian Service, including reservation and nonreservation schools, hospitals, and administration buildings.

The estimates for the Department of Justice include provision for construction at the Atlanta (Ga.) Penitentiary, \$100,000; at the McNeil Island (Wash.) Penitentiary, \$214,000; at the industrial reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio, \$1,000,000; for a new reformatory west of the Mississippi River, the location of which has not yet been decided upon, \$500,000; for Federal jails, \$500,000; and at the National Training School for Boys, Washington, D. C., \$200,000; a total of \$2,514,000.

For the Department of State \$2,000,000 is provided to continue the program for the construction of houses and offices for our representatives abroad.

Altogether this Budget carries \$111,811,500 for the procurement of sites and the construction of buildings, with a contract authorization for a further expenditure of \$3,000,000.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The estimates of appropriations for the War and Navy Departments for 1932 provide a total of \$689,084,000 for national defense. This is exclusive of all items of a non-military character and is a decrease under the appropriations for this purpose for 1931 of \$33,697,000.

The decrease for the War Department amounts to \$751,000, which amount is the net result of increases and decreases in many items based on the different requirements for the two fiscal years involved.

The decrease for the Navy Department is \$32,946,000. Due to the ratification of the London treaty, the operating force program of the Navy was revised to provide for a reduction in the enlisted force and a reduction in the number of vessels to be retained in commission. These changes involved a reduction in the estimated requirements for 1932 of approximately \$7,000,000. However, with a fleet much reduced in number of vessels, provision is made for 1932 for a reasonable increase in the enlisted complement of vessels and for relative increases in the items connected with the maintenance, repair, and operation of vessels, with the view that the efficiency of the personnel and of the vessels of the smaller active fleet may be further increased. After providing for these and other increases, the net decrease for ordinary operating expenses is \$4,446,000. The decrease for modernization of battleships is \$7,400,000, appropriations having previously been made to complete the modernization of all vessels so far authorized. For construction of vessels the decrease is \$21,100,000. A large unexpended balance accrued under the appropriations for ship construction because of the delay in the program pending the result of negotiations for modification of the Washington treaty. The construction of those vessels now authorized which are permitted by the London treaty should now go forward without delay. The cash withdrawals for new ship construction during 1932 is estimated at \$51,600,000 and for 1931 at \$44,200,000. Seven of the light cruisers carrying 8-inch guns and the aircraft carrier authorized by the act approved February 13, 1929, will be under construction by the close of the current fiscal year. Under the terms of the London treaty, and if this Government so elects, three more 8-inch-gun cruisers may be laid down; one in the calendar year 1933, one in 1934, and one in 1935. The remaining five cruisers authorized by the act may not, under

the terms of the treaty, be constructed with armament of 8-inch guns.

The estimates for 1932 provide additional funds necessary to carry forward work on the aircraft carrier and seven of the cruisers authorized by the act of February 13, 1929, and also the incompleting light cruisers and submarines being constructed under prior authorization.

AIR SERVICE

There is requested for the air services of the Army and Navy, including their civilian components, a total of \$29,361,000 for the procurement of new airplanes, their engines, spare parts, and accessories. I am also asking a total of \$277,000 for similar purposes for the Coast Guard, Department of Commerce, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. These two sums contemplate the procurement of a total of not less than 787 airplanes.

With regard to the Army, the estimates make provision for the procurement of at least 392 planes, which will provide an approximate total of 1,582 planes on hand and on order on June 30, 1932, leaving a possible shortage of 66 planes in the authorized total of 1,648. This is only an estimated shortage and may be substantially reduced by June 30, 1932. The National Guard now has its full complement of 152 planes.

Concerning naval aviation the expansion program authorized by Congress provided for 1,000 planes and two rigid airships. The airplane program will be completed during the current fiscal year, so that provision is made in this Budget only for the procurement of replacement planes to the number of 277. The two rigid airships are now under contract and there is included in this Budget \$1,675,000 for the completion of one and commencing the construction of the other.

In addition to the amounts which we are spending for the acquisition of aircraft we are also spending large sums for lighting and equipping airways, for the inspection and licensing of commercial planes and pilots, and furnishing weather reports necessary to the carrying on of aerial navigation. For these purposes \$10,375,000 is included in the estimates of the Department of Commerce and \$1,760,000 in the estimates of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Agriculture. It is estimated that by the end of the fiscal year 1932 there will be about 19,500 miles of airways lighted and equipped.

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

The estimates herewith contain an increase of \$5,000,000 for the maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works over the annual appropriation for the current fiscal year. In addition to this increase the estimates for 1932 show a further increase of \$4,680,000 over the estimates for 1931 in the funds required to meet the requirements of rivers and harbors and flood control under authorizations of law covering permanent specific and indefinite appropriations, advances, and contributions. The total contained in this Budget for rivers and harbors and flood control is \$108,553,000, of which \$71,703,000 is for rivers and harbors and \$36,850,000 for flood control.

PANAMA CANAL

The annual amounts now being appropriated for the Panama Canal are approximately \$12,000,000, and the receipts from the canal flowing to the Federal Treasury are approximately \$28,000,000, an excess of receipts over appropriations of \$16,000,000 annually. There seems to be a feeling in some quarters that under these circumstances either the tolls of the Panama Canal should now be materially reduced or the expenditures on the canal increased, or both. However, from 1903 to 1930 the total expenditures for the canal in excess of the receipts for the same period, with interest on the net outlay computed at 3 per cent annually, produce a total capital liability at the close of the last fiscal year of about \$535,000,000. The annual interest on this sum at 3 per cent is \$16,050,000. It is evident, therefore, as the tolls are now meeting only operating expenses

and interest on the investment, with no return of capital, any change in policy does not seem to be justified at the present time.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES

In the preparation of the estimates of appropriations contained in this Budget I have refrained (with the exception of one class of cases) from continuing the practice of recommending that the requirements for 1932 be met in part by a reappropriation, or extension of the availability, of unexpended balances of appropriations for the current or prior fiscal years. This practice effected an apparent reduction in the amount of an estimate of appropriation, but it did not affect in any way the amount of money to be withdrawn from the Treasury, and was to that extent misleading. As no saving resulted from such a practice, I felt that its discontinuance in framing the estimates for 1932 would result in having these estimates represent the true amount required and thus give a clearer and more accurate picture of actual requirements. The only cases in which the practice has been continued are those in which moneys appropriated for a specific nonrecurring project remain unexpended and it is necessary to continue the availability of the funds for the same purpose or purposes for which originally appropriated.

PAY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Under the classification act of 1923, as amended, and the application of that act to the field services by adjusting their rates of pay to correspond with those defined for the departmental service in the District of Columbia, there has developed through the years rather a wide difference among the several departments and establishments as to the relationship which the average of the existing salaries bears to the average of the compensation rates provided by law for the various grades of positions. In some instances the pay rolls show that the average has been approximately attained; in others that the grades are at least one step below the average, and in many cases two or more steps below the average. With a view to commencing the adjustment of this situation the estimates contained in this Budget carry for promotion purposes for each activity approximately 30 per cent of the amount required to bring all under-average grades up to the average. This will materially lessen the difference which now obtains between the many pay rolls, and if the same principle is followed for the next two or three years will eliminate such difference. It is estimated that it will require approximately \$14,440,000 to bring all under-average grades up to the average, and the estimates contained in this Budget provide for approximately 30 per cent of this amount.

While the percentage has been arbitrarily chosen and might be modified without affecting the purpose of eliminating discrepancies between and within the departments and

establishments, I believe any deviation from the general principle stated or any application of it to one department and not to another will defeat the purpose of providing "equal compensation for equal work," which was the expressed intent of Congress in enacting the classification act of 1923.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR 1932

In preparing the detailed statements of receipts and expenditures contained in this Budget I have segregated trust funds from general funds and special funds. This has been done for the reason that trust funds do not belong to the Federal Government but to the beneficiaries of the trusts; and, in summarizing the financial condition of the Government, trust funds should therefore be excluded.

For the purpose of comparison with the estimates contained in the Budget for the fiscal year 1931, submitted last December, trust funds are included in the following summary of receipts and expenditures:

Summary of receipts and expenditures

[Exclusive of postal revenues and postal expenditures paid from postal revenues]

	1932	1931	1930
Total general fund receipts.....	\$3,852,401,738.00	\$3,611,634,871.00	\$3,840,921,014.26
Total special fund receipts.....	103,317,543.00	94,143,572.00	207,639,566.98
Gross trust fund receipts.....	3,855,719,281.00 361,034,371.00	3,705,778,443.00 353,846,208.00	4,048,560,581.24 351,410,919.06
Deduct transfers from general to trust funds.....	4,316,753,652.00 231,633,725.00	4,059,624,651.00 224,759,408.00	4,399,971,500.90 222,029,798.91
Total net receipts.....	4,085,119,927.00	3,834,865,243.00	4,177,941,701.99
Total general fund expenditures.....	3,792,382,700.00	3,761,149,100.00	3,641,944,363.81
Total special fund expenditures.....	132,651,300.00	123,625,000.00	220,135,655.99
Total trust fund expenditures.....	3,925,034,000.00 361,118,925.00	3,884,774,100.00 354,927,208.00	3,862,080,019.80 354,102,266.20
Deduct transfers from general to trust funds.....	4,236,152,925.00 231,633,725.00	4,239,701,308.00 224,759,408.00	4,216,182,286.00 222,029,798.90
Total net expenditures.....	4,054,519,200.00	4,014,941,900.00	3,994,152,487.09
Excess of receipts.....	30,600,727.00		183,789,214.90
Excess of expenditures.....		180,076,657.00	

Since the Budget for 1931 was compiled before the segregation of funds was effected the estimates contained in that Budget do not show this segregation. In analyzing the differences between the present situation and that indicated in the Budget for 1931 it is therefore necessary to deal with totals including trust funds, although in the future it is contemplated to consider in such comparisons only general and special funds which represent true Government transactions.

	1931		1930	
	Estimated in this Budget	Estimated in the 1931 Budget	Actual	Estimated in the 1931 Budget
Receipts.....	\$3,834,865,243.00	\$4,225,727,666.00	\$4,177,941,701.99	\$4,249,263,434.00
Expenditures.....	4,014,941,900.00	4,102,938,700.00	3,994,152,487.09	4,023,681,900.00
Surplus.....		122,788,966.00	183,789,214.90	225,581,534.00
Deficit.....	180,076,657.00			

1930

The fiscal year 1930 closed with an actual surplus of receipts over expenditures of \$183,789,214.90 as against an estimated surplus as contained in the Budget for 1931 of \$225,581,534. The latter figure, however, did not reflect the effect of the temporary reduction in income taxes recommended in that Budget and which it was estimated would exceed \$80,000,000 during the fiscal year 1930. As a matter of fact, the actual receipts during the fiscal year 1930 were about \$71,000,000 less than the estimate contained in the 1931 Budget. This was partially offset by a net reduction

in expenditures of \$29,500,000 below those estimated in the 1931 Budget. This net reduction consisted of various increases and decreases, including about \$74,000,000 decrease in the reduction of the public debt on account of certain foreign interest payments being made in cash instead of in securities, as had been anticipated.

1931

For the current fiscal year, 1931, there has been a material change in our financial situation as now estimated compared with the estimates presented a year ago in the 1931 Budget. At that time it was estimated that the receipts

would total \$4,225,727,666 and the expenditures \$4,102,938,700, which forecasted a surplus of \$122,788,966. Here, again, the surplus estimated did not reflect the effect of the temporary tax reduction recommended in that Budget, which it was anticipated would cause a reduction of over \$75,000,000 in the receipts for the fiscal year 1931. Therefore, with this adjustment the surplus estimated at this time last year would have been about \$45,000,000.

Due to the depression it is now estimated that the income of the Government in taxes and in postal receipts for the current fiscal year will probably fall below the anticipation by over \$430,000,000. Moreover, the measures taken to increase employment by the expansion of construction activities in the Government under the authorization of Congress, together with other items of increase, including the increase in veterans' services enacted by Congress, represent a very material increase in Government expenditures of over \$225,000,000.

This would indicate a change in the situation from the estimates of the last Budget of nearly \$655,000,000. This large sum, however, is partially met by the application of \$185,000,000 of interest payments on the foreign debt to current expenditures and by arrangements of the Federal Farm Board by which they reduced their net cash demands upon the Treasury by \$100,000,000 during this period. These sums, together with economies brought about in the Government, reduce the practical effect of the change in the financial situation to a present estimated deficit of approximately \$180,000,000 for the current fiscal year.

This development, of course, is primarily due to the depressed condition not only in this country but in the whole world, accentuated by the drought, and, on the other hand, to the necessary measures of the Government to increase employment, and the increases of allowances to various services to veterans.

I do not look with favor on any attempts to meet this deficit by reduction of the statutory redemption of the public debt, which now amounts to about \$440,000,000 per annum. Nor do I look with great concern upon this moderate deficit for the current fiscal year, which, in fact, amounts to less than 5 per cent of the total Government expenditure. The adverse balance can be met by reducing the general fund balance from the amount in it at the beginning of the year, supplemented, if necessary, by temporary borrowing by the Treasury. When we recollect that our Budget has yielded large surpluses for the last 11 years, which have enabled us to retire the public debt, in addition to retirements required by law, to the extent of nearly \$3,500,000,000, we can confidently look forward to the restoration of such surpluses with the general recovery of the economic situation, and thus the absorption of any temporary borrowing that may be necessary.

It will probably be necessary for Congress to appropriate additional money for expenditure within the present fiscal year in order to increase employment and to provide for the drought situation. I have presented this matter in my annual message on the state of the Union. While this will operate to increase the amount of the deficit as above estimated, I believe such increase can be accommodated by the methods indicated. On the other hand, no appropriations should be made for such purposes which look beyond such action as will ameliorate the immediate situation during the next six months.

TAXES

The estimate of receipts for 1932 is predicated on the existing income tax law. The Congress granted a substantial reduction in tax rates upon incomes of the calendar year 1929. I wish that it were possible to continue this reduction for the taxes upon incomes of the calendar year 1930. I regret that the present outlook for heavy decrease in probable income and the necessity to increase public works and aid to employment does not warrant the continuation of the reduction at the present time. The difference in revenue between the tax rates upon incomes authorized for the calendar year 1929 by the joint resolution approved December 16, 1929, and the rates specified in the revenue

act of 1928 is approximately \$160,000,000. If our expected revenues for 1932 were reduced by this amount a deficit for 1932 as well as 1931 would now appear to be inevitable. I am confident that the sentiment of the people is in favor of a balanced Budget. I am equally confident that the influence on business of having the financial affairs of the Federal Government on a sound basis is of the utmost importance.

CONCLUSION

For the fiscal year 1932 the favorable margin between our estimated receipts and estimated expenditures is small. It will not take much to exhaust the expected surplus. In fact, it is inevitable that some portion, and perhaps a considerable portion, of it will be required to meet the settlement of judgments and claims and the cost of other contingencies or emergencies which can not now be foreseen. On the receipt side credit has been taken for all revenue that can reasonably be anticipated. In the expenditure statement there have been covered the amounts which reasonably can be estimated as necessary to meet the obligations of the Government under present law. This is not a time when we can afford to embark upon any new or enlarged ventures of government. It will tax our every resource to expand in directions providing employment during the next few months upon already authorized projects. I realize that, naturally, there will be before the Congress this session many legislative matters involving additions to our estimated expenditures for 1932, and the plea of unemployment will be advanced as reasons for many new ventures, but no reasonable view of the outlook warrants such pleas as apply to expenditures in the 1932 Budget. I have full faith that in acting upon these matters the Congress will give due consideration to our financial outlook. I am satisfied that in the absence of further legislation imposing any considerable burden upon our 1932 finances we can close that year with a balanced Budget.

When we stop to consider that we are progressively amortizing our public debt and that a balanced Budget is being presented for 1932, even after drastic writing down of expected revenue, I believe it will be agreed that our Government finances are in a sound condition.

HERBERT HOOVER.

DECEMBER 1, 1930.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOOD, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 14246, Rept. No. 2068), making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, which was read the first and second times and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves all points of order on the bill.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 14246, the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill; and pending that motion, ask that some arrangement be made with reference to general debate.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I have numerous requests on this side for time. I suggest that we run along to-day, dividing the time equally, and we may be in a better position to-morrow to determine upon how much time we need.

Mr. WOOD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be not limited at this time, but that it be divided equally between the two sides, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] to have charge of one-half of the time on that side and I to have charge of one-half of the time on this side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation

bill, and pending that asks unanimous consent that for to-day general debate be equally divided and controlled between himself and the gentleman from Tennessee. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of getting some information I reserve the right to object. When will we have the benefit of the chairman's speech on the bill? I am sure the Members want to hear his opening speech.

Mr. WOOD. I shall not make my speech to-day.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the chairman tell me why it is that the old-time practice has been changed in respect to making the opening speech on an appropriation bill? The time was when the chairman of the committee made the opening speech and made a full presentation of what the bill contained. I notice that recently that practice has been discontinued.

Mr. WOOD. It was changed in order to save time and expedite business. We found that many speeches made after the opening speech were made in criticism and there was no chance to reply, and in order that the House might have full presentation of the matter and that I might have a chance to answer any criticism that might be made, I felt that my speech should be made after the others.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the chairman's speech will come to-morrow?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; unless you gentlemen talk too much.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA].

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this Congress is faced with a crisis such as few Congresses in the history of the Republic have had to meet. If the Republic were threatened with an attack by the strongest nation in the world, there would be no question as to our power in marshaling the resources of the country to save the Republic.

If at this moment an individual falls on the street from starvation, municipal, State, or Federal Government will send an ambulance to his aid, stop traffic in getting that ambulance there, and bring him to a hospital and give him kindly and necessary aid, and restore him to life only to be turned loose again to starve. If a person breaks into a bank and he is caught he will have a judicial investigation of his conduct, a trial at great expense, and if guilty the State will provide him a sanitary room, proper diet, clothing, care, and recreation for a certain term. Yet we stand here as a Congress in despair and helpless to know what to do to meet a crisis of unemployment so great that it may threaten the very safety of our Republic. It is of no aid to know that there is distress, unemployment, and suffering in other countries, except that we can at least profit by the experience on this problem of other countries. We can at least examine and study measures taken by other countries to alleviate distress and their attempts to prevent suffering and hunger in periods of distress. I will concede that conditions are different in our country. Yet we can not close our eyes and ignore what has happened and is happening in other countries. By studying conditions and remedies we might be better able to solve our own immediate problem.

We have our own immediate problems to solve. The cause of unemployment in this country is quite different from that in other countries. Other countries are suffering from unemployment and distress generally owing to overpopulation, industrial inefficiency, or poverty. The greatest factor of unemployment in this country, as I see it, is our efficiency together with our wealth.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Not at this moment. Our situation is not temporary, and, gentlemen, you will be making a great mistake in your legislative enactments if you consider unemployment as merely something temporary or spasmodic. With all due deference to the recommendations that have been made to the Congress that only temporary relief is necessary and essential, and of course it is, yet temporary relief is not the solution of our problem. You can authorize an appropriation for all the public works that you will, but there will come a time when resources for public works will be limited. That will not be sufficient. You are faced now with a deficiency of over \$100,000,000. Recommendations have been made for additional public works, but no legislation has been enacted to provide means for carrying them forward. I would make provision for public works continually, work out all necessary engineering details and legal preliminaries so that such work could be immediately started and actual construction begun when needed as unemployment relief. But the number of employed is negligible on all the public work imaginable compared with the number of unemployed to-day. The thing to do is to prevent unemployment instead of just scratching the surface when millions of men and women are in want.

Cooperation between the Federal Government and the States and municipalities for temporary relief, of course, is highly desirable. But there should also be something done for permanent relief. If you will look up the figures of unemployment you will find our unemployment is increased progressively each year, regardless of our prosperity or so-called good times.

We are told that our efficiency in production and industry is so great and our industries are so wealthy in this country that, unlike the industries and needs of other countries, notably European countries, American industry can afford to acquire every new machine invented and thereby increase its output, reduce production cost—all resulting in less human labor employed. Yet we can not stop progress. We do not want to stop progress. We can not stop the utilization of machinery. But under our machine-producing methods all the advantage goes into capital and all the burden falls on labor. A readjustment is absolutely necessary and inevitable. Labor-saving devices can produce twice the output at one-half cost with 33 per cent less of human labor.

The result is that for several years American production has increased and employment has comparatively decreased. Whether it is shoes, steel, razors, automobiles, cigars, or even transportation, improved methods of production and labor-saving machinery have increased output and decreased employment. Such a system may work to the advantage of the manufacturers or, to be perfectly plain, to the owners of the machinery for a while. Eventually there is bound to be a glut of overproduction in the sense that there is not sufficient purchasing power to consume the productions of these industries. To date the owners of machinery have enjoyed the benefits of improved methods of production at the cost of human labor. But what good will it do to have machines to produce goods if human beings who are to consume these same goods have not the power to purchase. American manufacturers must never forget that machines may make their products, but human beings make the market.

Our great difficulty in dealing with this problem is not because a solution can not be found. Our trouble is to bring this solution into being. Had we but one Government I do not believe that Congress would hesitate to pass necessary regulatory laws and bring about a readjustment of the relation between capital and labor to fit the mechanical age in

which we are living. Our great difficulty is, instead of having one Government, we have 49 governments. There are 48 sovereign States, and no one will question that under a strict interpretation of the Constitution, the limited powers delegated to the Federal Government, each sovereign State has retained jurisdiction over such matters involved in bringing about such a readjustment. Many of the States have seriously endeavored to keep abreast of the times. Many of the States have enacted legislation to meet new methods of production, use of machinery, and to safeguard the interest of the workers. Many of the States have passed laws prohibiting the employment of children in factories. Many States have real effective factory laws and laws regulating the working hours of women. Employers' liability laws, which at one time were considered radical and extreme—I will not say bolsheviki, because the word did not exist at the time—have been enacted in many States. Injured workmen who at one time became public charges together with their families are now properly provided for. Many of the Members here may well remember that when machinery first was used on a large scale in factories the situation arose whether the old rules of the common law concerning injuries sustained while working could continue to be applied in the modern mechanical age.

At that time constitutional objections were immediately presented. How about the fellow-servant rule? How about assumption of risk and contributory negligence? How could an employer be held responsible if one of his workmen was injured through the negligence of another? That would be depriving him of his property without due process of law. Such objections were held sound for a long time, but the continued use of machinery, the introduction of high-powered machinery soon brushed aside all legal and constitutional arguments in opposition, and many of the States have enacted employers' liability laws. Workers are now cared for when they are injured while employed. Old principles of the common law which held for centuries became obsolete as machinery became perfected. And so it is with many other fundamental changes in law and constitutional construction which have been brought about by reason of changed conditions under which we are living. But many of the States that have been progressive and that have attempted to keep their laws abreast of progress have found all of this to their disadvantage. Why? For the simple reason that many States have remained backward. Many States have failed to pass State child labor laws, proper employers' liability laws, effective factory laws. Not only have many States failed to pass such necessary and beneficial laws but have advertised that fact.

The result is that industries have been attracted to such States, while industries remaining in the States desiring to protect the interests of the workers find that they must meet most unfair competition. Such competition is manifestly unfair both to the industry and to labor. It is well known that many industries, and we need only mention the textile industry, have been attracted from one State to another because of the fact that child labor was available. Every time a child is employed in a factory it means that another adult worker has been thrown out of work and the child taken out of school. The first thing that we must do is to bring about uniform State laws, uniform labor laws in all of the States. There should be a uniform child labor law in every State as well as the other measures which I have just mentioned. Of course, the easiest way would be a constitutional amendment giving Federal Government jurisdiction in these matters. I do not suggest a constitutional amendment at this time, regardless of how I may feel about it. The reason is people of this country are not yet ready to accept another constitutional amendment. I firmly believe that the havoc, wrath, and disappointment following the eighteenth amendment has made ratification of constitutional amendments difficult for a long time to come. That is the reason in my opinion that the child-labor amendment was defeated. I feel though that it is possible to get the States together and to agree upon uniform laws.

While it is well to talk about State rights, we must not forget that States are more interdependent now than ever

before. We have had an economic unification of the country. Cable, telegraph, wireless, radio, transportation, railroads, canals, steamships, and airships have made 1 State out of 48. When we have unemployment in New York you will have it out in Indiana, and when the farmers are in distress we will feel it in industrial centers. While at one time each Colony or each State had its own economic problems, to-day the economic unification of the country is such that the economic problem of a State just can not be solved by the State alone. We must work together in this proposition, because distress in one section of the country is immediately reflected in other sections of the country.

Now, can we do something to urge all the States to get together, not through the National Congress, because we have our own particular function, but to meet and agree upon model, uniform State laws, and then have those model laws referred back to each of the States with the force of public opinion back of them and obtain their enactment by each of the States. I have such a resolution now pending.

Gentlemen, just consider if we had a uniform child labor law, and I have yet to hear a man stand up and oppose restriction of the employment of children of tender years in factories. I have heard many arguments on the constitutionality of a Federal child labor law; I have heard arguments against the enactment of a constitutional amendment increasing the powers of the Federal Government to regulate child labor, but I have yet to hear anyone who dared stand up and oppose restriction of the employment of child labor on its merits. That being so, as I have just stated, suppose we had a uniform child labor law in each of the 48 States preventing the employment of children in industries and in factories, that would immediately give work to several hundred thousand men and women. It has put these children back into school and given them the opportunity their American birth entitles them to.

Suppose we had a uniform employers' liability law in each of the States. To that extent it would relieve poverty in cases where the workers were injured in the course of their employment. And it would equalize the overhead costs of production and eliminate at least that factor in competition that now exists between industries in various sections of the country. Suppose we had uniform State laws regulating factories as to light, ventilation, and floor space—that, too, would decrease the number of dependents who become public charges by reason of laboring in insanitary and unsafe surroundings and becoming dependent by reason of vocational disease.

I do not want to shock some of my more conservative friends, but suppose we had proper State care of superannuated workers—that would immediately take care of and make place for several hundred thousand younger men and women. As it is now, the question of superannuated workers is a problem in each State. It is difficult for a man with a tinge of white hair to find employment in a factory to-day by reason of the speed of production and the use of machinery. We have the problem in every large city of men in the fifties simply unable to find work. What is to become of these men? The number is increasing. They must be cared for. It is part of the cost of the industry. Either directly or through the State these men must be cared for.

Gentlemen, we are talking, officially and otherwise, about overproduction. Overproduction. Overproduction is true as a fact only when there is no further need for a particular commodity. You can not talk of overproduction in wheat; you can not talk to me about overproduction in flour, when we have hungry people in the city of New York and there are hungry people all over the world. We may be suffering from lack of ability to purchase, but there is a marked difference between lack of ability to purchase the necessities of life and overproduction of the necessities of life.

If all the people in our industrial centers were sufficiently nourished, if all the children in our industrial centers could have an extra piece of bread, butter, and molasses every afternoon, there would be no overproduction in the farming districts.

Mr. VESTAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. VESTAL. What does the gentleman say about uniformity in the hours of labor, and the fact that they should be reduced?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I am coming to that. I am trying to administer this medicine in graduated doses. I do not want to shock my conservative friends too much. So, in my opinion, all this talk of overproduction when people are in need of the very commodities that are in the warehouses, in the storage houses, and in the elevators has been overplayed.

I think it was stated yesterday about the price of butter being 30 per cent more in New York than it is in Copenhagen. My good friend, Farmer STRONG of Kansas, told me to-day that eggs were selling at 14 cents a dozen out his way. Why, gentlemen, eggs have become a luxury in my city. You have either got to be sick or a millionaire to eat eggs regularly. The old American breakfast of oatmeal, ham and eggs, buns, butter, and coffee simply does not exist any longer. Not in the city for the workingman, anyway.

Mr. ARENTZ. Why do you not drive out the racketeers?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I will join in any suggestion the gentleman from Nevada may have to drive them out. The gentleman, perhaps, is trying to get me onto another subject. I believe I know the gentleman has in mind oppressive methods employed in the distribution and retailing of certain commodities. That is another subject. When good, wholesome Americans are willing to work but can not find employment and when the heads of families see their children are not getting sufficient nourishment, something is wrong with our economic system. We can not dodge responsibility. That rests with us as national legislators. A cure must be found. A repetition of the present suffering must be prevented. To save the lives of American workers just can not be unconstitutional.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL] has asked me what I have to say about shorter hours. Why, gentlemen, shorter hours are coming, just as sure as we are sitting here to-day, and it is our job to bring them about in a constructive way before we are forced to do it.

I remember a time—and it is only 17 years ago—when we were working the tailors and garment workers in New York 60 hours a week. They went on strike. It was a long strike during the winter months. They finally went back to a week of 54 hours, and that was considered a great victory. However, we no longer think in terms of 54 hours. We no longer think in terms of even 48 hours.

What good is it, gentlemen, if industries so handle and exploit labor as to create a situation in which a large proportion of the population is unable to buy what the minority and machines are producing? Anyone with any vision will concede that industry must adjust itself to these new conditions.

If we employ all of the people of the country, we will find that we have thereby immediately created a market for our production, whether it be agricultural or industrial. After we have passed upon the basic legislation as to child labor, superannuated workers, employers' liability, minimum wage for women, old-age pension, and factory laws then we come right down to the practical proposition: How are we going to extend the enjoyment of machinery to the whole country? You can not avoid that, gentlemen. There is only one answer. A reduction of the daily hours of work and a reduction of the weekly hours of work. Perhaps six hours a day, five days a week. Less profits, more work, more consumption, better times, happiness.

I know some one will say that will create idleness. Yes. It will create an opportunity for education, for recreation, for travel, for enjoyment of life. Of course it will. But it all creates work for others—theaters, clothes, transportation, books, libraries, schools—all important in our modern life.

We went way ahead of other countries in labor conditions and we prospered by it. We must now go to the very root of our troubles and adjust the relations between employer and employee, and between the producer and the consumer, so as to utilize machinery, enjoy the advantages of progress, and yet employ all of our people.

Some one will say that is all right in theory, but how are you going to do it? Where is it going to come from? I will tell you where it will come from. It will come out of profits. There is where it will come out of. It must come out of profits. But it will mean security and peace, both to business and to our people.

Why, gentlemen, did you notice the figures given in the President's message yesterday—and the President was rather conservative in his figures? Although there has been an increase in unemployment there is an increase in the surplus, resources, and deposits of the banks of the country. That bears out my contention that unemployment is not due entirely to poverty, such as it is in Germany.

It is not due to the inefficiency of industry in not keeping abreast with modern systems of production, such as is the case in England. It is not due to overpopulation, such as is the case in Italy. It is because, as I said before, we are so efficient, and we have so many resources that we have, gentlemen, a margin which will permit us to adjust ourselves, decrease the hours, employ more people, and decrease the week. As I have just stated, it will create an opportunity for recreation—a big industry in itself—for travel and for more education. That is all necessary to the make-up of our modern life.

So let us not stand here idly and say this is going to adjust itself. Gentlemen, it will not adjust itself. We may pull through this crisis in a few months, but it will recur in just a few years. We must prevent a recurrence; we must eliminate the fear of unemployment, now the worry of every American workman.

We are always prepared for great emergencies of prosperity. In 1914, when the greater part of the world stopped producing, Germany, France, Belgium, England, and Russia were at war. We came up to the situation immediately and we were furnishing the markets of the entire world. We not only furnished the markets of the warring nations but we immediately provided South America, Asia, and Australia all the imports they were previously receiving from Europe. We measured right up to that emergency. Then when the war was over, in 1919 and 1920, we thought we had the world. We thought we were sitting on top of the world. We were still exporting to South America and we were still exporting to Europe. Why? Because the warring nations had not yet gotten themselves on a production basis. But the minute Germany started to produce and the minute England put itself on a production basis you saw our South American markets slip by and we lost them.

So the period of prosperity we had from 1914 to 1920 was because of world conditions. We had the entire world as our market, and yet during all of that time there seemingly was not sufficient vision to see what would happen, and we just kept going right along thinking prosperity would last forever. We know that it can not and therefore we must provide ahead for periods of depression.

Now we are confronted with these cold and hard facts of unemployment and of poverty. I have said this many times on the floor of this House, but I repeat it. The minute depression hits my city it is immediately reflected in your farming districts.

Now, what would I suggest? I do not see why we can not authorize the President of the United States to call a conference of States for the purpose of agreeing to model and uniform State labor laws. We can appropriate for the expense of that conference. We will not be infringing upon the prerogatives of the States or upon State rights, because it will be their own conference, called for one specific purpose. They have sufficient information available and they can there agree on what should be the minimum, model laws to take care of industry in this mechanical age, and then submit the proposition to each State.

It is a long process, I know, but we must make a beginning some time. We are always ready to see constitutional objections to every constructive proposition. Other countries have been forced to adopt some kind of unemployment insurance, but each of these countries had to begin unemployment insurance in the midst of a crisis, and naturally

those countries ran into a deficit. But we are in a position to study that question and get the benefit of the experience of England, Germany, and other countries. Then we can, by cooperating with the States, adopt a system of unemployment insurance so as to make the dread of starvation and poverty impossible in every American home. [Applause.]

Of course, it costs money and, of course, it takes courage to suggest any such radical, if you please, innovation as that. But you know, gentlemen, that the American farmer and working men and women are thinking. They can not be permitted to starve. Of course, they are thinking, and there is nothing more conducive to that than an empty stomach.

We had before us in the last Congress a bill providing for a system of national employment agencies. First the committee and then the House saw fit to amend that bill. It is in conference now. The bill should be passed as originally introduced. The national employment bill should likewise be enacted into law.

We must have some clearing house for labor, and if you want to eliminate all the vice that now exists in bringing down wages, in creating more bitter competition in the labor market, you must eliminate the private employment agency, and this can be brought about by creating a national employment agency, cooperating with the States as provided in the bill S. 3060, which will establish a central source of information on labor conditions and provide a clearing house for employment, orderly systematized and organized.

Gentlemen, all of these questions must be considered by this Congress, whether it is a short session or any other kind of session. You can not feed people with statistics. We have had more investigations, more commissions, more researches than we can digest, and it is time for some drastic action.

I do not know what we are going to do if all the public works that we have appropriated for are put into construction. May I pause here for a moment to suggest that if the President of the United States really desires—and I am sure he does—to spend the money which we have heretofore appropriated for public works, he would better look into the Treasury Department and into the architect's office and get some men there who can speed up the blue prints so we can start to dig and do some building.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WOODRUFF). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am sorry. I just got started. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss the bill which is pending before us. The chairman of the committee will doubtless later on take the bill up in detail and analyze it for the benefit of the membership of the House. For more than three weeks the subcommittee on the post office and Treasury appropriation bill has been conducting hearings in preparation of the bill before you. These bills are never considered from a partisan or political standpoint, and the Democrats of the Appropriations Committee will cooperate in every way possible with the majority members in the effort to promote economy and to bring about the speedy passage of all the regular annual appropriation bills by the House.

I wish to devote a very few minutes to a discussion in a general way, because I have not had an opportunity to study the message of the President which was read to-day or the annual message of the President, which was read upon yesterday.

May I say here that I somewhat regret the practice that has grown up in the last six years in the presentation of most of the appropriation bills in that the chairman, or the gentleman in charge of the bill, delays his remarks explaining the bill until the close of general debate.

There has been some criticism expressed to me of this practice, and while I have no personal criticism to offer of this practice, which, as I say, has prevailed with respect to some of the bills for the last six or seven years, I do think in the interest of those of the membership who are called upon to vote upon these measures and who desire to hear

some explanation of them, it would be more agreeable if the opening remarks in general debate upon these bills came from the gentleman who has particular charge of the bill. Members would then know when the bill would be explained and would thus make it a point to be on hand, and it certainly would be more satisfactory to some of us who do not want to anticipate our chairman in what he may say with reference to some of these appropriations.

Everyone realizes the widespread depression and unemployment which have existed throughout the country for many months, and to which the President gave the greater part of his attention in his message of yesterday.

The President told us in this message there was little hope of any relief in the next few months, although he did say he did not believe that any appropriation should be made for the purpose of taking care of unemployment for a longer period than six months, intimating that he had the hope and the belief that this depression and unemployment would be over by that time, and, of course, we all sincerely join in that hope.

But I was somewhat amazed at the remedy proposed by the President to relieve unemployment. Several months ago it was widely published over the country that an expert had been brought here from the city of New York and established in offices with considerable clerical force in the Department of Commerce. It was said that he was brought here for the purpose of assisting in relieving unemployment and advising with the President.

When this question of depression and unemployment became acute I do not suppose there was a man, woman, or even child who did not think of the idea that one way to relieve it would be to increase and speed up public works. So there was nothing new and nothing constructive in the message of the President when he asked for an appropriation for that purpose; but I had hoped that with the aid of this expert from the city of New York there might have been some constructive proposition submitted to the Congress which would really relieve the situation.

I have said I was surprised at the proposal of the President that Congress, the responsible appropriating body, and this House, which has time and time again expressed its disapproval of lump-sum appropriations, should appropriate and hand over to him the huge sum of from one hundred to one hundred and fifty millions. Mind you, it was his proposal, not that Congress appropriate for certain specific functions which had been recommended by him, but the money was to be put into his hands and he was then to select a committee from among his Cabinet to expend this sum according to their judgment—not the judgment of Congress. It would be as reasonable for him to ask Congress to make a lump-sum appropriation for every Government department—to be expended as the President and his Cabinet should see fit.

I have the highest respect for every member of the Cabinet. I recognize their probity and their patriotism; but as a Member of the House, charged with the responsibility of appropriating the money of the people, and primarily responsible to the people for these appropriations, I am unwilling by my vote to appropriate the huge sum of one hundred to one hundred and fifty million dollars without having some information as to just where and how the money is going to be expended, by what department it is going to be expended, and in what sections of the country it is going to be expended.

The President states in his message that he has had a survey made of the departments and that he has information as to just how much each department can use in the way of construction work. Certainly Congress is entitled to have that information. Certainly Congress is entitled to have the Budget Bureau, created for this purpose, send us estimates showing just how much money is going to be used and in what way it will have the effect of speeding up the building program and giving employment to labor.

Let me say here that I stand ready to vote for every dollar that is necessary, or that is believed to be necessary, to relieve the present depressed condition throughout this

country. [Applause.] I feel I can, as one of its humble members, speak for the Democratic side and give assurance that no Democrat will offer the slightest objection to any appropriation that is designed for that purpose. On the contrary, we join with you gentlemen on the other side in every effort you may make to relieve the distressed situation which exists throughout the country. [Applause.] But for one I wish to be advised as to what is proposed, and certainly Congress is entitled to that information.

Let us see what speed has been made heretofore in the construction of public buildings.

This situation did not grow up overnight. It has existed for months and months and months. It began with the great stock panic in Wall Street in the city of New York. Ever since that time business has been going to pieces. Men and women have been losing their jobs and farm prices have been going down.

So I say it is not a sudden thing. What progress has been made up to this time in the construction of public buildings? I recall two cases in my own State, and I daresay you gentlemen have personal information as to cases of a similar kind in your States.

In the last deficiency bill, which passed July 3, 1930, an appropriation was made for a public building in Chattanooga and one in Knoxville, Tenn., neither of which are in my district. Yet to-day not even a site has been selected.

One gentleman who went to Knoxville to look over and select a site a few days ago is quoted as saying that it would be eight or nine months before the Government would begin work on the post-office building in the city of Knoxville, Tenn. And yet they have got to-day in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the building fund \$72,558,000. If the administration is so anxious to provide work and that money has been lying there in the Treasury idle, why is it that these buildings have not been put under construction?

Do not misunderstand me. I am not indulging in criticism of any public official; but I am saying that when the country is told that we need \$100,000,000 or \$150,000,000 to speed up the construction of public buildings in order to take care of unemployment this winter, and that if such an appropriation is made it will have that result, the facts now at hand do not justify such a statement.

I am perfectly well aware that in the large task of constructing public buildings over the country time is needed. I wish to repeat that I am not offering any criticism of those who are in charge of this work. Hon. Ogden Mills, the Undersecretary of the Treasury, in discussing the appropriation of \$60,000,000 carried in this bill, and also the balance on hand, said:

It may well be, in view of the expanding building program, that an additional appropriation will be needed 12 months hence. In other words, we will be in a much better position in December, 1931, to know how much can actually be expended in the fiscal year than we are to-day.

They have \$72,000,000 now, and this bill carries \$60,000,000 in addition, making \$132,000,000 which will be at the disposal of the Treasury Department for the acquisition of sites and construction of public buildings. Do you know how long it takes to get a title through the Department of Justice after you have selected the site? It takes on an average of four months for the Department of Justice to pass on the title. Then after the title has been approved deeds must be passed; then plans and specifications must be drawn for the building, and bids must be called for; advertisements made, and after the lowest bid has been received and accepted contracts must be entered into and passed on by the legal authorities.

What about other public works? There is the construction of roads. There could be a good deal more money expended on roads, of course. That money could be distributed among the States, and let me say here that if it is done and legislation is passed, I want to see some of that money put upon what we might call the small market roads out in the communities, rather than upon the great highways, upon which most of the money has been expended in the past. However, under the law as it exists to-day, the States must cooperate with the Federal Government. Un-

der the law as it exists to-day, the States must match dollars with the Federal Government. How many States of this Union are prepared to put up their part of the money necessary to insure this increased appropriation from the Federal Government? Many of their legislatures are not in session in order to meet the increased appropriation. Congress will have to change the law so as to permit this money to be appropriated and distributed to the States without cooperation, but when it does it I am unwilling to let even the President of the United States, for whom I have great respect, say how much shall be given to this State and how much to that State.

Congress has passed upon that, and has provided that it shall be distributed according to the mileage in public roads and the population of the States in order to be fair and not to discriminate. The agricultural bill, which will be reported shortly, will carry, I think, \$125,000,000 for the building of public roads. That money can be made immediately available. I have no objection to increasing that amount, but I think a great deal has been said through the newspapers which has had the effect of creating the impression throughout the country that when Congress appropriates \$100,000,000 to \$150,000,000 and puts that money in the hands of the President the whole problem will be solved. The President stated in his message yesterday that in this year, 1930, there were \$7,000,000,000 in contracts for construction and betterment upon the part of public-utility companies and other great corporations. One hundred and fifty million dollars is not 2 per cent of that amount, so one can see how little additional relief this is going to give to the millions of men and women who are out of employment to-day and to their dependents.

Money can be spent in increasing amounts upon river and harbor work. The President and the Budget have only recommended an increase of \$5,000,000 for the next year over what we had last year, or \$60,000,000 to be spent in the way of flood control.

I have called attention to these facts in the hope that the country will not be deceived by this claim that simply by the appropriation of \$100,000,000 to \$150,000,000 this whole problem is going to be settled.

There is one other subject of which I wish to refer and that is the question of the Budget, which was submitted here to-day. As I said at the outset, I have not had an opportunity to analyze it. I have contended for many years that the expenses of our Government for ordinary operations were increasing rapidly every year, and this year is no exception. Mind you, these estimates do not relate to the additional appropriations necessary for speeding up work and increasing work of public construction. The estimates for 1932 amount to \$4,667,845,468.07. The appropriations for 1931 were \$4,437,342,585.22, or an increase for the next year over the present year of \$230,502,882.85. These are the estimates for the regular annual appropriation bills. You and I know that there will be deficiency bills at the next session of Congress, which will add to the amount of appropriations necessary to carry our Government through 1932. And this increase is made despite the fact that there is a saving in interest on the public debt of \$22,000,000 next year over this year and despite the fact that owing to a balance in the Treasury it is not necessary to appropriate \$28,000,000 for the increase of the Navy and major alterations of the larger vessels. Also, it is made in spite of the fact that the appropriation for 1932 carries \$104,000,000 less than was carried for the present year for the purpose of making tax refunds.

As I have stated, these expenses relate to the ordinary expenditures of the Government. The total expenditures as stated by the President, exclusive of postal expenses, amount to \$4,286,152,925, and if you will add to that the postal expenses, which are as much a part of the expenditures of the Government as those of any other department, and for which we appropriate, of course, in the pending bill for the next fiscal year, you will have, according to the President's figures, over \$5,000,000,000 of expenditure for 1932, a greater amount than we have ever had to expend in peace times

except in 1921, when we were still paying for the hang over of the World War and had an army of occupation in Germany.

The President states that there will be a deficit of over \$180,000,000 at the close of the present fiscal year. A year ago he estimated there would be a surplus of more than \$200,000,000, and Congress thereupon reduced the income tax for the year 1929 in the sum of \$160,000,000, and this fact was used in the last election as one of the great accomplishments of the present administration. Now, after the election it appears that instead of a surplus there will be a deficit and that the taxes obtaining in 1928 must be restored.

Those expenses are increasing, and increasing steadily.

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

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What is the increase under the prohibition enforcement act?

Mr. BYRNS. That is not in this bill. The Bureau of Industrial Alcohol has an increase of \$479,000 in this bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What is the amount of the Budget increase?

Mr. BYRNS. I understand the Budget carries an increase of \$2,000,000 for the enforcement, making a total of about \$17,000,000 for enforcement, with \$5,000,000 for industrial alcohol.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And then how much for the Coast Guard? How much is appropriated for that?

Mr. BYRNS. Thirty million dollars, of which \$16,000,000 or \$17,000,000 is on account of prohibition.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And the more we spend the less we enforce.

Mr. BYRNS. Well, that may be true in some cases. Of course, the gentleman and I are not responsible for that.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is certainly true in my section.

Mr. BYRNS. Well, I think it is true in nearly all sections, to a certain extent, but perhaps that is not altogether the fault of the law.

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

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Has the gentleman before him the figures relating to permanent and indefinite appropriations?

Mr. BYRNS. I can give them to the gentleman. The permanent indefinite appropriations for the year 1932 amount to \$1,075,369.89.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thought it might be interesting for the country to know that these figures include permanent expenditures.

Mr. BYRNS. I included permanent indefinite appropriations.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Is the appropriation for the Postal Department less than that of last year's law for the current year?

Mr. BYRNS. No; it is greater.

Mr. LINTHICUM. There is dissatisfaction in my city, and I presume everywhere, on the ground that there is not the same general delivery, and the people are dissatisfied. Why, then, should it take more money?

Mr. BYRNS. It is due to the natural increase and growth of the Postal Service. It is a growing service. More letter carriers and clerks are needed. There is a steady 4 per cent growth in the Postal Service every year on the average. For that reason postal expenditures naturally increase, though not to the extent of 4 per cent, because the Post Office Department does not estimate for the full increase of 4 per cent. But there is a necessary increase.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Has the gentleman any information as to the cause of the increase in industrial alcohol? Is that because more alcohol is used? Why is that?

Mr. BYRNS. Well, the gentleman is a distinguished leader of a certain number of gentlemen in the House, as—

Mr. LINTHICUM. Distinguished but not distinguished. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. BYRNS. I do not wish to consume any more time. I will probably have something to say on the Budget estimates at a later date. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield some time to some Member on his side of the House?

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKeown].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, the year of our Lord 1930 is drawing to a close and many thousands of our citizens will give a sigh of relief as the old year dies and a new year is born. But before the warm days of spring return many a soul will feel the biting breezes of winter and pass on over the divide.

What is the state of the Union?

A land of plenty and poverty.

A land of plutocrats and panics.

A land of big business and bankrupt merchants.

A land of inflated stocks and deflated buyers.

A land of trusts and combinations—chain stores and chained competition.

A land of gushing oil wells with importation of oil and its products increasing daily.

A land of the Federal reserve bank and home of breaking banks.

A land of natural water power controlled by trusts whose stocks are soaked with water.

A land where prohibition prevails and racketeers flourish.

A land blessed by Almighty God and damned by bootleggers and the godless.

Where farmers fight in vain for a fair chance.

Where wheels of industry have stopped and laboring men wander up and down in search of work.

What has happened so suddenly to change in a decade a happy, prosperous, and contented people into a condition of misery, unrest, and chaos. There is but one answer—unwise and discriminatory laws.

This condition is not the result of just happened so or to any particular distressing occurrence. This condition has been long on the way and is the result of years of folly.

When the industrial sections of the Nation were not satisfied with reasonable tariff rates to protect their interests and wholly disregarded the fact that prosperity in America includes the far stretches of the West and South as well as the area of the manufacturing States, they obtained the enactment of the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act. This afforded the industrial areas a season of apparent prosperity. They apparently cared nothing for the distress of the agricultural group, and imbued with the prospects of worldwide domination of trade they closed their eyes and ears to the cry of distress from the South and the West.

This attitude of industry led Mr. Coolidge to proclaim in every speech and from the housetop that we were enjoying unparalleled prosperity. This was his platform in 1924.

Speculative citizens after their run-to in Florida turned to the greatest of all Monte Carlos, the stock market in Wall Street, and there commenced an amazing debacle. Every sane man knew it could not last.

Whether it be the duty of the White House to warn reckless citizens is not one made so by statute, but it remains that no warning was issued.

The panic in Wall Street can not be said to be responsible for our economic dilemma.

The money was not destroyed in any holocaust of fire or lost in some whim of nature.

In the early days after the war the manufacturers having become more familiar with our European neighbors began to prepare to furnish to Europe her needed supplies. Funds to buy with were needed. This was arranged through eager bankers who could exact luscious rates of interest.

The orders came in a deluge.

Manufacturers converted war industries into mass production of goods. To hold this trade they set in to acquire and invent every possible labor-saving machine with which to reduce the costs of manufacturing and increase their profits.

The laborer and the farmer were left out of the picture. Whenever a labor-saving device was installed and 500 men thereby displaced, the wages of 500 men were saved; but, alas! the machine would not buy a pound of butter nor a yard of cloth.

They saved the cost of the labor of 500 men and likewise lost the buying power of 300 families.

While pandering to European trade they kept the sales prices at war levels to the consuming public in America. Although by mass production the costs were lowered, yet the retail prices were not immediately cut. When business slackened they made some reductions, but even to this hour the necessities of life are above the price level of farm products. During the war period agriculture, driven on by the world's demands, expanded tremendously in spite of a dearth of farm labor and its greatly increased costs.

Upon the close of the war the farmers suffered more than their share in the deflation which immediately followed. In order to lower food prices in the great cities and industrial centers the farmer was sacrificed on the altar of deflation.

He did not have in his pockets the needed money with which to absorb the shock. All America went on a spending orgy for a time and we lost that element of saving and thrift for which our ancestors were noted.

How different has been the reaction from the World War as compared to the end of the War between the States. The soldiers of the North returned home to bend their efforts to restore their industries and broken fortunes. The followers of Lee went back to Dixie, a land of waste and ashes, to reconstruct a new and better South.

Saving, thrift, and work were magic talismans that brought this Republic to the forefront with the great nations of the earth. What of the state of the Union to-day? Gigantic surpluses of food products and manufactured wearing apparel and thousands are hungry and nearly naked.

A land of boundless acres of land and thousands of homeless farmers and laborers with no place to lay their heads. A land of combination and centralization of wealth, where by one transaction you make one millionaire and a million poor. This is a situation brought about by unwise legislation fostered by the party in control of the Government. But to correct the situation calls for the best thought and votes of progressive Americans in both political parties.

The transportation question is here again. The railroads are to be consolidated. The whole rate structure should be revised.

During the time passenger rates were 2 cents per mile under the laws of Oklahoma you could scarcely get a seat. The railroads would crowd you into their coaches as long as there was standing room, and complained bitterly that they were losing money. It may have been true, but it is impossible to convince one that it is more profitable to haul empty coaches at 3½ cents per mile for passengers than crowded cars at 2 cents per mile.

They now have the higher rate and the empty coaches; they are not flourishing. Then while the people were crowding the trains traveling across the country during the war the Pullman surcharge was inaugurated to hold down travel as a war measure; but although it was abandoned as a war measure it was reinstated by the roads as a revenue measure to the tune of over \$30,000,000 annually. In this House an attempt to prevent the surcharge was defeated by the claim that to do so would defeat a reduction on farm products.

The surcharge is still on and farm products rates are still high. What a situation do we often find in America—delicious fruits and food rotting in orchards or fields in one section and mouths hungry for them in other sections, wholly because of prohibitive freight rates.

The railroads complain that the United States Government is building highways and waterways out of the public fund for busses and boats to use in competition with their privately owned roads. They will not agree for Uncle Sam to run them and do nothing to meet the competition.

There would be but few bus lines competing to-day had the railroads been willing to furnish shuttle trains and station-to-store delivery. On the other hand, if we do not regulate the tonnage, rates, and sizes of vehicles on highways, we will destroy both our railroads and highways.

The railroads, in a measure, are in the situation of the steamboats on inland waterways when railroads began to build. The Congresses of bygone days permitted the railroads over the outcry and protest of the river boats to parallel the river and destroy the steamboats.

We should profit by the errors of the past and put an end to the constant fighting between transportation agencies even if we go to the extent of fixing the classes of freight to be hauled by railroad, by busses and by barges, by pipe lines, and by air.

America needs all our methods of transportation, and it was an economic crime when we lost our river transportation.

The railroads are now clamoring for regulation of oil and gas rates by pipe lines.

Why did they not furnish equipment and fair rates to the oil people at the proper time and avoid the pipe-line competition?

America is suffering from high freight rates, and what we need most at this time is not consolidation but freight classification and conservation of all our transportation methods.

Proscribe the sphere of the activities of each method, make them stop squabbling among themselves, and give the American people service.

The farming industry has been permitted to starve out and is to-day a quarter of a century behind industry in the matter of equipment and method.

We are not going to solve the difficulties of agriculture until we start at the root of the trouble underlying. As long as there are thousands of tenant farmers without land of their own or hope of a home; as long as the tenant farmer because of his dire extremities must pay excessive rates of interest for his supplies and exorbitant tariffs on his purchases; as long as his home and community conditions are such that the bright lights of the near-by towns and cities lure his sons and daughters away from home, so long will farming be a failure.

Cooperative marketing is good for big producers, but the little fellow will never get into the picture.

American business men want to do things on a big scale. Never satisfied to enjoy the better things of life, such as happiness and contentment, they seem to want to gather together in a short span of life all the money in the world. Corporation farming and peasant farmers are in the offing. No individual farmer is financially able under present prices to equip his farm with necessary cost-cutting machinery. In Oklahoma, due under the constitution to the wisdom of its makers, corporation farming can not exist.

In view of the doctrine of isolation to which Republican leaders have committed our country in world affairs; first, by rejecting any affiliation with the other nations of the world, which action was approved by several millions of American voters who in an evil moment failed to foresee the commercial results; and second, by prohibitory tariff rates destructive to trade at home and commerce abroad. We shall now have to turn our attention, in so far as our industries are concerned, to the domestic markets.

Before you can stabilize agricultural products you must assist the producers in controlling production. You apply control to the other industries, why not agriculture? [Applause.]

This is what must take place in America under the ill-advised and ill-constructed policies that have been inaugurated and put into force in the last 10 years in this country. You may as well make up your minds that you are going to confine all of your business activities to America alone, because, as I said a moment ago, in an evil moment there was a rejection of the association of nations that would have put us in touch with the foreign peoples and kept us in contact with them. But what have we done? In order to add

insult to injury we refused to associate with them. We then passed the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act, which was the highest bill that was ever passed. Then, in addition to that, we passed this monstrous Hawley-Smoot bill, which absolutely closed the markets for 26 nations of the world to our products.

Why do the cotton farmers of the South propose to raise cotton so that they can sell it abroad at less than it costs to produce it? Do your farmers of the South owe the manufacturers of England that much consideration that your women and your children shall toil in the fields in the hot days of summer to produce cotton and to sell it to the manufacturers at less than it costs to produce it? Why do you not favor curtailing production of your cotton to meet domestic demands? Why do the wheat farmers of the West produce wheat and spend their time and energy to produce wheat to be sold to foreigners for less than it costs to produce it in America?

You can control overproduction. You control the production of manufactured articles. You control the production of oil, and yet there is importation of oil into this country every day that is overwhelming the oil business. You are going to destroy the American oil industry. You are going to give the foreign companies control of the American oil industry in this country within the next five years unless you change your policy. If we are going to have home markets, then the farm products must be controlled.

I have introduced a bill, for whatever it is worth, that sets out a plan by which the products of the farm can be controlled to meet domestic demands, and I can not understand why the farmers want to produce these articles and sell them at less than it costs to produce them.

Now, let me call your attention to something else. You may just as well make up your minds that you have either to pass an old-age pension bill in the Congress of the United States or you must close the Patent Office of the United States for 10 years on labor-saving devices. Where are you going to gain when you put a labor-saving device in by which you supplant thousands of men and not only lose both the labor of those men but the purchasing power of those men to buy your products?

With reference to road construction and relieving unemployment by spending thousands and millions of dollars in road construction, what does that mean? Road construction, as it is carried on to-day, is a machinery proposition, and the farmer of the country gets very little good out of the proposition of road building by machinery. That is not the way to help the farmers of this country. The way to help the farmer is to help him stay on the farm; and not take him off the farm. To-day the American farmer has been driven from the farm into the cities where he augments the supply of unemployed people. When the farmers of this country learn that they are not going to make much money farming, and learn that it is not a place to make money, but where they can raise their children in the fear of God and where they can raise them in morals, and when they will be satisfied to make a good living, then America will take a step forward. Your fathers never made a fortune in farming. Nobody ever made fortunes in farming, except in the increased value of the land as time went forward.

But there is a priceless reward to the farmer that no other man enjoys in this world, and that is the fact that he is independent. He does not have to come at the whistle of any man. He is an independent American citizen. He goes about his business with that feeling of an owner, and with some pride, but unless you change his condition the situation is going to be worse.

If it were left to me to-day to say what would be the first thing I would do to relieve the financial situation in America, if I had it in my power I would pay all adjusted compensation claims up to \$500 and I would advance \$500 on those who had adjusted claims above that sum, and I would pay it before Christmas. [Applause.] If you will pay off the claims that amount to \$500 it will be sent to every nook and cranny of this Nation. You will help men in every city, township, county, and State in the Nation. Now, somebody will say, "Is that not a bonus?" Certainly it is not a bonus.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman tell us what the widow of some World War veteran will do, some widow who has nothing to look forward to when her husband passes out, if this bonus was not in existence? It is the only protection that a widow or the children of an ex-service man now has to take care of them after he has gone.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman answer me this question: If the gentleman owed me \$1,500—and we say we owe it to them and that it is not a gift—does he think it would be best for my widow and my children for me never to have it in my lifetime? Is that the way the gentleman thinks it would relieve me?

Mr. MURPHY. The gentleman is begging the question. I am asking the gentleman if there is any other protection which the widows and children of ex-service men can get outside of the compensation laws?

Mr. McKEOWN. The same protection which the widows of Civil War veterans received when the time came. They got their protection when the time came.

Mr. MURPHY. But there is no pension now.

Mr. McKEOWN. Do I understand the gentleman to mean that the widows and children of these ex-service men should be allowed to starve to death?

Mr. MURPHY. The gentleman knows I did not say any such thing as that. The gentleman knows I have always been for the soldiers. The gentleman knows the fight I made years ago for the soldiers.

Mr. McKEOWN. I know that, and that is the reason I am surprised that the gentleman can not go with me now.

Mr. MURPHY. I am now calling the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is no protection for the widows or children of these ex-service men outside of this compensation or bonus, if you wish to call it that, and you are not going to help the widows and children of ex-service men by taking away from them the protection they now have.

Mr. McKEOWN. We came here and said to these soldiers, "Boys, you were not paid enough during the time you served in the war; we did not pay you what we paid the civilians, so we are doing it now. It is a debt, not a bonus, not a gift, but an honest-to-God debt," and you said you owed it to them. However, at that time you said, "We have not the money to pay you to-day, but we will pay you in 1945." Now, if we want to, why can we not start in and pay a little of this debt to-day and start the wheels of industry turning in this country and start everybody to paying a little on their debts? I am in favor of paying off to those ex-service men whose bonus does not amount to over \$500, and I am in favor of paying \$500 on account to those soldiers whose bonus amounts to more than \$500. If that were done, the little shopkeepers in every part of this country would be greatly helped. If that were done, it would not be necessary for the Red Cross to take care of these ex-service men and the ex-service men would not be humiliated by going up and asking for a cup of coffee. So I say that the United States Government should start to pay some of this money now. Let us pay it when these men need it.

Mr. MURPHY. Does not the gentleman think it would be wise to introduce a bill to pay a pension to the widows and children of these ex-service men before you take away from them the only protection they have? If you took away that protection, they would become charges on the community if the poor fellow happened to die without any means. Does the gentleman mean to say he is in favor of taking away that protection from the children and mothers?

Mr. McKEOWN. No; I do not want to do that and I do not want them to become charges on the community now, and they will become charges on the community unless we do something for them. I want to say to the gentleman that he will not go any further on the proposition of giving pensions than I will, but I say we owe this debt to them, and we should pay it. I also want to say to the gentleman

that he will find me right here fighting for any proposition which comes in for aiding the unemployment situation.

I stand here and say that farm relief should have been carried on by making loans to the States. I say the States should have been made responsible for the loans and should have been made to stand some part of the obligation. I will not stand here and be for everything that means taking money from the Treasury of the United States under the guise of helping unemployment, because we are not responsible for all of this situation. I want to say to the gentleman that we are here to guard the Treasury as well as to help the people. However, I am for helping the people now and not talking about it next week. Let us pay this \$500 now. Some fellow will say, "Where are you going to get the money?" I would get the money in the same way I would have to get money if I paid my debts. If I pay my debts I would have to go to the bank and borrow the money and then pay it out to them. If everybody in this country—the Government and every citizen of the country—would pay a little money on what they owe between now and Christmas you would see a smile come over the people of this country, and in that way you will start things moving upward.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. As I understand it, my colleague is in favor of placing the widows of these ex-service men on a parity with the widows of soldiers of the Civil War.

Mr. McKEOWN. I certainly am, and I will certainly go as far on that proposition as any other man here.

Mr. MURPHY. Does not the gentleman believe that the widows and children of these ex-service men should have and hold the protection they now have until this Congress does just what the gentleman admits it ought to do and what I say it ought to do? However, I do not want this protection taken away from these children and widows until this Government does what it ought to do.

Mr. McKEOWN. What about his insurance? For the protection of his widow and children you gave him insurance.

Mr. MURPHY. We did if he took it, but you know there are a million men and women in this country who carry no insurance. Some of them took out the insurance and then let it lapse. You can not put an old head on young shoulders, and they were boys who fought this war.

Mr. McKEOWN. But a debt is a debt. You said you could not pay it until 1945 and the soldier was indulgent and said that was satisfactory. There were those in this House who cried then for cash payments. Many of the level-headed men in this House said that it ought to have been paid in cash, but the soldiers accepted the proposition and agreed to extending the payment to 1945. So what I am asking is not to give anybody a bonus, not to give them something they are not entitled to, but simply to pay a part of our debt, and I do not ask that you pay it all. They do not want it all. I want to pay any such claim up to \$500 and advance \$500 in those cases where the amount is more than \$500.

This can not be unfair and there can not be any other crowd coming in and getting this money. This money will go right into general business.

Although I was born and reared in South Carolina I have supported every pension bill in this House, because I knew that it was right; and in addition to that, I knew that as an economic proposition, pension money comes back into the Treasury quicker than any other money.

Mr. MURPHY. The gentleman, however, does want the widows and children of the World War veterans to be protected, does he not?

Mr. McKEOWN. I certainly do.

Mr. MURPHY. Then why does the gentleman want that protection taken away from them? The only protection they have now is this much abused "bonus," if you wish to call it that. Almost everyone abused you and me and the rest of us who voted for it, but it is the only protection the widows and children have. Let us keep it for the widows and the dependent children until this Government, of which the gentleman is a part and I am a part, passes a pension bill, which we ought to do.

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

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. McKEOWN. All I have to say in conclusion is that this is a debt, it is an obligation and is not a bonus. We said, "We did not pay you enough wages during the war and we now ask you to give us until 1945 to pay this claim," and all I am asking the Government to do to-day is to say that on these small claims of \$500 or less, we will pay them off now, and if any needy soldier wants \$500 above that, we will advance it to him, and we will not be paying off all we owe. And I will say to you, to-day, if you pay this \$500 between now and Christmas you will start a movement of prosperity, because the money goes to cities and towns, country and village, and goes into every nook, cranny, and into every county in this great Republic. In this way you will get some real benefit, and you can do this while they are waiting down here in the architect's office to draw plans to build public buildings.

Why, my friends, if we had been in a war and had depended on public buildings to save us, we would have been whipped a long time ago. We would have been whipped before they could ever get the plans prepared. Why, they will not draw a plan at all down there until they make some kind of scientific survey of the lot to see which way the water runs or whether it runs off at all, even in a little town of 5,000 people. It takes them more time to make blue prints than it takes a good contractor to build a building. [Laughter and applause.] And I may say to you now that if you want to start prosperity in this country you have got to go to the fundamentals, and you might just as well start out now by giving these soldiers some of the money we owe them, and pay it to them now. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE].

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the Clerk read in my time the bill H. R. 13542.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Clerk read as follows:

A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following additional sums, to wit: \$250,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1931; and the sum of \$250,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1932.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to enter into cooperative agreement with the highway departments of the several States for the construction of highways with the funds appropriated under section 1 of this act, and he is hereby exempted from the limitations imposed by the said Federal aid road act and amendments thereto as to the per cent cost of such projects to be borne by the Federal Government. In no case shall any State be required to contribute more than 20 per cent of the cost of the highway constructed or improved with moneys appropriated in this act.

Sec. 3. That section 6 of the said Federal highway act is hereby amended authorizing and creating a third class of highways to consist of both those intracounty and intercounty highways over which passes the United States mail by rural mail carriers. First selecting and improving those rural mail roads which shall best serve the agricultural needs of the country in obtaining access to the Federal-aid system, the rail and water shipping points, and the markets. Funds provided by the counties or the subdivisions thereof may be used in cooperative contracts for the construction or reconstruction of the aforesaid farm service mail routes, but none of the appropriation made under this section 3 shall be spent in the construction or improvement of the roads included in the Federal-aid system and known as primary or secondary roads.

Sec. 4. Fifty per cent of the funds appropriated under section 1 of this act shall be used in the construction and improvement of highways comprised in the Federal-aid road system as specified in the Federal aid road act of July 11, 1916, and acts amendatory thereof, and the remaining 50 per cent of the funds apportioned under section 1 of this act shall be expended on the construction or reconstruction of the farm-service mail routes as designated in section 3 of this act.

SEC. 5. If any provisions of this act shall be held to be invalid, such invalid provision shall not affect the validity of any other provision of this act which can be given effect.

SEC. 6. All acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect immediately upon its passage.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, official figures show that there are at least 3,500,000 people out of employment in the United States. Unemployment is undoubtedly the most important question which will be considered at this session of Congress.

The bill which I have introduced, in my opinion, will give employment to more people and at the same time will hasten an important public work which a larger number of people will receive benefits from than any other work this Government can undertake.

This bill provides for an authorization of \$250,000,000 per year for the next two years for the improvement of our highways. Fifty per cent of the amount to be appropriated to be expended on trunk roads in the Federal-highway system. The remaining 50 per cent to be expended on the improvement of the rural mail farm-to-market roads. The amount of the appropriation in this bill would be apportioned among the several States as provided in the present law, and is in addition to the amount which has already been appropriated by the Federal Government.

It also provides that the Government shall contribute 80 per cent and the State 20 per cent to the building of roads.

In my opinion, there is no public work which the Government can engage in where the money expended will help as many and diversified industries and be distributed as widely as the money expended in building our highways. The remotest section in every county of our 48 States will receive the immediate benefits of this appropriation, not only in the expenditure of money for labor but in the improvement of roads over which the people will travel 365 days in the year in all kinds of weather, in the nighttime as well as in the daytime, and the 42,750 United States rural mail carriers will traverse daily. The passage of this bill will mean the purchase of tractors, trucks, graders, steam shovels, gas engines, cement mixers, gravel, sand, asphalt products, lumber for fencing embankments and safety signs, steel, oil, gas, and iron, and dozens of other kinds of road machinery and material used in road making, and benefit the railroads in hauling the material. The construction of many public works are in the main helpful to a certain locality. The building of roads under this bill would be of great benefit to every locality in the United States.

FEDERAL-AID ROADS SHOULD BE HASTENED

Federal aid to roads is a belated improvement. It was begun in the administrations of Washington and Jefferson and advocated by both these statesmen, who believed that the Federal Government should pay the entire cost of these main arteries of travel. As a result the Federal Government built the Cumberland Road from Cumberland, Md., to the Ohio River, over which began the march of civilization from the east to the west. The invention of the steamboat and the locomotive centered the attention of the public to these modes of transportation, which were subsidized by Congress, leaving the building of roads to the local communities. Federal aid for highways was thus suspended for a hundred years.

INTERSTATE ROADS A NATIONAL MATTER

Before the invention of the automobile when traffic moved slowly over our highways in horse-drawn vehicles, the building of roads might have been considered of only local concern. The invention of the automobile has revolutionized transportation over our highways. The situation has changed very materially since the Federal aid road law was passed in 1916, at which time there were less than 4,000,000 motor-power vehicles in the United States. To-day there are over 29,000,000 motor-power vehicles in the United States. Out of these there are over 4,000,000 trucks, 93,000 busses, and over 8,000 of these are interstate busses. Seventy-two steam railroads are using busses as feeders for their rail-

roads. There were 263,000 miles of common-carrier bus routes and 48,362 miles of exclusive interstate bus routes in operation in 1928. There are through bus schedules from Washington to New York and San Francisco, and every other large city in the United States. A total of more than 2,000,000 bus-miles were traveled in 1928; 19,900,000 motorists from all the States in the Union visited our national parks in 1929, a million and one-half more than the preceding year.

The United States mail is carried 300 days in the year, rain or shine, by 42,750 Government mail carriers, who traverse 1,319,576 miles of road daily between sunrise and sunset. Over 1,000,000 school children are transported daily in school busses. The State highway engineer of Wisconsin informs me that an accurate record of the number of cars with nonresident State licenses coming into Wisconsin in 1929 was kept, and that these cars brought into the State over 4,500,000 people in a hundred days during the summer season. These figures show conclusively that the question of building interstate roads and mail roads over which the United States mail is carried by Federal Government employees is not merely of local or State concern but a national matter over which the Federal Government will soon exercise complete control in the regulation of all interstate traffic the same as it now exercises over railroads.

HIGHWAYS ARE INADEQUATE

No one will seriously disagree with my statement that our highways are inadequate to meet the demands of traffic. The question is then how can we hasten the completion of our Federal-highway system and how rapidly should we complete the system of Federal-aid highways? It should be remembered that the Federal-road system includes only 7 per cent of the roads of the United States. The remainder, or 93 per cent, of the roads are built, maintained, and kept in repair by the States and political subdivisions of the States. In other words, the several States and political subdivisions of the States are building, maintaining, and keeping in repair close to 2,000,000 miles of road, including over 90 per cent of the rural Federal mail roads having a mileage of 1,543,545 miles. This is in addition to paying over 60 per cent of the cost of the Federal or interstate roads and maintaining and keeping in repair and open to traffic summer and winter all Federal or interstate roads.

Mr. Taber, president of the Grange, who carefully weighs his words, made the statement in his recent address that the taxes on the farm property of the United States had increased since the war 257 per cent and that high taxes were one of the major causes of farm depression. This enormous increase in the taxation of farm property has been caused very largely by the building of roads. Therefore, if our Federal-highway system is to be completed within a reasonable time, the Federal Government must appropriate larger amounts and pay a larger proportion in the building of Federal highways. The States and local subdivisions have gone to the limit and there is a reaction growing against further road building if it is to bankrupt the farmer.

With the small aid from the Federal Government and at the present rate of building roads it will take over 54 years to complete the Federal system of roads, which only comprise 7 per cent of the total road mileage. I make no criticism in any way of the Bureau of Roads; I have only words of commendation. They have used the money appropriated by Congress for Federal aid in the most efficient possible way. I am giving these facts to show how inadequate the Federal appropriations have been in the hope that the Federal Government may realize its responsibility and make adequate appropriations to complete the Federal-aid system of this country within a reasonable time.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SLOAN. I notice that you put 80 per cent on the Government and 20 per cent on the States. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWNE. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. This bill does not give the Government any additional jurisdiction in the control or selection of these roads other than it has now?

Mr. BROWNE. No. Let me answer the gentleman. At the present time no road can be designated as a Federal road without the consent of the Director of the Bureau of Roads, Mr. MacDonald. Every cent of money that is expended on the Federal-road system must be approved by the Director of Roads. The Federal Government has a perfect veto power on anything the State may do on the Federal-road system.

Mr. SLOAN. They have not now, and the purpose is to make the Government expend \$4 where the State expends \$1. If the Government is going to adopt the additional burden, why should not the Government have something more to say about where the road shall be and more to say about the control of it than it now has under the 50-50 plan?

Mr. BROWNE. It has now the full power of veto on anything the State highway department contemplates doing on the Federal-road system. It can designate the road to be improved and if you wanted to you could not give the Federal Director of Roads any more power than he now has.

Mr. SLOAN. You could give the Government full control of the road after it is built.

Mr. BROWNE. It has that now, for if the State does not keep up the system the Federal Director of Roads can prevent the State being given any more money.

Mr. SLOAN. That is a veto power instead of direct control.

Mr. BROWNE. The Interstate Commerce Commission also has control over the Federal system of roads the same as it has over interstate railroads.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the gentleman think it is necessary to place that provision in the bill for the Government to contribute 80 per cent and the State only 20 per cent? Does he not think it would receive more favorable consideration if he put it on the 50-50 basis? Does he not believe that all the States of the Union would be glad to avail themselves of the opportunity of matching the Government's money 50-50? I know that my State would be glad to match any amount the Federal Government might contribute. And permit me, while I am on my feet, to say that I am in sympathy with the gentleman's bill. I am in favor of some of this money going to build up the smaller communities and the market road—the primary road in the various States.

Mr. BROWNE. In reply to the gentleman's statement, I will say that many of the States are bonded so high that they can not raise any more money by bonds than they are now raising. Some States' constitutions prohibit them entirely from issuing bonds, so that they have had to put the amount raised for roads in the tax roll. And you will find that there are many States to-day that are straining their financial resources to the very utmost to comply with the Government's requirements and of maintaining and keeping repaired the trunk lines besides helping the other State and county road systems. The Government so far has contributed 40 per cent and the States 60 per cent, but you will remember that that is only on 7 per cent of the roads. The 93 per cent have to be built and maintained and kept open at all times by the States and the subdivisions of the States. You will find that in many States there is a limit to that. Take the amount of money expended by the State and the subdivisions of the State and that appropriated by the Federal Government and you will find that the ratio is \$1 of Federal money to \$20 raised by the State and subdivisions of the State. That is too much.

Mr. HASTINGS. If there is that sort of proportion, it seems to me that there would be no difficulty in inducing every State in this Nation to match the Government on a 50-50 basis.

Mr. BROWNE. I maintain that on the Federal roads, purely interstate roads, the Federal Government should pay

the whole cost of the roads. These roads are traveled by the people of all the States, as I have shown. The Wisconsin State Highway Commission keeps track of the number of autos with out-of-State licenses and of people who come into the State in automobiles bearing foreign licenses.

Mr. HASTINGS. How would he ascertain if they came in on interstate roads?

Mr. BROWNE. Oh, there are only a few trunk lines that come in, and they have their agents there. They made computation last year, and it is reasonably accurate, that four and a half million people came into the State of Wisconsin in 100 days in automobiles bearing foreign licenses, showing that these roads are not local State roads but are interstate roads.

Mr. HASTINGS. But it does show that Wisconsin was greatly benefited by those interstate roads.

Mr. BROWNE. Yes; and the people from other States coming there were benefited. It also shows that these interstate roads in the Federal system should be built with Federal money. Mr. Taber, of the Grange, says that the increase in taxation of farm property has been 257 per cent since the war. That increase has been upon real estate and personal property. The money which the States and the subdivisions of the States raise in taxes comes largely out of real estate, and real estate is assessed and taxed now more than it can stand. That is one of the troubles with agriculture to-day.

Mr. HASTINGS. The people of Wisconsin ought to have a progressive governor such as we have elected, who is going to do away with the ad valorem taxes on land.

Mr. BROWNE. Oh, I think the gentleman from Oklahoma can congratulate himself upon the governor that Oklahoma has. I had the pleasure of seeing him when he was in the House, and he was a very versatile and able Member. I know that he would pay the same high tribute to our governor elect if he knew him.

IT WILL TAKE 54 YEARS TO COMPLETE FEDERAL-HIGHWAY SYSTEM UNLESS LARGER APPROPRIATIONS ARE MADE

The Federal-road system consists of 7 per cent of the roads, 193,049 miles; total road improvement under Federal aid which will stand modern traffic, 34,773.7 miles; balance of road system remains unimproved for modern traffic, 158,275.3 miles.

Roads improved for fiscal year ending December 1, 1930, as shown by table in Bureau of Roads report, 3,151.6 miles.

At the rate of improvement of permanent roads in the last year, which was more than an average year, it will take 54 years to complete our Federal highway system.

The 84,012.8 miles classified as improved with Federal aid at the close of the fiscal year, June 30, 1930

[Taken from report of Thomas H. MacDonald, chief, Bureau of Roads, December 1, 1930, pp. 16-17]

EXHIBIT A

Roads which will not stand modern traffic

	Miles
Graded and drained earth roads.....	12,488.5
Untreated sand-clay roads.....	7,166.2
Bituminous-treated sand-clay roads.....	16.5
Untreated graveled surfaces.....	28,607.9
Total.....	48,239.1

EXHIBIT B

Roads which will stand traffic

	Miles
Bituminous-treated graveled surfaces.....	482.5
Water-bound macadam surfaces.....	1,754.1
Surfaced by bituminous-treated macadam.....	803.4
Improved with low-cost bituminous-mixed surfaces.....	742.0
Surfaced with bituminous macadam.....	4,057.1
Paved with bituminous concrete.....	3,204.7
Portland cement concrete pavements.....	23,693.3
Block pavements.....	904.7
Consist of bridges and their approaches.....	331.9
Total.....	35,773.7

Total mileage, 35,773.7 miles of improved roads, which will stand modern traffic, built with Federal aid from 1917 to June 30, 1930.

STATE APPROPRIATIONS CONTRASTED WITH FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

President Hoover in his message to Congress December 3, 1929, commenting on highways, gave the following figures: The total expenditure of Federal, State, and local governments last year for construction and maintenance of roads amounted to \$1,660,000,000.

Taking the President's figures and deducting from this amount, the amount the Federal Government appropriates \$75,000,000, it leaves the amount of State and local appropriations at \$1,585,000,000, or the ratio at about \$1 that the Federal Government expends on our roads to \$20 the States and their subdivisions expend.

President Hoover in his message of December 3, 1929, says further:

Federal aid in the construction of the highway system in conjunction with the States has proved to be beneficial and stimulating. We must ultimately give consideration to the increase of our contributions to these systems, particularly with a view to stimulating the improvement of farm-to-market roads.

The bill which I have introduced provides for improving the farm-to-market roads which would be included in the rural-mail routes. With 3,500,000 men out of work in the United States, this is certainly a very favorable time to carry out the suggestions of President Hoover and at the same time help the unemployment situation.

GOOD ROADS CONCERN EVERYBODY

The question of good roads concerns everybody. At one end of the road is the farmer with his crops for sale, which aggregated last year over \$12,000,000,000. At the other end of the road is the city with its people waiting to be fed, with merchants waiting for trade, and with railroads waiting for goods to transport. To whose advantage is it to have good roads for the farmer to come to town? It is clearly to the advantage of the merchant in the city and the railroads as much as it is to the farmer. Every man's house faces on a road which connects with every other and leads to every other man's door and to every market place throughout the land. The farm and the farmers are the great and abiding support of the city.

ROLLING STOCK

The phenomenal increase in automobiles in the last 14 years is amazing. In 1916 there were 3,512,996 motor vehicles. In 1930, up to October, there were 29,577,935.

Roads have not kept pace with rolling stock. Our highways are inadequate to meet the demands of traffic. Roads must be built faster. The rolling stock, which consists of over 30,000,000 motor vehicles, are almost 100 per cent perfect, while the roads they move over are not 25 per cent perfect.

At \$600 per motor vehicle there are approximately \$18,000,000,000 invested in these 30,000,000 automobiles and trucks. The increased wear and tear and depreciation of automobiles because of being operated over poor roads per year at \$30 per motor vehicle would amount to \$900,000,000 a year more than if operated over good roads.

Every railroad system considers it good business to keep its roadbed as perfect as its rolling stock, and hundreds of millions of dollars are expended by the railroads improving their roadbeds. Railroads consider this a very good investment. Why is it not a good investment for the Government? The poor-road tax is the heaviest tax the people are paying to-day.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS RECEIVED MORE FROM THE TAXATION OF AUTOMOBILES THAN IT HAS EXPENDED ON ROADS

The Federal Government up to date has expended on its roads less than \$900,000,000. The Government, as a war measure in 1918, placed an excise or sales tax on automobiles at 5 per cent; also a tax on accessories. This in 1926 was reduced to 3 per cent. From 1918 to 1927, when the tax was repealed, the automobiles and accessories have paid a Federal excise tax or sales tax of \$1,081,845,555. In addition to this the owners of automobiles are paying local personal-property taxes, State taxes for registration amounting to \$787,501,791 annually.

OWNERS OF AUTOMOBILES PAY A HEAVY TAX

The motor-vehicle tax in 1928 was as follows:

Registration fees.....	\$322,630,025
Gasoline tax.....	304,871,766
	627,501,791
Personal-property tax.....	140,000,000
Municipal tax.....	20,000,000
	160,000,000
Grand total.....	787,501,791

MONEY FOR FEDERAL AID DERIVED FROM INCOME TAXES

The Federal Government does not levy any tax on real estate. The money received by the Federal Government from taxation is from income taxes, inheritance taxes, excise taxes, and duties levied on imports of foreign goods under the tariff.

The opposition to Federal aid to highways comes from a few of the wealthy States east of the Allegheny Mountains.

Statements have been frequently made on the floor of Congress and broadcasted throughout the country that New York pays almost 25 per cent of the total income and inheritance tax. Therefore, unless it receives back 25 per cent of any distribution of Federal aid the State is imposed upon. One-fifth of all the money deposited in banks of the United States is deposited in banks in the city of New York. Admitting these facts, I deny that New York or any State contributes one cent more to the Federal highway fund than it receives in benefits. New York is the financial center of the United States, but if it were not for the natural resources of the various States the millions of acres of wheat, corn, and cotton, and the 25,000,000 dairy cows and the other great resources which contribute toward making this the wealthiest Nation in the world, New York would not have the bank deposits it now has and be the wealthiest city in the world.

In the 10-year period from 1912 to 1922 the wealth of the United States increased from \$186,000,000,000 to \$320,000,000,000, a net increase of \$134,000,000,000. From 1922 to 1928 it is estimated by the Census Bureau our wealth has increased over \$40,000,000,000. All of the 48 States, with their splendid citizenship and wonderful natural resources, contributed to the unprecedented increase of wealth. New York did no more than many other States in the creation of this wealth.

On May 15, 1925, the statement of the United States Treasury Department showed that while the deposits in the New York national banks totaled \$2,218,027,000, 38 per cent of these deposits were from banks and trust companies outside of New York State. The coming census will undoubtedly show the same proportionate increase.

RAILROADS AND LARGE CORPORATIONS PAY TAXES IN NEW YORK

The Union Pacific Railroad in 1923 paid an income tax in New York of four and a half million dollars, and yet this road does not operate east of Omaha and Kansas City, a half continent away from New York State.

The Southern Pacific paid a tax of \$5,000,000 in New York and this road does not run any nearer than New Orleans.

The United States Steel Corporation in 1923 paid an income tax of \$16,000,000 in New York. They have 145 plants, only two of which are in the State of New York. They have 153,350 stockholders who paid this tax, and only 32,322 of these stockholders live in the State of New York. Many other corporations pay their income tax in New York, but are obtaining their resources and making their money in other States in the Union as well as New York State. As an illustration of this, such large corporations as the American Railway Express, American Beet Sugar Co., American Can Co., American Locomotive Co., American Radiator Co., American Smelting & Refining Co., American Tobacco Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., Nevada Consolidated Copper Co. pay their taxes in New York.

All of the chain stores have their home offices in the city of New York, Chicago, or some of the large cities and pay

their income taxes in those cities. The Borden Milk Corporation, the National Dairy Corporation, and other similar organizations, control 70 per cent of the fluid milk of the country, paying their large income taxes in New York City. The Ford Auto Co. and many other large automobile companies situated in Detroit and deriving their incomes from all parts of the United States pay their large income taxes in the cities where they have home offices. Thus the wealth of the United States coming from the millions of people in every one of the counties of the 48 States drains into the large commercial centers and pays a large income tax. It is therefore equitable and fair that a small proportion of the large incomes of these corporations having their home offices in the cities should contribute in the way of taxes toward the building up of a system of public roads which are helpful and necessary to them in the maintenance of their business. It is no more than fair that a portion of the wealth which is produced in the various States should come back to the thousands of localities where it originated for the improvement and betterment of these localities.

HOW TO RAISE THE MONEY

We have been paying off our national debt since the war at a rate of nearly a billion dollars a year. I am informed by the Treasury Department that we have reduced the national debt from \$26,594,267,878.45, August 31, 1919, to \$16,185,308,299.18, June 30, 1930, a reduction of \$10,408,959,579.27. This is a most remarkable achievement. I think, however, in this emergency, with 3,500,000 men unemployed, it would be good business to skip one year in applying the Government income reducing the national debt and use the billion dollars, or as much thereof as is necessary, toward building public works and improvements, which will give employment to our people. An extra billion dollars expended by the Federal Government in the next fiscal year for road building and rivers and harbors and hastening our public-building program would go a great way toward relieving unemployment and helping business without increasing taxation, but only prolonging the payment of the national debt one year. I believe this plan is feasible and will meet with public approval.

SUBSTITUTE JOBS FOR DOLES—MONEY COULD BE RAISED BY AN ISSUE OF LIBERTY BONDS

During the war we had four Liberty bond issues.

An issue of Liberty bonds, or call them "employment bonds," the proceeds to be expended for needed public works, such as public roads and public buildings and rivers and harbors improvements, would meet with public approval. The prosperity that these expenditures, with the employment of this labor, would bring would pay the bonds with very little, if any, increase in income taxes.

It would substitute jobs for doles and increase the purchasing power of the people and help farmers, retailers, railroads, and business in general.

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

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Indiana to yield me 10 minutes more.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin 10 minutes more.

Mr. BROWNE. Harold S. Buttenheim, chairman of the Emergency Committee for Federal Public Works, 470 Fourth Avenue, New York City, a committee composed of prominent men who stand high in commercial circles, suggests that Congress authorize a billion dollars of Liberty bonds. The proceeds to be expended for needed public works in every State in the Union. He makes the following suggestion:

If we were facing a great war Congress would authorize billions of dollars of Liberty bonds; everyone would begin feverishly to produce and use machinery and other resources to the utmost capacity; and the general standing of living would be materially raised. Confronted now with this great problem of peace—this "war against human misery," as it has recently been termed by Col. Arthur Woods, director of the President's Emergency Committee for Employment—should we not act with similar patriotism and courage? Should not the Federal Government authorize an immediate issue of "Employment bonds"—to an ultimate total of a billion dollars or more if necessary—the proceeds to be expended for needed public works in every State of the Union?

To assume that the Nation could not afford to spend a billion dollars, or several billions, in this manner would be unreasonable. To pay the interest and amortization might require a slight increase in the income-tax rate; but it can not be doubted that the financial and psychological stimulus to prosperity would so increase corporation and individual incomes as to more than offset the taxes collected by the Government to finance such a program.

THE ADMINISTRATION SHOULD FOLLOW THE ADVICE IT GIVES OTHERS

The administration is advising the people to buy now and spend as much money as they are able to spend. In the conferences which have been held those in authority have advised the employers of labor to extend their activities in every way possible to relieve the unemployment situation. I believe this is excellent advice and I think the large employers of labor, including the railroads, have responded courageously. Is the Federal Government following its own advice?

In the rural-carrier service alone there were 44,168 carriers employed in 1928. In 1930, at the same date, there are 43,178 rural mail carriers employed by the Government, a reduction of 990. Over 546 carriers have been laid off during 1930 in one branch of the post-office service, and this curtailment to the injury of the rural-mail service.

I am reliably informed that there are approximately 600 vacancies in the clerical force in the first and second class post offices. There are 400 vacancies in the city-delivery forces which remain unfilled. This means that there are at least 1,000 jobs in the Postal Service that could be immediately filled if the department followed the policy which is being urged upon private industry.

Would it not be consistent for the Government at this time to take the money that it already has raised by taxation and expend it on Federal roads and other public works that will be of inestimable value to the people and employ a large number of people who are now idle and in destitute circumstances?

Congress could make the appropriation called for in the bill which I have introduced with no extra tax by simply putting off the payment of the national debt one year or by a bond issue.

It would give Wisconsin, which has 51,141 miles of rural and star routes, \$6,066,000 per year.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The problem of unemployment is a world-old problem. The relief in times of unemployment has usually been slow and inefficient.

Not so with the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte of France. Napoleon has been called by some a benevolent despot. He was a man of action in times of peace as well as in times of war. Here are some of his instructions given to his ministers at a time of great unemployment in France.

If the cold should be sharp, as it was in 1789, you must have fires kept alight in the churches and market places so that as many people as possible can warm themselves. * * * The winter is very severe, meat is dear, we must provide work in Paris. Get on with the cutting of the Ourcq Canal, with the construction of the Quai Desaix, with the paving of the back streets. * * * We must have several homes of refuge in every department. * * * There are a great many out-of-work shoemakers, hatters, tailors, and saddlers. See to it that 500 pairs of shoes are made every day.

He writes to the Minister for War, saying that special orders for supplies for the artillery are to be issued. To the Minister for Home Affairs:

We must provide work, especially this month before the holidays. Issue an order that in May and June 2,000 St. Antoine workmen are to supply chairs, chests of drawers, armchairs, etc. Send me your proposals to-morrow so that a beginning may be made promptly.

He reads a by-law that no one wearing a workman's blouse is to walk through the Tuileries garden. Instantly he has the regulation canceled and gives express permission for such people to walk through. He learns of a proposal to close the public reading rooms:

I won't allow anything of the kind. I have not forgotten my own experience, how useful it was to know of a well-warmed room where I could read the newspapers and recent pamphlets. I will not allow others who are as poor as I was then to be robbed of these comforts.

In the Theatre Français the stalls are to be very cheap on Sunday—"so that the people may enjoy the performance."

There are to be no gambling hells in France:

They bring families to ruin, and I should set a bad example were I to tolerate them.

By his new education law he establishes public elementary schools, middle schools, lycees, and technical colleges throughout the country. There are to be 6,000 free scholarships, and a third of these are to be reserved for the sons of especially deserving persons. Within three years there are 4,500 elementary schools, 750 middle schools, and 45 lycees. "He honors the institute by choosing a third of his first senators from among its members."

State	Mileage of star and rural routes as of June 30, 1930	Tentative apportionment of \$250,000,000 Federal aid
Alabama.....	39,695	\$5,176,000
Arizona.....	5,060	3,567,000
Arkansas.....	20,799	4,230,000
California.....	29,990	9,469,000
Colorado.....	22,352	4,594,000
Connecticut.....	7,727	1,585,000
Delaware.....	3,218	1,219,000
Florida.....	15,281	3,310,000
Georgia.....	64,908	6,329,000
Idaho.....	10,731	3,072,000
Illinois.....	74,218	10,348,000
Indiana.....	60,537	6,227,000
Iowa.....	64,248	6,447,000
Kansas.....	62,881	6,680,000
Kentucky.....	34,540	4,592,000
Louisiana.....	16,061	3,494,000
Maine.....	15,062	2,183,000
Maryland.....	12,937	2,067,000
Massachusetts.....	9,149	3,482,000
Michigan.....	57,187	7,684,000
Minnesota.....	56,380	6,858,000
Mississippi.....	34,864	4,371,000
Missouri.....	66,948	7,695,000
Montana.....	16,322	5,094,000
Nebraska.....	43,217	5,205,000
Nevada.....	3,982	3,198,000
New Hampshire.....	7,292	1,219,000
New Jersey.....	9,821	3,368,000
New Mexico.....	8,574	3,974,000
New York.....	53,714	12,367,000
North Carolina.....	46,240	5,872,000
North Dakota.....	31,414	3,958,000
Ohio.....	71,039	9,134,000
Oklahoma.....	46,986	5,867,000
Oregon.....	16,092	4,022,000
Pennsylvania.....	61,519	10,714,000
Rhode Island.....	1,510	1,219,000
South Carolina.....	27,612	3,393,000
South Dakota.....	30,123	4,076,000
Tennessee.....	47,677	5,303,000
Texas.....	89,300	15,503,000
Utah.....	4,607	2,820,000
Vermont.....	9,579	1,219,000
Virginia.....	35,979	4,586,000
Washington.....	19,562	3,872,000
West Virginia.....	17,194	2,667,000
Wisconsin.....	51,141	6,066,000
Wyoming.....	7,605	3,136,000
Hawaii.....	651	1,219,000
Total.....	1,543,545	243,750,000

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

Mr. BROWNE. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin intend to use the money paid in as interest on our foreign obligations on the principal for the purpose of this enterprise he has so well put forth?

Mr. BROWNE. All of the money that we receive as interest on foreign debts goes into the Treasury, and that reduces the amount of general taxation.

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

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, the remarks that I shall make will have no political significance whatever. I am not talking for home consumption, but I shall endeavor to bring to the committee certain information that may or may not have some bearing on an issue which the House will at an early date be called upon to decide. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the latter days of the last session of the present Congress reported favorably H. R. 11, com-

monly known as the Capper-Kelly retail price control bill. I would have much preferred waiting until that measure reached the floor for consideration to make my argument, but not being a member of that committee, doubtless I would not have the opportunity to give full expression to my views. And even now I do not hope to cover the entire case, but I shall briefly give you in a general way my views on the fundamental questions that are involved, leaving you to apply the arguments that may be suggested by anything that I might say.

The bill provides as follows: That no contract relating to the sale of a commodity which bears—or the label or container of which bears—the trade-mark, brand, or trade name of the producer of such commodity, and which is in fair and open competition with commodities of the same general class purchased by others, shall be deemed to be unlawful, as against the public policy of the United States, or in restraint of interstate or foreign commerce, or in violation of any statute of the United States, by reason of any agreement contained in such contract.

That the vendee will not resell such commodity except at the price stipulated by the vendor.

The only conditions and exceptions to this rule are:

SEC. 2. Any such agreement in a contract in respect to interstate or foreign commerce in any such commodity shall be deemed to contain the implied condition, (a) that during the life of such agreement all purchasers from the vendor for resale at retail in the same city or town where the vendee is to resell the commodity shall be granted equal terms as to purchase and resale prices; (b) that such commodity may be resold without reference to such agreement—

(1) In closing out the owner's stock for the purpose of discontinuing dealing in such commodity or of disposing, toward the end of a season, of a surplus of stock of goods specially adapted to that season;

(2) With notice to the public that such commodity is damaged or deteriorated in quality, if such is the case; or

(3) By a receiver, trustee, or other officer acting under the orders of any court, or any assignee for the benefit of creditors.

It will be noted there is no provision for Government supervision or regulation. The producers and manufacturers are given a free hand. They may fix their profits and prices to wholesalers, jobbers, retailers, and to the consuming public at will.

In the interest of a better understanding of the meaning of this bill, let me make a brief statement of conditions out of which the proposal comes.

Prior to 1890, when the Sherman law was passed, all business was being hurriedly merged into monopolistic combinations and trusts. Conditions became such that the public interest demanded some congressional action, hence the anti-trust act, which denounced as illegal any contract, combination in form of trust, or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, and further provides that every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor.

While this law put some restraint upon the then widespread movement toward monopolistic combinations it did not entirely suppress it, and many schemes were devised to evade the statute, among which were certain forms of contracts. The contract scheme had developed into large proportions by 1910, when the Supreme Court in the case of *Dr. Miles Medicine Co. v. John D. Park Sons Co.*, reported in 220 U. S. 373, declared them to be in restraint of trade in violation of the antitrust act and the common law.

There were two contracts involved in this case. One was between the manufacturing medicine company and a wholesaler, binding the latter to sell only to retailers approved by the former and at prices fixed by the manufacturer. The other contract was one between the manufacturer and the retailer binding the retailer to sell at prices fixed also by the manufacturer. The question presented to the court was: Can a manufacturer dictate by contract the price at which its trade-marked, patented, or otherwise identified products shall be sold by wholesaler or retailer, and the price at which the retailer shall sell to the consuming public?

In the course of its opinion the court said:

It is, as we have seen, a system of interlocking restrictions by which the complainant seeks to control not merely the prices at which its agents may sell its products, but the price for all sales by all dealers at wholesale or retail, whether purchasers or sub-purchasers, and thus to fix the amount which the consumer shall pay, eliminating all competition.

The court further said:

Contracts between a manufacturer and all dealers whom he permits to sell his products, comprising most of the dealers in similar articles throughout the country, which fix the price for all sales, whether at wholesale or retail, operates as a restraint of trade, unlawful both at common law and, as to interstate commerce, under the antitrust act of July 2, 1890, even though such products may be proprietary medicines made under secret formulas.

It is the nullifying of that part of the antitrust act and the common law upon which the decision of the court is based and the legalizing of these contracts in restraint of trade that this bill is designed to accomplish.

The question presented is a serious one and demands careful consideration. An extensive and aggressive campaign for manufacturers' price-fixing legislation has been carried on by the manufacturers for more than 50 years. The advocates are closely organized and often heard, but the time has come for some one to speak for the voiceless millions who are threatened with having fastened upon them a trade system that will exact of them a greater toll represented in manufacturers' and producers' profits than they are already having to make. There is no better time than now to challenge this business of government by propaganda. Nothing tends to deteriorate the quality of legislation so much as yielding to such pressure. In the Washington Post of December 2, 1930, under heading Calvin Coolidge says, I read the following:

One of the hardest problems the Congress has to meet is the constant pressure of outside influences. The old lobby that was so frequently charged with vicious activity practically has disappeared. But the organized minorities of special interests, with agents and publicity bureaus for creating an artificial appearance of public opinion and showering Senators and Representatives with letters and telegrams, has grown to huge proportions. It is a species of supergovernment, undertaking to exercise sovereignty without any duly constituted authority or public responsibility. In consequence the Congress is put under duress. Almost all these organizations seek an expenditure of the taxpayer's money.

Every interest has a right to organize and be heard. But the right to congressional action depends on the relation of the request to the welfare of all the people. If the Congress could be let alone, if it could be free to form its own judgment on what it knows are the realities instead of being forced to surrender to the artificial, much time and money could be saved and much better legislation would result. The Congressmen are the legal representatives of the people. No other agency can claim exclusive right to speak in the name of the people.

Continuing in this course, how long will it be before the greedy maw of selfish interests will have swallowed up all the substance of the land?

You will have observed that the terms of the bill limit resale price control by the manufacturer to commodities which bear—or the label on container of which bears—the trade-mark, brand, or trade name of the producer, and that the exceptions to the rule that the distributor can not sell for less than fixed prices are, in discontinuing the handling of such goods, in selling reasonable goods at end of season, selling damaged goods with notice of damage, or sales made under orders of any court. In other words, the only way a retailer once signing one of these contracts can regain his lost independence is to die, or go broke, except as the manufacturer may determine when goods are damaged or as to when a season ends.

And it should not be overlooked that the contract, though in restraint of trade, is made legal by the bill and will subject the retailer and jobber to an action for damages for any breach thereof, and for the redress of any grievance that the wholesaler or retailer may have against the manufacturers or producers they must take their case to the courts where the manufacturers' or producers' principal place of business is located. This would mean that, due

to expense involved in such proceedings, the average retailer would have no redress against the wrongdoings of the manufacturers and producers.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman is making an interesting statement. I regret I did not get the benefit of his remarks from the beginning. Does the gentleman oppose the principle of the manufacturer having the right to control his resale price?

Mr. COX. I do.

Mr. KELLY. Has not the Supreme Court of the United States given its sanction to that very practice?

Mr. COX. Let me make this observation to the gentleman: Your bill is intended to legalize price control by contract between the manufacturer and retailer. That is your proposal. The Supreme Court has said in a number of decisions that that practice is not only violative of the antitrust act but it is against the common law.

Mr. KELLY. The fact of the matter is that the Supreme Court has held it absolutely just and valid for the manufacturer to control the retail price through his own agencies. Under the General Electric case 30,000 retailers were required to maintain a retail price under the circumstances described, and the Supreme Court decided that the manufacturer could control the price under such circumstances.

Mr. COX. The Supreme Court has said that the manufacturer has a monopoly of the production and distribution of his product. Of course, it has that, and he does not violate the antitrust act by setting up agencies in the different localities and marketing his product through those agencies. That is what the Supreme Court has said in the decision referred to by the gentleman. But let me remind the gentleman that the decision in the Miles case was not the first pronouncement of the Supreme Court to the effect that the scheme sought to be legalized by the bill to which I am addressing my remarks was illegal. There are earlier decisions than that case, but the decision in the Miles case is the first pronouncement of the court which covered all of the points urged by the manufacturer in his effort to avoid the provisions of the antitrust act.

Mr. KELLY. Does my friend object to the principle of the manufacturer, by consignment, controlling the retail price of his product?

Mr. COX. If the consignment is merely a colorable transaction practiced on the part of the manufacturer for the purpose of avoiding the law, not only the provisions of the antitrust act but the provisions of the common law as against restraint of trade, I certainly am opposed to it.

Mr. KELLY. That is not what I asked you.

Mr. COX. But I submit that I am not opposing the manufacturer in good faith setting up agencies to market his product through them. If the gentleman has any point on which he wishes to question me relating to the conditions as presented to the court in the Miles case or in any of the cases succeeding, I shall be glad to answer any question. The decision in the Miles case, as I said, was the first pronouncement of the court that covered all the points that had up to that time been presented and all the schemes that had been urged by the manufacturer in his endeavor to avoid the provisions of the antitrust act. If the consignment is merely a device on the part of the manufacturer for evading the law, not only the provisions of the antitrust act, but the provisions of the common law as against restraint of trade, I certainly am opposed to it. That is what I am opposed to. I do not say that it is illegal for a manufacturer to set up an agency.

Mr. KELLY. I want to get at what the gentleman is really opposing.

Mr. COX. I am opposing the bill you have offered here, which has for its purpose the setting aside of a public law enacted for the public good, the suspending of the antitrust act and also the suspension of the common law, so far as it declares against acts and combinations in restraint of trade.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman knows as well as I do that Congress never declared illegal a contract for the maintenance of a resale price.

Mr. COX. I submit that no open and fair minded lawyer can take the antitrust act and put any other construction upon its provisions than is put upon them by the Supreme Court in the Miles case.

Mr. KELLY. I would submit the name of Louis D. Brandeis, now a distinguished Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. He says that decision did not take into consideration the facts connected with modern commercial transactions.

Mr. COX. The statement by Mr. Brandeis was based upon this supposition that the manufacturer's property rights in his patent and trade-mark monopolies give him the right to control resale prices of his products. In other words, he enlarged the property rights of the manufacturer in this respect.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman is mistaken about that. If he will read the hearings had before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, he will notice that Mr. Brandeis made a very complete argument in behalf of the passage of this bill.

Mr. COX. I regret to say that is not the fact.

I challenge the gentleman to name a single decision of the court which upholds the theory that the gentleman now proposes before this committee. There is not a single case.

Mr. KELLY. I just named one.

Mr. COX. Oh, there are decisions of inferior courts, but all these were upset by the Supreme Court.

Mr. KELLY. In 1928 the Supreme Court held that the General Electric Co. could deal with 33,000 retailers and maintain the price of the product.

Mr. COX. But there was nothing said in that case by the court that in any way modified the decisions of the same court outlawing price fixing by contract or otherwise.

Mr. KELLY. What they really did was to say that it is perfectly legal to maintain the resale price of a product if it is done by a system of resale agencies or consignment. It is not legal if done by contract. It is perfectly legal if done by consignment and resale agency, which reaches the same end.

Mr. COX. We come right back to the agency proposition. Nobody disputes but that a manufacturer has a right to market his products through an agent. Of course he has.

Mr. KELLY. Well, that is maintenance of price.

Mr. COX. And the courts have said that if it is a colorable transaction, set up for the purpose of evading the law, it is under the indictment of the law.

Mr. BUSBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. BUSBY. In regard to the case just cited by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY], if I recall correctly, the sole reason the practice of the electric company was upheld was because it was their own product and belonged to them, and they were selling their own product.

Mr. COX. Of course.

Mr. BUSBY. And that is reasonable. The only reason their position was maintained was because it was dealing with a product that belonged to them, through their own agency.

Mr. COX. On which they have a complete monopoly, or did have until the title passed out of them.

Mr. KELLY. Then, neither the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] nor the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Busby] objects to the principle of maintaining a uniform resale price of a product?

Mr. COX. I object to anything, sir, that is intended to be used for the purpose of interfering with trade; that is, in restraint of trade.

Mr. KELLY. The automobile business interferes with trade in just the same way.

Mr. COX. But it comes back to the same proposition. The automobile business has no bearing whatsoever on the issue I am discussing. That is a case where the automobile people market their cars and their products through their

agencies, but if they have a contract with an agency which is entered into for the purpose of controlling the price that the agency will charge for the product in retail, that contract is unenforceable, provided the title to the product at any time before sale passes out of the manufacturer into the agency.

Mr. KELLY. That is true, but the end is maintenance of the resale price of the automobile.

Mr. COX. On the question that your bill is intended to effect, let me read from the best mind that has ever been brought to bear upon this whole question, from a decision by Mr. Justice White in the case of Boston Store against American Graphophone Co., which the committee has referred to in quoting from the brief filed by a distinguished Member of Congress in that case. The court said:

We at once say, despite insistence in the argument to the contrary, that we are of opinion that there is no room for controversy concerning the subjects to which the questions relate, as every doctrine which is required to be decided in answering the questions is now no longer open to dispute, as the result of prior decisions of this court, some of which were announced subsequent to the making of the certificate in this case—

And so forth.

In that decision Mr. Justice Brandeis concurred, because, as the statement was made, the rulings of the court in prior decisions bound him in the case. There is a review of different decisions of the court made in that case.

Mr. BECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. BECK. Will the gentleman not read the end of that opinion, which, if my recollection serves me correctly—and I happened to argue that case in the Supreme Court—two Justices dissented, and Justice Brandeis only failed to dissent on the ground of stare decisis. He felt the court had previously passed upon it. It does not militate against the argument of my friend that a majority of the court held otherwise. That is the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. COX. Yes, of course. Justice Brandeis concurred in the following language:

Whether a producer of goods should be permitted to fix by contract, express or implied, the price at which the purchaser may resell them, and if so, under what conditions, is an economic question. To decide it wisely it is necessary to consider the relevant facts, industrial and commercial, rather than established legal principles. On that question I have expressed elsewhere views which differ apparently from those entertained by a majority of my brethren. I concur, however, in the answers here given to all the questions certified, because I consider that the series of cases referred to in the opinion settles the law of this court.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. COX (continuing reading):

If the rule so declared is believed to be harmful in its operation, the remedy may be found, as it has been sought, through application to the Congress, or relief may possibly be given by the Federal Trade Commission, which has also been applied to.

Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Van Devanter are of opinion that each of the questions should be answered in the affirmative.

Mr. BECK. So there were three dissents?

Mr. COX. One special concurrence and two dissents.

Mr. BECK. Now will the gentleman permit a further interruption?

Mr. COX. I will if it does not require any extended answer, because I wish to complete my statement.

Mr. BECK. The purpose of interrupting the interesting address which the gentleman is making is to correct what seems to be a misapprehension as to the nature of this bill as it is recommended by the Committee on Interstate Commerce. Apparently the gentleman is under the impression that the bill as now reported to the House sanctions the practice adopted in the Doctor Miles medical case.

Mr. COX. Unquestionably.

Mr. BECK. Such is not the fact, in my humble judgment.

Mr. COX. Well, I can not see that any other meaning could be given to the bill.

Mr. BECK. Would the gentleman just allow me to make a statement, as a member of that committee, as to what the committee, at least, conceived to be the nature of the bill? If, however, the gentleman prefers that I should not do so, of course I will not.

Mr. COX. I would like to have sufficient time to finish my statement.

Mr. BECK. I trust the gentleman will have it, because the gentleman is making a very interesting address.

Mr. COX. The gentleman flatters me.

Mr. CRISP. My friend from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] has promised me 15 minutes. I will be glad to waive it and give it to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. How long will it take the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK] to make his statement?

Mr. BECK. Two or three minutes; just to explain what we believe to be the nature of the bill.

The bill called the Capper-Kelly bill, as originally considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, unquestionably did seek to legalize the practice which was condemned by the Supreme Court in the Doctor Miles medical case, the practice being the power in a manufacturer not merely to impress upon his immediate vendee a prohibition against the retail price but to compel that vendee to project the same covenant against a cut price to his vendee, and thence forever, by a kind of running covenant, until it reached the consumer.

Mr. COX. Is not that the bill before the House?

Mr. BECK. It is not the bill of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I happen to know this, because when the bill came before us in that form I made an amendment—which must be embodied in the bill—in which the limit of the proposed legislation was to give to a manufacturer who had created a good will at his own expense in his commodity the right to impress upon his immediate vendee the retail price, that he must not sell at less than a certain price, but that the vendee, having complied with that, could not say to anyone to whom he sold, "You must adopt a similar restriction." In other words, as all the goods that are really the subject matter of this bill are sold to distributors, undoubtedly a manufacturer, we will say the Victor Phonograph Co., could impress upon his distributor that he could not sell at less than a certain price, but the distributor could not say to the retailer, "You must not sell to the consumer at less than a certain price." So that the only purpose of the legislation as reported by the committee was as between the immediate vendor and vendee and their right under the general liberty of contract to require that the vendee shall not sell at less than a certain price.

Mr. COX. Let me say in answer to the gentleman that I, of course, do not agree with him in the construction he puts upon the bill, and I challenge every Member of this body to consider the bill in the light of the hearings, and determine if he agrees with the gentleman's pronouncement.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The principle announced in the Miles case that it was violative both of the antitrust act and of the rules of the common law that a vendor who parts with the title to property should dictate to the vendee the price at which it should be resold. The principle is violated in toto by the bill being discussed.

Mr. COX. That is right.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That is the principle. Now, that principle is violated in toto by this bill.

Mr. COX. That is right.

What is the purpose of the bill? It is to legalize monopolies and contracts in restraint of trade. But that is not all. By this form of restrictive agreement the manufacturer seeks an enlargement of his property rights to the disadvantage of all others. It is proposed that he shall have the right to control his product all along the line,

from the time it leaves his hands until it comes into possession of the ultimate consumer.

What becomes of the principle of freedom of exchange in movable property if the manufacturers be permitted to impress his products with the stamp of interest after it has been sold and paid for? Title would never vest with the unrestricted right of alienation. Is not such an arrangement as is sought to be legalized "against the trade and traffic and bargaining and contracting between man and man"? In the Miles case referred to, the Supreme Court said, in the language of the now Chief Justice, "The public have an interest in every person carrying on his trade freely." Under the bill there is no more freedom of contract or freedom of trade in the retailer. He will become the pawn of the manufacturer, a cog in the machine of another.

But has it occurred to you that this is a special law to be enacted for a special class? Immunity against the anti-trust law is granted to none other. Why this special and extraordinary grant of power? Is this the class most entitled to the tender consideration of Congress? It has been the general belief that, due to the ability to measure demand and adjust production accordingly, thereby avoiding the loss incident to overproduction and burdensome surpluses, that they, of all operators, are in best condition, and in spite of the colossal losses in capital investments sustained by the whole country, theirs have been comparatively small. That which is made lawful for the manufacturer is unlawful for the distributor and the public.

But much is said by the advocates of the measure about protecting the manufacturers' interest in his trade-mark, patent, and copyrights in the sale of his goods. Confusion is likely to arise on this score, for which reason I would like to discuss his rights under existing laws.

A manufacturer may, because of his secrecy of process, letters patent, or for other reasons, have a complete monopoly of production on the thing he makes, and has absolute control of such production before sale, but his title ends when sale is completed. Rights of patentees are derived from statutory grants. The grant of letters patent is not a gratuitous conference of a right, as was the case under the old English law, but is one based upon public consideration. The right is to protect the inventor in the fruits of his invention. The consideration to the public is the stimulation of inventive genius and the benefit it derives from new inventions and discovery and the public use of the patent after monopoly expires.

This same principle, in part, holds true in the case of trade-marks and copyrights. No one can disturb him in the use and enjoyment of these statutory grants. Infringements are prohibited by law. His monopoly in production and distribution is secure. The control of his business is his, but this is not enough; he now demands that he be permitted to also control the business of the wholesaler and retailer.

Listen to what the Supreme Court, in the language of Mr. Justice Hughes, says:

But because there is monopoly of production it certainly can not be said that there is no public interest in maintaining freedom of trade with respect to future sales after the article has been placed on the market and the producer has parted with his title. Moreover, every manufacturer before sale controls the articles he makes. With respect to these he has the right of ownership, and his dominion does not depend upon whether the process of manufacture is known or unknown, or upon any special advantage he may possess by reason of location, materials, or efficiency. The fact that the market may not be supplied with the particular article unless he produces it is a practical consequence which does not enlarge his right of property in what he does produce. * * * But because a manufacturer is not bound to make or sell it does not follow in case of sales actually made he may impose upon purchasers every sort of restriction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. COX. What changes have taken place in modern methods of business that demand the sacrifice of the public

interest through granting to manufacturers immunity from the operation of a public law enacted for the public good?

The bill legalizes price fixing—the dictation of prices by the manufacturer—which the courts have said is unreasonable restraint of trade and against public policy. If it eliminates competition—and who questions but that it does—what becomes of the public interest? If the public have an interest, why not preserve it? If fair dealings in trade be wholesome, why not make sure that they be maintained? What is the meaning of monopoly but excess profits and high prices? And with the unrestrained power in the hands of the manufacturer, with all competition out of the way, how will the public fare?

The contention that the passage of this bill is necessary to the protection of the property rights of manufacturers in their trade-marks and patents is based upon the false assumption that trade-marks and patents have a greater value than is actually given under the law. A patent simply protects one in the use and enjoyment of his creation during the period fixed by the statute. It is property and as such subject to transfer.

The reputation and good will which a man acquires in business are property, and as such entitled to protection against invasion, and also in part upon the theory of protection to the public against fraud, and in order to obtain the advantage of one's good will and reputation it has long been the custom to affix to the goods employed in a particular trade or business some particular mark to distinguish such goods from similar goods employed by others engaged in the same business. Broadly speaking, such distinguishing marks are trade-marks and their use has been widespread in all countries from very ancient times. There is no limit of time on the life of trade-marks as is the case with patents. A personal trade-mark can not be assigned while an impersonal trade-mark can be assigned only in connection with the particular business in which it has been used, and for continued use upon the same articles which it was first applied to and used upon by its original adopter. The sale of a trade-marked or patented article in nowise affects the manufacturer's property rights in his mark of identification. It is only title to the article itself that passes impressed with marks of identification. To contend that the stamp of identification gives to the owner of identifying mark an interest may be likened unto the affixing of a man's signature (which is his mark of distinction or identification) to a contract as witness giving to him an interest in the subject matter of the agreement. Or a better illustration would be giving a stockman who brands or marks his stock an interest in his product after sale simply because the stock bears his brand or mark. When a manufacturer is protected against use of his trade-mark or patent by another he has enjoyed to the fullest his property rights in the things themselves.

The inroads that chain stores have made into the fields of distribution heretofore occupied almost exclusively by the independent merchant, and the threat that these operations carry to the smaller communities, and the argument that the proposed law would operate as a restraint upon the chain store has brought to the manufacturers a support that otherwise they would never have been able to secure, and which they would not now have if the real purpose and intent of the measure were understood.

This is a manufacturer's bill, nothing more nor less. They want it as insurance of security and profit and at public expense. Its passage will convert the retailer into a mere distributing agent, putting him into a state of wardship to the manufacturer. The argument that it would restrain the chain store and protect the small merchant is a snare and a delusion. As between the manufacturer and retailer it is the spider's invitation to the fly. Chain stores in thousands of instances already take the complete output of manufacturers and in other instances are operating their own plants. If the bill would have any influence upon their business, would it not be to increase their manufacturing operations? The chain stores' methods of conducting their business have done great injury to the business of independent merchants,

and we would all doubtless be glad to do something to remedy this evil, but this can not be done by uprooting an age-old principle of the common law, the destruction of rules of public policy, local and national, and the tinkering with fundamental principles of economic laws.

It is doubtless true, as the Federal Trade Commission says, "that price maintenance and price cutting have been found under certain conditions to be objectionable," but where does the public interest lie? In price maintenance by law, what becomes of competition? While in price cutting it is only the fair use of competitive practices that are involved. As between the manufacturer whose profits are fixed under competitive conditions, and extortionate prices exacted of consumers under unrestricted price maintenance, the duty of the legislator seems perfectly clear.

One of the dangers of the bill is that of putting a monetary value upon trade-marks that they are not intended to have, which will mean that they will be capitalized in the business of the manufacturers and the consuming public made to pay a dividend upon a statutory grant given for an entirely different purpose. The effort is to set up a new system of social arrangements that runs counter to our conception of property rights and personal liberty.

It would be ideal if every operator, whether manufacturer, wholesaler, jobber, retailer, farmer, laborer, or whatever the occupation might be, could realize reasonable profits upon his operations, but if no legislative insurance can be given to all then why give it to the manufacturer to the detriment of others?

The report of the committee reporting this bill is not convincing. It reflects a misconception of the purpose and effect of the measure in this statement:

It must always be kept in view that this bill does not refer to necessities of life, so that it in no way affects the necessary cost of living.

It evidently did not occur to the author of this language at the time of penning it that it is comparatively few necessities of life that are not marketed under some trade-mark, brand, or trade name. What are the necessities of life that are not sold under trade names? They can be named on the 10 fingers. And the language that "what is accomplished by this bill is to restate the principle of the common law" would indicate that the very decision of the Supreme Court that outlawed the contract now sought to be legalized was likewise overlooked, for in that case the court said "that the contract was not only in violation of the antitrust act but likewise against the common law." The committee doubtless accepted as authority for this statement the brief and argument made by another distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Beck], in case of Boston Store of Chicago against the American Graphophone Co., decided by the Supreme Court in 1918 and reported in 246 U. S. 8, as it is from this brief that quotations are set forth in this report. Statements from the learned gentleman from Pennsylvania are always interesting and informative, but the committee might have learned by consulting the decision of the court in this case that every argument advanced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in that case was rejected by the court.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. COX. At common law, contracts in restraint of trade—other than conspiracies to defraud—were illegal in the sense that they were unenforceable; but they were not unlawful in the sense that they were prohibitive. However, the modern tendency of the general and common law recognizes a larger freedom of contract, a wider liberty of bargaining, materially broadens the narrow and medieval view as to what did constitute a restraint of trade. Nevertheless, no contract, arrangement, or conduct has been condemned by the Supreme Court as against the Sherman law, which would have been favored at common law, and no contract or quasi contract has been condemned that would have been enforceable at common law. If the antitrust act were re-

pealed, this contract would still be under the indictment of the law; and if the language set forth in the report to the effect that the bill is not intended to relate to the necessities of life were incorporated in the measure the manufacturers would reject it.

Another objection to the bill, as has already been mentioned and as stressed by the Federal Trade Commission, is that it contains no provision for a review of the terms of resale contracts or revision of resale prices by any disinterested agency. The commission's recommendation of the bill is upon the condition—

That it be provided by law that if the manufacturer of an article produced and sold under competitive conditions desires to fix and maintain resale prices he shall file with an agency designated by the Congress a description of such article, the contract of sale, and the price schedules which he proposes to maintain, and that the agency designated by the Congress be charged with a duty, either upon its own initiative or upon complaint of any dealer or consumer or other party at interest, to review the terms of such contract and to revise such prices, and that any data and information needful for a determination be made available to such agency.

That is the condition upon which the commission makes its recommendation, and surely no legislator would favor the bill without such provision for the protection of the public being incorporated in the measure.

Why give the manufacturer the right to fix the prices that others shall ask for his products without at the same time subjecting his price to the revision of a disinterested agency? But write this provision into the law and the manufacturer will lose interest in it, for he is unwilling to have applied to his business the same rule that he wants to apply to the business of others.

There is much said about freedom of contract. What freedom has the retailer in dictating terms of a contract with a manufacturer for goods that the retailer must have and can secure from no other source? The advantage is already that of the manufacturer with his monopoly of production and distribution. Why give him the liberty to take away from all purchasers the freedom of contracting in the sale of his own goods as his best judgment dictates, taking from him the right of conducting his own business in his own fashion? The freedom here sought to be conferred upon a special class is the denial of freedom to all others. The right to contract as one wills should never be conferred. There are sound public policies that would thereby be upset. It is to such that this bill runs counter.

Public policy is that principle of the law which holds that no one can lawfully do that which has a tendency to be injurious to the public or against the public good. No court has undertaken to give an exact definition of the term, leaving it loose and free of definition in order to meet the exigencies incident to varying habits and fashions of the day, the growth and development of commerce, and the usages of trade, but Mr. Story says:

This rule may, however, be safely laid down: That wherever any contract conflicts with the morals of the time and contravenes any established interest of society, that it is void, as being against public policy.

It was a rule of ancient common law that all contracts in restraint of trade were against public policy and therefore void, but this rule was early modified as the state of society and the condition under which business was transacted changed, however, held within the limits of the necessary protection of the rights of contracting parties. The courts of the United States, in the main, have followed, reluctantly, it is true, but have followed the English courts in the liberalization of the old rule, always, however, making the reasonableness of the restraint the test of legality.

The theory upon which the English courts and those of this country have upheld contracts in restraint of trade is that all restraints of trade are not against the public interest, but it can be safely asserted that any contract or combination in restraint of trade, partial or total, that injuriously affects the public interest is contrary to public policy and void.

This, in brief, is my contribution to the discussion. The question is fundamental and threatens our entire economic

structure. It puts a check upon the progressive development of the law and starts us back toward where we stood three centuries ago under English law, when letters patent were granted, not upon public consideration but upon the favor of the Crown, when under patent rights monopolies upon trades, professions, callings, and such like were effected.

We may take the bill, we may take it with a smile, but the informed membership will smile as does the ass eating thistles. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the sincerity and the earnestness of my friend from Georgia in dealing with what is, as he says, a fundamental issue and one that touches deep on the business system of America and on social and economic conditions as well.

I did not have the pleasure of hearing the gentleman's opening discussion of the Doctor Miles decision, but I take it from what I heard that he made the point that the Supreme Court ruled against the right of a manufacturer to name or control the resale price of his product, and that he was in accord with that principle. I asked him the question as to whether he agreed with the Supreme Court in the decision where they said that a manufacturer has the right to maintain his price through the consignment or agency system, and my friend said he was in accord with that principle also. I made the point that the Supreme Court legalized price maintenance by certain methods, while denying it by another.

Now, let us take his statement that no "open and fair minded lawyer can take the antitrust law and put any other construction upon its provisions than is put upon them by the Supreme Court in the Miles case." My contention is that never in the history of the Congress has any bill been passed specifically limiting the right of a manufacturer to contract as to resale prices. In proof I will quote one man who has the respect of all and who, as a prominent member of the Boston bar, wrote the original measure for the legalization of resale prices, Louis D. Brandeis, now an honored Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. I shall quote his testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I simply put Justice Brandeis, or rather Attorney Brandeis, as one outstanding lawyer who went into the decision in the Miles case and reached opposite views regarding it.

Mr. COX. Would the gentleman be willing that the witness as judge be quoted against the witness as lawyer?

Mr. KELLY. I am placing in the RECORD his words and, of course, as justice or as lawyer, he stands in a position beyond cavil, as a man who looks at the public policy as well as the letter of a law. Here is what he has said:

Prima facie, a man has a right to enter into any contract he wants to; the limitation is, it must not be against public policy.

A man must start out in business some way. He has certain liberties guaranteed to him by the Constitution which should be protected by the laws of the land, and one of them is liberty of contract. The liberty of contract, however, guaranteed by the Constitution, is not absolute; it is subject to the police power of the Federal Government either as applied by legislation or by limitation in other ways. The law has a right to step in and should step in so far, and only so far, as liberty of contract is used to the injury of the public. I say that the right of the individual to fix a resale price for his goods is consonant with the public interest.

The thing the Supreme Court was passing on was not a thing involving legal erudition. If the court had followed what other courts had said on this subject, it would have decided the other way. It merely exercised its judgment as to what the interests of the country demand and made its interpretation as to what Congress intended by the Sherman Act.

The fact that the Supreme Court by a 5-to-4 decision in the Sanatogen case says that such a contract is in restraint of trade does not prove that such a business practice does actually restrain trade. That decision proves only that such is the law of the Federal courts until that court reverses its decision, or Congress, which has the supreme power of declaring the law in this respect, says otherwise. It is Congress which must ultimately

determine questions of economic policy in matters of interstate commerce.

The Supreme Court has the right to determine what is public policy in a limited number of cases as long as Congress has not declared what it is. The Supreme Court has, in passing upon this quasi-legislative question, made what I respectfully submit is an error, and if so, it is the duty of Congress to correct that error.

The court merely expresses its opinion that such agreements are against public policy and that it believes Congress intended to prohibit them when it enacted the Sherman law. I submit most respectfully that this is a most erroneous supposition. There is nothing against the public interest in allowing me to make such an agreement with retail dealers. The public interest clearly demands that price standardization be permitted.

There is no reason why five gentlemen of the Supreme Court should know better what public policy demands than five gentlemen of the Congress. In the absence of legislation by Congress the Supreme Court expresses its idea of public policy, but in the last analysis it is the function of the legislative branch of the Government to declare the public policy of the United States. There are a great many rules which the Supreme Court lays down which may afterwards be changed and are afterwards changed by legislation. It is not disrespect to the Supreme Court to do it.

The American principle is that a man has a right to do anything he pleases with the article he buys unless he has an agreement with the man from whom he bought it that he shall do something else.

There is no constitutional question involved. The only question is, What does the general interest of the community demand?

What I say is this: Such a restriction upon individual liberty instead of being beneficial is harmful and therefore Congress in its wisdom ought to correct the error.

There are certain liberties we have found by experience it is wise to curtail. But wherever you do not have to curtail liberty, wherever the exercise of full liberty by a business man is consistent with the public welfare, public policy demands that we should allow him that liberty, because freedom is the fundamental basis of our Government and our prosperity.

The object here is to restore the individual right to make a legitimate contract. * * * What is being asked for here is not any privilege at all; it is a measure to restore a right commonly enjoyed in the leading commercial States of this country, and the leading commercial countries of the world enjoy as a matter of course, and which was abridged in respect to interstate commerce by certain decisions of the Supreme Court.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman, as I understand, is quoting Justice Brandeis?

Mr. KELLY. Justice Brandeis; yes.

Mr. COX. As a special pleader in some case before some court?

Mr. KELLY. No; in an appearance before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, when he stated he represented the public interest.

Mr. COX. In what year?

Mr. KELLY. This was published in the hearings of 1926 and had been given by him at a previous hearing.

Mr. COX. I know, but can the gentleman recall the date of the statement?

Mr. KELLY. The date of the original hearing was 1915 or 1916.

Mr. COX. It was before he went on the court, of course?

Mr. KELLY. He was still a practicing attorney; yes.

Mr. COX. Was it the year before he went on the court?

Mr. KELLY. We all know Justice Brandeis, and I hope the gentleman will not take my time on that.

Mr. COX. In spite of what Justice Brandeis has said, the Supreme Court has followed the ruling of the court which he was indicting in the statement he made there before the committee. The Supreme Court has followed that ruling in the case of *Bauer & Cie. v. O'Donnell* (229 U. S.); and in the case of *Straus against American Publishing Co.*, reported in Two hundred and thirty-first United States Reports; and in the case of *American Graphophone Co. against Chicago Stores*, in Two hundred and forty-sixth United States Reports; and in the case of *Board of Trade of Chicago v. United States* (246 U. S.); and in a number of other cases; is not that true?

Mr. KELLY. I am familiar with those cases.

Mr. COX. And they have also been supported and reaffirmed in decisions approving them?

Mr. KELLY. I hope the gentleman will not take any more of my time in citing cases, because those cases all come down to the last expression made by Justice Brandeis,

wherein he said that his continued expression of dissent to the majority opinion of his brethren on the court had become impossible and Congress has the right to remedy the harm. That sums up all those cases.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman familiar with the principle involved in the decision in the *Henry against Dick* case?

Mr. KELLY. The case of the requirement of an appliance to be used?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. KELLY. Yes; but that does not enter into this question.

I would like to continue now, and I hope the gentleman will let me lay down a few points in reply to his assertions. Of course, it is impossible to go into the whole question at this time, because this involves a philosophy that, as the gentleman has said, concerns all business and every community.

I make the statement that the Congress of the United States never intended at any time to pass any law which would prevent an independent manufacturer of a standard trade-marked article from agreeing with his distributors as to the resale price at which it should be sold.

Mr. COX. Then the Supreme Court in all of these decisions is wrong?

Mr. KELLY. I just quoted Justice Brandeis on that very point. He says the Supreme Court made an error that should be corrected.

Mr. COX. I understand; but is the gentleman contending that those decisions of the Supreme Court are erroneous?

Mr. KELLY. I am contending that the Supreme Court did not take into consideration at all the progress of trade-mark merchandising and that they acted on a set of circumstances which did not apply.

Mr. COX. And, therefore, the decisions were wrong?

Mr. KELLY. And I was putting up Justice Brandeis as a better authority than myself on the Supreme Court.

Mr. COX. But a majority of the court did not agree with Justice Brandeis.

Mr. KELLY. I put Justice Brandeis forward as a far better authority on the Supreme Court than myself. I agree with every word he says, and maintain that it was an inadvertent decision that has wrought tremendous injury in the business fabric and is leading to monopoly in merchandising in this country.

Mr. COX. But the decision which has been followed by the court of which Justice Brandeis is a member—

Mr. KELLY. And Justice Brandeis has protested that by saying the Congress has the power to remedy the evil.

Mr. MERRITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. MERRITT. The point being that the whole question is a question of economic law in which the Congress is the court of last resort and not the Supreme Court.

Mr. KELLY. Yes; Congress decides public policy. And Congress has never acted to make illegal such a contract, but the interpretation of the Sherman antitrust law was an interpretation by the Supreme Court and that created a law made by the judicial power instead of the Congress.

Mr. COX. And is not that decision—

Mr. KELLY. I want to be courteous, but I can not yield further at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor and has declined to yield.

Mr. KELLY. I will yield to the gentleman for one question.

Mr. COX. Is not that the tribunal that the Government has set up for the interpretation of the acts of Congress and other laws?

Mr. KELLY. That question is thoroughly discussed in the passage I read, where Justice Brandeis said that as long as Congress does not decide what the public policy shall be the Supreme Court had the power of deciding it in disputed cases.

Now, the gentleman has said that the Miles decision prevented a manufacturer from maintaining a resale price on his product. It did not do anything of the kind. That Su-

preme Court decision applies to one method of maintaining a resale price, and that method is by agreement.

The Supreme Court in the Doctor Miles case and in all other cases that have come under it ruled that the manufacturer can not enter into an agreement with his distributors as to the resale price, but the Supreme Court says it is perfectly legal, if the General Electric Co. desires to deal with retailers on a consignment basis, they have the power to stipulate the price to the consumer. They also ruled that Henry Ford has a valid right to maintain the price on every automobile he puts out, making it uniform all over the United States by resale agencies. So that what the Supreme Court has done is to say, "Maintenance of the retail price is perfectly legal; we give our judicial benediction to it; we say it must be done, however, by corporations that have capital enough to establish resale agencies everywhere or to wait until the goods are sold and title transferred under consignment. Done by these methods it is perfectly valid, and we give it our blessing."

But if any little independent manufacturer who is in competition with hundreds of other manufacturers desires to put his article out in the regular channel of distribution via the wholesaler and retailer, he is absolutely debarred from having control over the price.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 10 minutes more.

Mr. KELLY. My friends, if we are to limit the right of contract, if we are to interfere with the freedom of contract, one thing is certain, and that is we should put restrictions on every competitor alike. If it is right for Henry Ford to maintain the retail price of his product, then it is right for the little, independent manufacturer, who is in competition with many others of the same class. That is all we are contending for in this bill.

The gentleman thinks that this is extending a new and dangerous power to the little manufacturer. It is nothing of the kind. It is simply a restoration of the right universally held up to 1911 and one that is now recognized in every civilized land in the world. It is even legalized by the acts of the legislatures in some of our own States.

The result is that there is such a chaos in business that the Federal Trade Commission says that it can proceed no further.

This bill is a clear provision giving the right to any manufacturer who is willing to put his name on the article, who is willing to put up his guaranty that he stands back of it—that he may enter into an agreement as to the resale price of the article so that the predatory price cutter may not be able to use that article to lure customers into his store and then sell them other goods at excessive profits.

In the hearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission every opponent testified that there is an undoubted evil in the practice of using these articles as spider-web bargains under certain circumstances.

The results are seen in the monopolization of merchandising which has spread through the country.

From 1920 to 1930 there has been concentration in retailing. In 1920, 4 per cent of retail business was in the hands of chain stores; to-day 22 per cent of the retailing is in the hands of chain stores, that are conducted by heads of organizations far away from the local communities. A great part of that growth is due to this false-pretense system of merchandising.

My friend here says that this is a manufacturer's bill.

Ninety-five per cent of all of the retailers in this country have been praying for Congress to act on this bill for the past 10 years. I have here letters which were sent to President Hoover within the last 30 days, 1 from the National Grocers' Association, 1 from the National Druggists' Association, and 1 from the National Jewelers' Association of America, praying him to carry out the principle of his speech before the American Federation of Labor in Boston and take any step possible against the destructive competition which

is now destroying independent retailers all over the United States.

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

Mr. KELLY. I yield.

Mr. COX. Then what does the President mean when he inveighed against the repeal of the antitrust law in his message yesterday?

Mr. KELLY. His reference to the antitrust law was in line with the evil I inveigh against, and that is, destructive competition. That is what I am against—the cutthroat competition which is destroying independent retailers. But another point raised by the gentleman was that the trade-mark is a monopoly and that if a man is given a right to name his article then he should go no further but must lose all right to have anything to do with the most vital factor of the good will of his trade-mark, and that is the price of the product. The trade-mark is a public welfare right granted because it is believed that when a man puts his name on a product he will stand back of it and guarantee it.

He is given the right to protect it against adulteration and infringement, but he is helpless against the cutting of his price for ulterior purposes. We are contending that the trade-mark, which is in itself an evidence of competition, because no man can get a trade-mark unless there are competing brands of the same kind of articles, shall also be protected from predatory cutting of prices, which injures the good will of the article. We say that the very existence of a trade-mark is a proof of competition. My bill provides that no man shall be permitted to make this agreement unless he is in competition; he shall not be able to make it unless he has a trade-marked, identified article. He will have a right to add other provisions to the contract besides those specified. He may give the retailer the right to send goods back to him at the price paid. This measure is for fair cooperation between the independent retailers and the independent manufacturers so that they shall serve the public better than they can serve them under a jungle method of price cutting, which destroys orderly distribution of identified goods.

Mr. COX. The gentleman agrees that this is a price fixing bill?

Mr. KELLY. Oh, now the gentleman raises a point to distort the purpose of the bill.

Mr. COX. Let me ask this question.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman has asked me a question. Let me answer it. He asked whether this is a price fixing bill, and that is exactly the attempt on the part of many opponents. They would give this bill a bad name, calling it a price fixing bill, and thereby encourage the attempt to put into the hands of some Government agency the right to fix these prices.

Mr. COX. Oh, no; I did not mean that.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The gentleman from Georgia is interrupting the speaker without addressing the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor.

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

Mr. KELLY. Let me continue my answer.

Mr. COX. But the gentleman is quoting me as insisting on this bill being adopted with the recommendation that the Federal Trade Commission be incorporated in it.

Mr. KELLY. I understood the gentleman to favor that.

Mr. COX. No; the bill would still be objectionable. I do not suppose the gentleman would insist upon the passage of the bill without the recommendation of the commission being incorporated in it.

Mr. KELLY. The Federal Trade Commission, if it still holds that view, and the gentleman, if he is in favor of that proposition, are entirely opposed to my position. I can not yield any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania declines to yield. The Chair hopes the gentleman from Georgia will respect his right to the floor.

Mr. COX. I shall respect it.

Mr. KELLY. The idea of a Government agency having the final determination of prices, which we contend shall be determined by fair competition, is, of course, the very opposite of the principle of this measure. That is what those who call this a price fixing bill want the public to understand it is. I have heard it said that the Government is to fix the prices under this measure. That is the very opposite of our contention.

We are trying to take the Government out of business. We are endeavoring to protect the freedom which is inherent in Americans and say to them: You shall have the right when you are in competition to agree for a worthy purpose, which is in line with true public policy. Price fixing! Of course somebody must fix the price. But who shall fix it, the maker or the price cutter? If I have a knife in my pocket and I want to sell it, somebody must name the price, either myself or the man who buys it. The manufacturer who makes the article is best equipped to name the fair price, if he is in competition, for fair competition best regulates fair prices. The public then says whether they will buy or not. Therefore we say that if there is competition there shall be restored the right of agreement, which was universally held up to 1911. The gentleman talks about the freedom of contract. Our opponents in the business world are not for freedom; they are not for free competition. What the great distributors who have chained up into powerful organizations want is the price-fixing power in their own hands. They want to take these articles and fix the price on them so that they will be bait to sell other articles at unduly high prices also fixed by themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. KELLY. I ask the gentleman to yield me three minutes more.

Mr. WOOD. I yield three minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY. The independent retail dealers favor this bill, and the chain stores generally are opposed to it. The chains know what they want, and they know what this bill will do. They know that if they have the power to slaughter the prices of nationally advertised articles they can thereby use those articles as a lure for the sale of other articles at high profit; and that is the reason why they contend manufacturers and independent retailers should not control price cutting. We say that all predatory price cutting on identified goods is an evil, and we propose to put in the hands of independent manufacturers and retailers the right to protect themselves against it.

You may talk about the propaganda that has been coming into Congress on this measure. Have we come to the time when Americans who find themselves crucified by unjust decisions shall not come to Congress and ask for relief? Mr. Brandeis in 1915 said, "You must educate the public and Congress on this vital business question." That is what we are trying to do. I have tried in every way to turn the light on this problem. I sincerely believe that the passage of this bill will benefit every consumer in America. It will also be beneficial to a million and a half retailers who find themselves in danger of extinction at the hands of chain-store organizations. It will be of benefit to many manufacturers who desire to protect their names and good will. It is in line with the American system of equal opportunity and the square deal. It is legislation which, if put on the statute books, will bring more relief to honest business than anything we can enact in this session of Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, there is no question, after hearing the learned discussion that we have just had, but that occasionally the Supreme Court says something or does something that ought to be changed. Of course, Congress has always reserved the right to change it. Congress itself frequently does things that ought to be changed, and we reserve the

right to change them. In fact, a distinguished President of the United States a few years ago—one of the great Presidents—held that the Comptroller of the Treasury was mistaken in one of his decisions. The comptroller held that he had merely followed a certain line of decisions. The President did not conform to that view. It was a matter in relation to seniority of Army officers, and so on. The question was submitted again to the Comptroller of the Treasury, and he held to the decision he had previously made, and he wrote a letter saying he regretted he was unable to change his opinion. The President replied, and said in substance: "It is perfectly proper for you not to change your opinion, but the President can change his Comptroller of the Treasury," and he did so in that case. We are not infallible, and I think sometimes we should change our policy.

Not long ago we had men from every township in the United States assembled in the most democratic army ever assembled, and we ascertained that we had not paid them what they were entitled to. As a matter of justice we said we would pay them a dollar a day; a dollar a day to those who did not go overseas, and \$1.25 for those who went over. Congress agreed to that. We afterwards enacted a bonus certificate law. Those men have gone along until they are now men in the prime of life to-day. They are trying to build up this country, and the burden of the country will fall largely on their shoulders. Those men think they were not treated right, and they are tied up to-day.

Not long ago a very intelligent fellow came to my office and referred to a leading editorial in a well-known newspaper published in my State, which said, "The chief thing to do is to pay debts." About 100 banks have been closed within the last year. The editorial said, "If people paid their debts the banks would stop closing." The soldier put down on my desk a bonus certificate representing \$1,522, payable in 1945. "Now," he said, "if the people advocating improvement of business and relief of unemployment would do their duty, they would pay their debts," referring to the bonus certificate. It would be a criminal offense for anybody to buy this certificate. He said, "If I tried to borrow money on it they would charge me 6 per cent for it. How can we pay debts when the Government does not pay us, and they are talking about millions and millions of money to be appropriated for the relief of unemployment and for the payment of debts, and all that."

Gentlemen, if the Government would take that matter up—and it can get the money; there is no trouble about that—it would be of great public benefit under the present circumstances. It is a liability on the part of the Government to do justice to these men, just as \$16,000,000,000 of United States war bonds are a liability.

If the Government would get the money and pay these men, it would put two and one-quarter billion dollars into circulation and it would be so distributed that there would not be a township or a school district in this United States that would not get some of it. It would be in circulation and the stringency that now confronts us would be largely relieved, at least temporarily.

I introduced a bill, and so did the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] last year looking to this. We did not get much support then, but the experiences of last summer seem to have made many conversions. I have seen many gentlemen who have seen as much light as Paul when he was going into Damascus. They are all rushing to get behind it. What Congress should do is to change its policy and pay off these men who stood between the property interests of this country and the Kaiser and give them at this time this measure of relief, which will be a measure of relief to everybody in the United States.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does the gentleman propose by his bill to pay these certificates at their present value or the value in 1945?

Mr. STEVENSON. I propose to pay them in full. [Applause.] How much does the gentleman suppose they have

loaned on it? There is \$200,000,000 loaned on them, and they have been charged 6 per cent, and when the bank loaned on them they have charged 6½ per cent. Nearly every day a man comes to me to have me help him fix up his letters to send remittances for interest to the bank in Minneapolis. Most of mine seem to have strayed into the bank at Minneapolis. They are paying 6½ per cent to that bank.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. This bonus was originally based on \$1 and \$1.25 per day.

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Has the gentleman figured out what it will amount to if we pay it in full now?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes, sir. If we pay it in full now?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Per day?

Mr. STEVENSON. I have not figured that, but it would not be very great. We could pay it in full now—there were \$3,239,000,000 originally. There has been loaned by the Government and other agencies, mostly by the Government, \$200,000,000. There has been paid on account of deaths, distributed, \$100,000,000. There is a sinking fund now of about \$700,000,000 for the purpose of paying it off. When those amounts are deducted they would have to pay \$2,239,000,000.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What is the difference in percentage between the present value of those certificates and their value when they mature?

Mr. STEVENSON. I have not calculated that.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Would it be about 50 per cent?

Mr. STEVENSON. Four per cent for 15 years would be 60 per cent.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. In other words, to pay these certificates in advance we would have to pay 50 per cent more than the \$1 and the \$1.25 per day?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes, sir; and that would mean that it would run up to about \$1.85 or \$1.90 per day instead of \$1.25.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. When these men were getting only \$31 per month for fighting in the trenches in France, and some of their brothers who were exempted from the Army were getting \$31 a day for skilled work in our shipyards, it would not be out of proportion to pay them \$1.80 a day, would it?

Mr. STEVENSON. It would not be out of proportion at all. Gentlemen, there was an old man in my county who was sort of out of a job at the time, and he got a job at a cantonment nailing shingles on the barracks at \$7 a day. That is what he got. He was too old to get into the Army. He struck a nail carelessly and it flew up and put his eye out, and I got him a pension from the Bureau of Pensions for the injured civil employees, that is more than many of the men who were actually in the war get right now on their compensation. That is the situation—the people who stayed at home got much more than \$2 a day.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman's proposition, but how is the money to be raised? Is it to be raised by bond issue?

Mr. STEVENSON. To be sure. The United States Government might just as well owe bonds to Wall Street as to the veterans all over the country. They want it. It is the way in which the capitalists earn their money. It is a good thing for them to have bonds of the United States. These boys are getting a little more every year, and the interest which they pay takes about one-half of the additional loan which they get. It is just a question of time when the Government will get all that they promised to pay them, and will get it in interest. I say, pay them now and distribute \$3,000,000,000 into every township in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, unemployment and distress can be relieved and our Nation made prosperous immediately without changing our tax laws if Congress will authorize the payment in cash at this time of an honest debt which has been publicly confessed now owed by the Government to the veterans of the World War for services rendered.

PAY VETERANS' CERTIFICATES NOW

May 28, 1929, I introduced a bill (H. R. 3493) to provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the World War the face value of their adjusted-service certificates. It is now pending before the Committee on Ways and Means, and a hearing is expected on it at an early date. June 6, 1929, and April 3, 1930, I made speeches in the House of Representatives advocating this legislation. Those speeches explained the proposal and the reasons for it more fully than I expect to explain it here to-day.

3,478,956 VETERANS HOLD CERTIFICATES—\$1,010 AVERAGE VALUE

To date 3,478,956 veterans of the World War, who reside in every section of the United States, hold adjusted-service certificates for amounts from \$51 to \$1,585—the average value of \$1,010. These certificates are usually referred to as "bonus certificates," but they do not represent a bonus; they represent the Government's confession of a debt for services rendered. They are dated January 1, 1925, and due January 1, 1945.

EVERY SECTION OF THE UNITED STATES WILL BE BENEFITED

The following table discloses the maximum amount of money that will be paid to veterans in each State, District of Columbia, and foreign possessions of the United States if the certificates are paid in cash at this time. The minimum amount may be determined by deducting 18 per cent. Eighteen per cent is the maximum amount that the veteran can borrow on the certificates to this time.

	Approximately
Alabama.....	\$62,544,670.97
Alaska.....	1,756,872.78
Arizona.....	9,487,113.01
Arkansas.....	52,354,808.84
California.....	120,170,098.15
Canal Zone.....	245,962.19
Colorado.....	35,137,455.60
Connecticut.....	50,597,936.06
Delaware.....	7,027,491.12
District of Columbia.....	21,433,847.92
Florida.....	31,623,710.04
Georgia.....	76,951,028.16
Guam.....	175,687.28
Hawaii.....	7,378,855.68
Idaho.....	16,514,604.13
Illinois.....	240,340,196.30
Indiana.....	99,087,624.79
Iowa.....	84,681,267.99
Kansas.....	80,436,423.63
Kentucky.....	69,923,536.65
Louisiana.....	56,571,303.52
Maine.....	24,244,844.36
Maryland.....	46,381,441.39
Massachusetts.....	148,280,062.63
Michigan.....	122,278,345.49
Minnesota.....	89,600,511.78
Mississippi.....	46,381,441.39
Missouri.....	120,521,472.71
Montana.....	29,515,462.70
Nebraska.....	42,516,321.28
Nevada.....	4,216,494.67
New Hampshire.....	14,406,356.80
New Jersey.....	99,790,373.90
New Mexico.....	10,892,511.24
New York.....	356,996,548.90
North Carolina.....	64,301,543.75
North Dakota.....	20,379,724.25
Ohio.....	178,498,274.45
Oklahoma.....	67,563,914.75
Oregon.....	32,326,459.15
Pennsylvania.....	268,388,786.23
Philippine Islands.....	19,676,975.14
Porto Rico.....	13,703,607.68
Rhode Island.....	20,731,098.80
Samoa.....	70,274.91
South Carolina.....	47,084,190.50
South Dakota.....	23,893,469.81
Tennessee.....	66,961,165.64
Texas.....	142,306,695.18
Utah.....	15,811,855.02
Vermont.....	10,541,236.68

	Approximately
Virginia.....	\$68,166,663.86
Virgin Islands.....	35,137.46
Washington.....	49,543,812.40
West Virginia.....	43,219,070.39
Wisconsin.....	89,600,511.78
Wyoming.....	9,135,738.46

MONEY AVAILABLE NOW

"Where are we going to get the money?" This is the question that is usually asked and is the easiest question to answer. In 1919 Congress outlined a policy that our Government should pursue in paying the national war debt. Congress considered that the World War was fought for posterity, and the present generation should not be compelled to pay all of the expense of the war. Such policy, as outlined by Congress, if it had been carried out, would have caused the payment on our war debt during the past 10 years of \$3,000,000,000. Instead, \$10,000,000,000 have been paid or \$7,000,000,000 more than Congress said should have been paid. The war debt has been reduced during this time from \$26,000,000,000 to \$16,000,000,000. Foreign governments owe us long-termed bonds aggregating about \$11,000,000,000. After deducting the present value of these bonds from the \$16,000,000,000 little remains of the public debt for the present generation.

SIMPLE PROCESS OF DIVERTING PAYMENTS FROM ONE WAR DEBT TO ANOTHER

Since we are \$7,000,000,000 ahead of the program in paying the national debt I suggest that payments on the principal of the national debt should be diverted to the payment of the adjusted-service certificates. After they are paid our Government will then be more than \$4,000,000,000 ahead of the program outlined by Congress in 1919 for the retirement of the national debt. No change in our tax laws will be necessary.

AMOUNT OF MONEY REQUIRED

To pay this debt in full will require \$3,513,745,560. There is in the Treasury at this time a reserve fund to be used to retire the certificates, when due, of \$748,222,715. After deducting the latter amount from the former the remainder, to be raised by either short-termed certificates or bond issue, is \$2,765,522,845.

INTEREST RATE LOW

This money can doubtless be borrowed by our Government at this time for the lowest rate in many years. The Government is borrowing money now for 1.7 per cent annual interest. It would be good business policy to borrow the money at a low rate and pay off these certificates.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

The President to-day submitted his Budget message to Congress. It discloses that a payment is expected to be made on the principal of the public debt during the next fiscal year of \$468,509,905. This amount can be paid each year without an increase of taxes. Why pay it on a debt that is \$7,000,000,000 ahead of the policy outlined by Congress for the retirement of the public debt? Let us pay this amount each year on bonds used to retire another war debt, to wit, the adjusted-compensation certificates, until that debt is paid in full; then we will be more than \$4,000,000,000 ahead of the program outlined by Congress for the retirement of the public debt.

FOREIGN DEBTS WILL BE CANCELED IF VETERANS NOT PAID

International and Wall Street bankers want Congress to cancel the \$11,000,000,000 in debts owed our Government by foreign nations. They would profit to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars if such debts were canceled. They know that the quicker our public debt is paid the quicker they will be successful in their efforts. If we do not pay the veterans now, our public debt will soon be paid and debts of foreign nations canceled.

FULL AMOUNT OF CERTIFICATE SHOULD BE PAID

"Why should the veteran have the full amount of the certificate?" John Doe went to the Army in 1917. He served 200 days overseas and 150 days in the United States. Congress, in adjusting the pay of the veterans, decided that John Doe was entitled to \$1.25 a day extra for his oversea service and \$1 a day for home service, making a total of

\$400 due him. Instead of paying him the \$400, the Government issued to him an adjusted-compensation certificate for \$1,000, due in 1945, which represented the \$400 with interest at about 4 per cent, compounded annually, to that time. The Government having confessed the debt and the amount, it was certainly due halfway between the beginning and the ending of the emergency period, or about June 5, 1918. If John Doe is now given the \$400 with 6 per cent interest, compounded annually, which is the same rate of interest that he is now paying the Government for his own money, the amount will exceed at this time \$800, and by June 5, 1931, it will be \$856, or only \$144 less than full value of certificate. During this time Doe has borrowed the limit allowed by law on his certificate. He received as loans, \$88.15 January 1, 1927, \$26.80 in 1928, \$26.34 in 1929, \$25.85 in 1930, and he will be permitted to borrow \$24.87 January 1, 1931, on his certificate. During this time he has had to pay as high as 6, 7, and 8 per cent interest, compounded annually. He has also had to wait 12½ years for his money. Considering the fact that he has only received the money in little dribs, paid high interest for his own money, and has had to wait so long, I think complete justice should be done by paying him the full amount at this time, less, of course, the amount of money he has borrowed.

SHOULD VETERANS KEEP CERTIFICATES UNTIL 1945?

"Would not the veterans be better off if they will keep their certificates until 1945 and receive the full amount then?" This question is often asked. The answer is "No." About 2,000,000 of the certificate holders have borrowed on their certificates. They are paying 6 per cent interest, compounded annually, for their own money, for which they are only receiving 4 per cent. The difference in interest rate unduly consumes the policy. By borrowing, as a majority of them are doing, they are receiving their money in small dribs, never receiving at any one time enough to be of substantial benefit. After the first loan is granted, the amounts allowed to be borrowed annually after that are about \$24 each year on the average-sized certificate. At the end of 20 years, or in 1945, if he has been fortunate in obtaining the very best interest rate from the beginning, the veteran will have much less than \$50 to his credit, which the Government will pay and cancel his certificate. Over the period of 20 years in the case of a veteran who borrows the limit allowed by law each time the Government will receive in interest more money than the veteran will receive on the principal of his certificate. Why would it not be better to pay the certificate now at full face value and give the veteran a sufficient amount in one lump sum to be of material and substantial benefit?

MILLIONS IN INTEREST AND OVERHEAD SAVED

If the certificates are paid in cash now, the Government will be saved millions of dollars each year overhead expense. The veterans will also be saved millions of dollars in interest that they are paying for their own money.

A PART OF THE WAR DEBT

This debt is just as much a part of the war debt as any other Government obligation. It will have to be paid some time. It can now be paid by diverting payments from one war debt to another. If our national debt is liquidated at the same rapid rate that it has been for the past 10 years, it will soon be paid; then foreign nations will, doubtless, make a successful effort to get their debts owed to the United States canceled.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION OF OTHERS PAID IN CASH

After the war the owners of railroads received adjusted compensation in cash; 7,000 war contractors received adjusted compensation in cash; 50,000 Government employees, who received an annual salary of \$2,500 or less during the war, received adjusted compensation in cash. The amount necessary to pay the railroads and war contractors aggregated approximately \$3,500,000,000, and the money to pay them was raised in the fifth Victory loan drive. The same principle of adjusting pay was invoked for the veterans, but instead of paying them in cash the Government insists on being guardian for all of the veterans and permitting

them to receive their money in very small amounts at one time and is compelling them to pay 6 per cent interest, compounded annually, for their own money.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES GIVEN BILLIONS OF DOLLARS

After the war Congress gave to foreign countries what was the equal to \$10,000,000,000. All of these foreign countries paid their veterans not only adjusted compensation but bonuses, and paid them in cash with our money. France was given \$4,500,000,000 of our money, which she used to pay her own soldiers a bonus, and now France is so prosperous that she is trying to find a market for a billion dollars she has to lend, while people in the United States can not understand where we will get the money to pay our own veterans a debt that has been confessed by Congress as just and due. It will not be a raid on the Treasury to pay these certificates. It will be carrying out a policy adopted by Congress of paying a debt when due in a business way.

Mr. BLANTON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. If we were to pay this money in cash in January, it would go immediately into the banks of the country. How could we better help in relieving the present depression than by taking such action?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman has asked me that question.

Much of this money will be placed in the banks and can be borrowed by other people; none of it will be hoarded. Very little of it will be spent foolishly. Most of it will go to provide the veterans, their wives, and children with comforts and necessities of life. Suppose a few of them should spend their money foolishly? The money belongs to them. It will be paid to them for services rendered, and why should the Government be interested in how the money is spent?

PURCHASING POWER WILL BE INCREASED

We all agree that there can be no prosperity without purchasing power. I believe that we are all in agreement that there can not be sufficient purchasing power unless there is sufficient circulating medium. We know that by deliberately increasing purchasing power we can increase general prosperity. Our problem is not so much overproduction as underconsumption.

WILL INCREASE PER CAPITA CIRCULATION OF MONEY

To-day we have about \$36 per capita circulating money in the United States. Ten years ago the per capita circulation was more than \$50, or at least one-third more than it is to-day. You had just as well expect a person to remain well and efficient after the withdrawal of one-third of his circulating blood as to expect a nation to remain prosperous after the withdrawal of one-third of its circulating medium.

PROSPERITY WILL BE RESTORED IMMEDIATELY

If these certificates are paid in cash now, the per capita circulation of money will be increased sufficiently to give the people of the Nation adequate purchasing power. The people of the Nation having adequate purchasing power, prosperity will be restored immediately. You can not operate an automobile without a clutch, neither can you expect our country to be prosperous without sufficient circulating medium.

If the veterans are not paid now, payments will continue to be made on the national debt on which \$7,000,000,000 more has been paid than Congress intended should be paid up to this time. If payments are made on that debt, it will go to people who neither desire nor need the money. It will not cause the purchase of homes, automobiles, radios, furniture, or other comforts and necessities of life. If the money is paid the veterans, it will cause an immediate demand for all of the comforts and necessities of life and even a few of the luxuries. The industries of the country will be able to resume their mass productions and still not be able to supply the demand. Everybody will be helped; the general welfare will be promoted.

Many Members of Congress claim that the ex-soldiers will squander the money. I believe that 99 per cent of them

will use it for a good purpose. I hope the ex-soldiers of this Nation will write their Congressmen and Senators their views on this matter regardless of what they are.

Many Members of Congress claim that the ex-soldiers do not want these certificates paid; that they prefer the certificates in their present form to be payable upon death or 20 years after their issuance. I hope the ex-soldiers will write their Congressmen and Senators their views on this matter regardless of what they are.

I say to you, my friends, in all sincerity, if you want prosperity you should pass this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the time was when each department of Government had a separate supply bill, with its annual necessities specifically provided for. We then knew where all of its money was to be spent. The time was when these bills were printed and they were carefully considered by the membership of this House before they were debated and passed. There was a time when there were no lump-sum appropriations.

I have heard such eminent chairmen of the Committee on Appropriations as Fitzgerald, of New York, as Sherley, of Kentucky, as James W. Good, of Iowa, and Martin B. Madden, of Illinois—than whom, in my judgment, no man in this Congress saved more money for the people of the United States—I have heard all of them inveigh on this floor against lump-sum appropriations.

I have heard such men say that there never would be economy in the Government until the Congress provided appropriations for departments specifically and knew what each million dollars was to be spent for before it was taken over by the department.

The time was when I have heard the present distinguished chairman of this Committee on Appropriations [Mr. Wood] stand upon this floor and demand that big sums of money provided for in appropriations should be made specific, so that we should know who handled them, what they were for, and how they were to be spent.

There was a time when I followed the distinguished gentleman from Indiana in his efforts for economy, in his efforts to save the expenses of this Government and keep them within the bounds of proper limitation. But I am afraid I can not follow him much longer, because his policy has changed.

We now have in this bill appropriations for two departments of the Government. They are two large departments of the Government. We are appropriating for them in this one supply bill which is taken up under general debate to-day just a few minutes after it was introduced from the floor. There is no official print of the bill. There will be no official print until to-morrow, Thursday, and yet we have it up under debate hurriedly, and in it we provide \$241,750,026 for the Treasury Department and \$841,803,917 for the Post Office Department. Most of it is in lump sums.

I am in favor of the Capper-Kelly bill just as strongly as my friend Mr. KELLY is in favor of it. I am in favor of the bill of my friend, Mr. PATMAN, to pay the honest debt to these soldiers—to pay what is coming to them. These adjusted-compensation certificates should be paid at once to our ex-service men in cash. I am going to support him down the line on that bill. I am for the bill to stop immigration, to prevent foreigners coming into the country and taking away the jobs of American workmen. I would go farther than some of the pending measures are proposing. I have been preaching as long as I have been here that there should be a suspension of immigration for a number of years until we can properly assimilate the foreigners now within our bounds. I would like to see all immigration stopped for five years. I am sorry to say that my friend from Texas [Mr. Box] will not be back next year. Every Member knows of the distinguished services of this gentleman, and if Congress could have followed him in his judgment and wisdom we would have now a proper limit on immigration. I am against the proposal of the Postmaster General to increase the rate on first-class mail. We must

defeat that. And I am against lump-sum appropriations, and in favor of getting back to specific appropriations.

The time was when we could take up the bill for the Treasury Department and the bill for the Post Office Department, and we would find that it had been considered by more than six Members of this House. As it is at present, only six Members of this House know anything about this bill; only six Members have sat in the hearings. They are the ones who have asked the department chiefs about it. The departments prepare these technical bills. They have their experts prepare them, and I am sorry to say with respect to the War Department and the Navy Department, they have experts prepare those bills in language so technical that few members of the subcommittee even understand what the language means and they do not know the legal result of the language after they pass it into the bill. The time was when a large proportion of the membership passed on appropriations, but now these six Members, the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, consider and approve the bill, prepared by departments, and they bring it in here hurriedly, they debate it hurriedly, and they read it hurriedly under the 5-minute rule, and few of us ever have time to compare these bills with previous bills, and to read the hearings and see where the camouflaged items are that the departments have placed in the bills so that even the subcommittee has not been able to digest them.

I have made it a part of my duty since I have been a Member of this Congress, for 13 years, just as soon as the hearings are printed on a supply bill, to take them to my office and study same, and to take the bill and compare it with previous bills and try to find out what new items are being placed in the bill, as a charge on the exchequer of the people.

I have tried to find out what legislative items are placed in the bills, and our departments are continually trying to legislate. That is nothing new to the membership. They are continually encroaching on the legislative powers of the legislative committees of the House, and that ought to be stopped. The Members who want to do it ought to be given time to look into these bills and scrutinize them carefully.

In a day or two our friend, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], I take it, in response to the President's message, is going to come in here with a bill asking this Congress to turn over to the President and his Cabinet \$150,000,000 for the President and his Cabinet to spend without any direction, without any limitation, without the membership of this House knowing anything about how it is going to be spent, when it is going to be spent, where it is going to be spent, or for what purpose. I am in favor of relieving this present situation. I am in favor of voting every dollar that is necessary. I am one of those who, when the distinguished gentleman from Indiana brings that bill onto the floor, want him to tell every Member of the House what the money is going to be spent for, who is going to spend it, and where the money is finally going to land, and if he feels now as he did in January, 1919, he is going to require that to be done himself. It will be amusing for me to read to you a little passage from the speech of the gentleman from Indiana, whom we all love and respect, and whom, as I say, I used to follow sometimes on questions of economy.

He made a speech on January 13, 1919, when we had a similar proposition before this House, a proposition to turn over then \$100,000,000 without strings to it to the same man who is now asking for it—President Hoover. Let us see how he felt about it then; let us see whether he was then in favor of lump-sum appropriations, and whether he was in favor of turning it over without any strings, without an understanding. I read now from page 1353 of the RECORD of January 13, 1919:

Mr. Wood of Indiana. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I voted against this measure, and nothing has occurred since it was reported to the House to change my opinion. * * * But it occurs to me that we should reach a point presently where we should distribute our charity with some degree of intelligence and where we have some idea as to the character of program that is to be pursued in its distribution. * * *

There is no information in these hearings with reference to the extent of that suffering or where we should commence or the

amount we should distribute here or there or yonder. All of that, we are told, must be left to the discretion of this newly organized body. * * *

Where does it come from? It comes, if you please, from a new organization that has been formed within a month; and who is at the head of the organization? Mr. Hoover. It is Mr. Hoover that is asking for this appropriation and not the President of the United States. * * *

Now, then, gentlemen may differ with me with reference to Mr. Hoover.

I want you gentlemen now to listen further to what the distinguished chairman of this committee [Mr. Wood] said—a man who has spent years here watching the Treasury of the United States, a man whom many of us have followed on questions of economy, a man with good judgment, a man who is stable, a man who is not swept away hither and yon by this wind or that. Here is what he then said:

Now, then, gentlemen may differ with me with reference to Mr. Hoover. I think that Mr. Hoover is the most expensive luxury that was ever fastened upon this country.

Mind you, that comes from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. Wood], but he did not stop there. He said:

I think that he will continue to be the most expensive luxury with which we have to do if we still continue to give him unlimited power.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Wood, when he asks for the \$150,000,000, will require the President, who he says is the most expensive luxury the country has ever had, and who he says will continue to be the most expensive luxury, to show us just exactly where and how he is going to spend the \$150,000,000.

I hope he will come up and toe the line and show us exactly where he is going to spend the \$150,000,000; and when he does that I will vote for it. But I am not going to vote for it if he does not. I am not going to vote to turn that much money over to any man thus spoken of by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood].

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. Does the gentleman know what the people of the country think about that?

Mr. BLANTON. The country has already passed upon that question. It did so last November. Mr. Wood was the campaign leader for the administration. They were following Mr. Wood, and they took its estimate from the gentleman. I am sure the gentleman from Indiana does not often forget what he says. What he said was so important that we remember it.

Now, we get back to the question of legislation on an appropriation bill. I contend that we should make these departments come in and discuss and explain the specific appropriations and state in detail the amounts which they need. We shall continue to increase expenditures until we get back to specific appropriations.

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

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 14246) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, reported that that committee had come to no resolution thereon.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 305

Resolved, That an additional appropriation of \$2,000 be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers ordered by special committee, authorized by House Resolu-

tion 191, to inquire into the official conduct of Harry B. Anderson, United States district judge for the western district of Tennessee, be made available for the use of said special committee.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On line 1 strike out "\$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000."

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

MARY YOUKER

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I submit another privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 304

Resolved, That there shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Mary Youker, widow of George W. Youker, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to six months' compensation and an additional amount, not exceeding \$250, to defray funeral expenses and last illness of the said George W. Youker.

Mr. GARNER. Was this a unanimous report from the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

TEMPORARY JANITOR, HOUSE DOCUMENT ROOM

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I submit another privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 307

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the House compensation at the rate of \$1,440 per annum, payable monthly, for the services of a temporary janitor in the House document room, to be appointed by the Doorkeeper of the House. The compensation and employment hereby authorized shall start from December 1, 1930, and terminate March 31, 1931.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman for one question.

Mr. PATTERSON. This was not a unanimous report. I want to make a little statement about this. All the members of the committee have agreed that the resolution was correct, but some thought that this was not the proper time to consider it. We are to pass a resolution here to employ a man temporarily as a janitor and put him in a place while there is another man in the same place. I am opposed to that kind of a policy. Many irregularities can be expected if we are to go on and pass such resolutions. When some fellow gets old and we have no particular system of retirement and no system of adjusting these things, and we say "We are just going to employ another man at \$120 a month to do that work" when we are already paying a man \$105 a month to do it, and he has been paid that for years and years, and we are still paying him that, and planning to continue it, I am opposed to such a measure.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I will not call for a record vote on it if the gentleman from New Jersey will promise me that this entire matter will be taken up and investigated.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. The Committee on Accounts has resolved to do that, and it will be taken up forthwith.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BELL for two weeks on account of important business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on December 2, 1930, present to the President for his approval bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 736. An act to authorize the cession to the city of New York of land on the northerly side of New Dorp Lane in exchange for permission to connect Miller Field with the said city's public sewer system;

H. R. 9267. An act for the relief of John A. Fay;

H. R. 10387. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the city of Denver, Colo., the ship's bell, plaque, war record, name plate, and silver service of the cruiser *Denver* that is now or may be in his custody;

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution 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"; and

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the United States-Massachusetts Bay Colony Tercentenary Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 4, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, December 4, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.

Agriculture Department appropriation bill.

State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Departments appropriation bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows: 652. A letter from the Postmaster General of the United States, transmitting the cost ascertainment report for the fiscal year 1930; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

653. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting statement of the expenditures under appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

654. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting accompanying statement of the fiscal affairs of all Indian tribes for whose benefit expenditures from public or tribal funds were made during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

655. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report to Congress as to the desirability and practicability of establishing a national park, to be known as the Tropic Everglades National Park, in the everglades of Dade, Monroe, and Collier Counties of the State of Florida (H. Doc. No. 654); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 14246. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post

Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2068). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Accounts. H. Res. 304. A resolution to pay Mary Youker, widow of George W. Youker, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to six months' compensation and an additional amount, not exceeding \$250, to defray funeral expenses of the said George W. Youker; without amendment (Rept. No. 2069). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Accounts. H. Res. 305. A resolution to provide an appropriation to inquire into the official conduct of Harry B. Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2070). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Accounts. H. Res. 307. A resolution relating to payment of compensation for services of a temporary janitor in the House document room; without amendment (Rept. No. 2071). Ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of the Rule XXII the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13543) to authorize the payment of the sum of \$2,500 to the dependents of the officers and men who lost their lives on the submarines S-4 and S-51, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 14246) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 14247) to increase the efficiency of the Veterinary Corps of the Regular Army; to the committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 14248) to provide for the disposition of asphalt, gilsonite, elaterite, and other like substances on the public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14249) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes,' approved June 24, 1930, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14250) to provide for the compromise and settlement of claims held by the United States of America arising under the provisions of section 210 of the transportation act, 1920, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 14251) providing for a 40-hour week for Federal employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 14252) for the naming of an avenue in the District of Columbia in honor of the State of California; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 14253) authorizing an appropriation of \$5,000,000 to the State of Arkansas to be expended on rural and post roads to relieve the drought situation of 1930; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14254) to stabilize conditions in areas gravely affected by drought in year 1930; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 14255) to expedite the construction of public buildings and works outside of the District of Columbia by enabling possession and title of sites to be taken in advance of final judgment in proceedings for

the acquisition thereof under the power of eminent domain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 14256) to amend the filled milk act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14257) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell the Morton nursery site, in the county of Cherry, State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONTET: A bill (H. R. 14258) to establish terms of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana at New Iberia, La.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14259) to provide for advancing to drought-stricken States funds for highway construction; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14260) to provide for the employment and compensation of agents to carry on agricultural extension work in counties affected by drought; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOLFENDEN: A bill (H. R. 14261) to remodel with colonial design the present post-office building at Phoenixville, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 14262) to amend section 2 of Public Resolution No. 89, Seventy-first Congress, approved June 17, 1930, entitled "Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the siege of Yorktown, Va., and the surrender of Lord Cornwallis on October 19, 1781, and authorizing an appropriation to be used in connection with such celebration, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14263) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to lend War Department and Navy Department equipment and other supplies for the use of the United States Yorktown Sesquicentennial Commission at the celebration in October, 1931; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14264) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Warren, in the State of Ohio, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a dam across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio," approved September 22, 1922; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAIL (by request): A bill (H. R. 14265) to extend certain letters patent to the heir of Oscar Morath; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HILL of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 14266) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to lend to the Governor of Alabama 250 pyramidal tents, complete; fifteen 16 by 80 by 40 foot assembly tents; thirty by 50 by 15 foot hospital-ward tents; 10,000 blankets, olive drab, No. 4; 5,000 pillowcases; 5,000 canvas cots; 5,000 cotton pillows; 5,000 bed sacks; 10,000 bed sheets; 20 field ranges, No. 1; 10 field bake ovens; 50 water bags (for ice water); to be used at the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Montgomery, Ala., in June, 1931; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 14267) to amend the act providing for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD: A bill (H. R. 14268) to extend hospital and home facilities to veterans of the Confederate Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 14269) to amend section 11 (a) of the merchant marine act, 1928, Public No. 453, Seventieth Congress; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CULLEN: A bill (H. R. 14270) to amend the act of March 4, 1911 (ch. 239, 36 Stat. L. 1267), as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 14271) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and manufacture a medal in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown, Va., and of the establishment of the independence of

the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 14272) to empower the Government to write into the specifications and contracts the compensation to be paid to laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public works of the United States and of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 14273) to provide for a memorial to William H. Seward for his distinguished services; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 14274) granting a pension to widows and dependent children of World War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GLOVER: A bill (H. R. 14275) to regulate the prescribing and use of waters from the Hot Springs Reservation at Hot Springs, Ark., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 14276) to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Dayton-Decatur Road between Rhea and Meigs Counties, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SELVIG: A bill (H. R. 14277) to stabilize the price of wheat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 14278) to authorize the donation of obsolete Army rifles and accessories to organizations of war veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRUNNER: A bill (H. R. 14279) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act so that adjusted-compensation certificates will be paid off in three years in quarterly installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 14280) to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to expedite work on the Federal building program authorized by the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, and acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KENDALL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14281) for the construction of the proposed new lock and Dam No. 4, Monongahela River, at its present proposed location; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 410) to suspend for a period of five years general immigration into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 411) for the relief of farmers in the drought-stricken areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONNERY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 412) to require that public contracts provide for employment of resident laborers and mechanics and for payment of highest prevailing wages; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ERK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 413) designating the first United States narcotic farm to be established near Lexington, Ky., as the Stephen G. Porter Institute; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 414) to require the public contracts provide for employment of resident laborers and mechanics and for payment of highest prevailing rate of wages; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BLOOM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 416) to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the expenses of participation by the United States in the International Exposition of Colonial and Overseas Countries to be held at Paris, France, in 1931; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SELVIG: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 417) authorizing an appropriation for loans for seed, fuel oil, and feed for farmers in the storm-stricken areas of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: Resolution (H. Res. 309) to authorize an investigation of the methods of Chinese immigration to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHITE: Resolution (H. Res. 310) relative to broadcasting stations since February 23, 1927; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 14282) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Turbeville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOLTON: A bill (H. R. 14283) granting a pension to Eliza A. Humiston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14284) granting an increase of pension to Serepta O. Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14285) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Cozier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14286) granting an increase of pension to Louisa P. Moon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14287) granting an increase of pension to Anna Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14288) granting an increase of pension to Tabitha Alkire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14289) granting an increase of pension to Sarepta Short; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14290) granting an increase of pension to Josephine L. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14291) granting an increase of pension to Millie A. Washington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14292) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Stokes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14293) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Weigel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14294) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Marion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14295) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Tracy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14296) granting an increase of pension to Catherine March; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14297) granting an increase of pension to Bethana W. Glaze; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14298) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14299) granting an increase of pension to Catharine M. Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14300) granting an increase of pension to Flora Willhide; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14301) granting an increase of pension to Deborah Fent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14302) granting an increase of pension to Emma D. Eagleston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14303) granting a pension to Stella E. Moody; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14304) granting an increase of pension to Lavina M. Leaverton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14305) granting an increase of pension to Hattie A. Lemen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14306) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Null; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14307) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14308) granting an increase of pension to Kate J. Lafferty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14309) granting an increase of pension to Talitha Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14310) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Diltz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14311) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 14312) granting an increase of pension to Loretta G. Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of California: A bill (H. R. 14313) for the relief of Harvey M. Hunter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 14314) for the relief of Walter Crowley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARKE of New York: A bill (H. R. 14315) granting a pension to Grace A. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 14316) for the relief of Fitzhugh Robinson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOKE: A bill (H. R. 14317) granting a pension to Victoria I. Gates; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14318) granting a pension to William Hansen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14319) granting an increase of pension to Harry E. Panghorn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 14320) granting a pension to James P. Frederickson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14321) granting a pension to Joseph A. Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14322) for the relief of Walter Prince Keene; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14323) for the relief of John McBirney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14324) granting an increase of pension to Belle C. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 14325) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Freestone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14326) granting an increase of pension to Harriett L. Moon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14327) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14328) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Person; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14329) granting a pension to Eliza Utter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRIVER: A bill (H. R. 14330) for the relief of Maj. L. D. Worsham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 14331) for the relief of E. Grant Stuart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14332) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to determine the claim of Madelena Carattini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 14333) for the relief of Martin T. Leafly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 14334) granting an increase of pension to Addie J. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14335) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Beckwith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14336) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Pickard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14337) granting an increase of pension to Josephine A. Lothrop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14338) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14339) for the relief of the Metropolitan Camp Goods Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 14340) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Humes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14341) granting an increase of pension to Sophie H. Penn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14342) granting an increase of pension to Marian E. Champlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 14343) for the relief of John Young Gooch, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 14344) granting a pension to Amanda M. Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14345) granting a pension to Ruth P. Kerns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14346) granting a pension to Mae M. Hobson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14347) granting an increase of pension to Priscilla Ann Craine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14348) granting a pension to Emma Zane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14349) granting an increase of pension to William James Eaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14350) granting an increase of pension to Anna C. Eldridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 14351) granting a pension to Julia Mulkey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 14352) granting a pension to Kathryn Abernethy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 14353) granting an increase of pension to Hattie M. Robbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14354) granting an increase of pension to Revitha A. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14355) granting a pension to William M. Chevront; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 14356) granting a pension to Priscilla Jane Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 14357) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 14358) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14359) for the relief of Earl I. Brown, colonel, Corps of Engineers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14360) for the relief of Lieut. M. A. Sprengel, Supply Corps, United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14361) to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian employees of the naval operating base, Hampton Roads, Va., for the value of tools lost in a fire on Pier No. 7, at the naval operating base on May 4, 1930; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 14362) granting a pension to Chester Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14363) granting a pension to Ernest Stapleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14364) granting an increase of pension to Missouri F. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 14365) granting an increase of pension to Susan Ashley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14366) granting a pension to Lizzie Downing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 14367) for the relief of Henry James Pape; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 14368) granting a pension to Dicey Terry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14369) granting a pension to Louise Workman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14370) granting a pension to Carrie Stidham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14371) granting an increase of pension to Nettie Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14372) granting a pension to Roda Markwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 14373) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Carson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 14374) granting an increase of pension to Martha R. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14375) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Tillinghast; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14376) granting a pension to Gladys Sanford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14377) for the relief of Walter S. West; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14378) for the relief of John Leonard; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14379) for the relief of Walter E. Bassett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 14380) granting a pension to Creed C. Polston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14381) granting a pension to Jennie Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14382) granting a pension to Rachel Elizabeth Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14383) for the relief of Julia A. Reid; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 14384) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Britton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 14385) granting an increase of pension to Clara E. Seaward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 14386) granting a pension to William James; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARCOURT J. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 14387) granting a pension to Emily D. B. Pharmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 14388) for the relief of Moses Flowers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 14389) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Frakes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14390) granting an increase of pension to Eunice T. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14391) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Dowdell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14392) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14393) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie E. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14394) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Yearwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14395) granting a pension to Harry D. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14396) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Bucklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14397) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Conrad; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14398) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Pace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14399) granting an increase of pension to Zetta Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14400) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14401) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Grubb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14402) granting an increase of pension to Amanda A. Sibrel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14403) granting an increase of pension to Jane Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 14404) granting a pension to Thomas Grimsley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICH: A bill (H. R. 14405) granting a pension to Michael Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 14406) granting a pension to Allie Henkel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14407) granting an increase of pension to William A. Blades; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 14408) granting a pension to James B. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14409) granting a pension to Jane Wood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 14410) granting an increase of pension to Helen L. Madden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14411) granting an increase of pension to Mary Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14412) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELVIG: A bill (H. R. 14413) granting a pension to Emma L. Marheine; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 14414) for the relief of Seymour Fairchild; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 14415) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Laning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14416) granting an increase of pension to Cora O. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14417) granting an increase of pension to Alice T. Downs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14418) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. Franks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14419) granting an increase of pension to Maria Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14420) granting an increase of pension to Mary Schutte; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOBBS: A bill (H. R. 14421) granting an increase of pension to Nellie M. Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14422) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Burke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14423) granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Darling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14424) granting an increase of pension to Susan L. Dean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 14425) for the relief of Erik Nylen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 14426) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Tansey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14427) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Personett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 14428) to authorize the appointment of Chester Lawrence Fordney as a captain in the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WATRES: A bill (H. R. 14429) for the relief of Daniel Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITLEY: A bill (H. R. 14430) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Schuey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14431) granting an increase of pension to Ella Budd White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14432) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14433) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14434) granting an increase of pension to Phebe Janet Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 14435) granting a pension to Julia Pitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14436) for the relief of William C. Ross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFENDEN: A bill (H. R. 14437) for the relief of Edward P. O'Neal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14438) for the relief of Laura Mae Kurtz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CELLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 415) for the relief of Bernt Balchen, a member of the Byrd Antarctic expedition; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

7756. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution adopted by the American Federation of Labor, at its convention held in Boston, Mass., October 6 to 17, 1930, favoring the maintenance of efficiently manned navy yards and arsenals to produce adequate national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

7757. By Mr. BRUMM: Petition of evidence in support of House bill 14104, granting a pension to Sarah E. Derr; also, House bill 14105, granting a pension to Anna Stutzman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7758. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of approximately 500 citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., favoring the immediate enactment of legislation which will result in the outstanding adjusted-compensation certificates being paid in cash at their face value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7759. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petitions signed by Georgia M. Canty and three other residents of the seventh district of Michigan, urging favorable action on House bill 7884, a bill for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7760. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of American Federation of Labor, favoring maintenance of efficiently manned navy yards and arsenals for adequate national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7761. Also, petition of Women's Committee for Repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, urging that the people be given the right to determine the question of retaining or repealing the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7762. Also, petition of Retail Dry Goods Association of New York City, urging that Congress reject the proposal of Postmaster General Brown to increase the rate of postage for first-class mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7763. By Mr. EATON of Colorado: Petition of 20 citizens of Denver, Colo., urging the passage of legislation looking to immediate payment of soldiers' adjusted-compensation certificates in cash (H. R. 3493); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7764. Also, resolution signed by the president and five members of the board of directors of the Board of County Commissioners of La Plata County, Durango, Colo., urging passage of Senate Resolution 282 to secure an appropriation for use on highways in Ute Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

7765. By Mr. FISHER: Petition of citizens of Memphis, Tenn., urging the passage of House bills 162 and 6603; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7766. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of certain citizens of the eighth congressional district of Oklahoma, urging enactment of legislation providing for cash payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7767. By Mr. GLOVER: Petition of citizens of England, Ark., urging drought-relief legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7768. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the common council of the city of Buffalo, relative to the restoration of excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7769. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Al Grosz, Accepted Modes (Inc.), New York City, opposing increased postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7770. Also, petition of the American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C., favoring maintenance of efficiently manned navy yards and arsenals for adequate national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

7771. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolutions of the American Federation of Labor, favoring manufacture of war munitions and naval vessels in arsenals and navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

7772. By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition urging the passage of the Vestal copyright bill, H. R. 12549, signed by Alfred R. Bradford and 53 other citizens of Dubuque, Dubuque County, Iowa; to the Committee on Patents.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1930

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 3, 1930)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

CARTER GLASS, a Senator from the State of Virginia; HARRY B. HAWES, a Senator from the State of Missouri; and JOSEPH E. RANSELL, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, appeared in their seats to-day.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I send to the desk the following order, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the following Senators be assigned to membership on the following committees:

Mr. CAREY: To the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Civil Service, the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DAVIS: To the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Civil Service, the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, the Committee on Manufactures, and the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MORROW: To the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the Committee on Printing, and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the order may be entered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas and by unanimous consent it was—

Ordered, That the membership of the Committees on Banking and Currency, Commerce, Education and Labor, Manufactures, Post Offices and Post Roads, and Privileges and Elections be increased by one each for the minority and that one each of the membership on the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs heretofore assigned to the majority be transferred to the minority.

That Mr. BRATTON be excused from further service on the Committee on Pensions.

That the following Senators be assigned to membership on the following committees:

Mr. MCGILL: To the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on Pensions, and the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BULKLEY: To the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Manufactures, and the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. WILLIAMSON: To the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Education and Labor, and the Committee on Military Affairs.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES

Sundry messages from the President of the United States making nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmit-