1936, urging the establishment of a Federal housing agency and appropriation of necessary funds to enable such agency to aid local public housing agencies to develop low-rent housing programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10935. By Mr. DARROW: Memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, opposing Senate bill 4174, authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve or disapprove the consolidation or abandonment of carrier facilities of public service, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10936. By Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts: Resolution by the board of aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass., opposing admission to the United States of former President Calles of the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10937. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Memorial of J. Webb Howell, chairman, agricultural committee, and Hon. W. S. Barron, chairman, legislative committee, Bryan-Brazos County Chamber of Commerce, Bryan, Tex., favoring House bill 12496; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10938. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of the Boonville (Ind.) Press Club to Members of Congress, urging that recognition be given the work of Hon. William Fortune in connection with the George Rogers Clark Memorial by the placing of a tablet inscribed with his name and his accomplishments in this cause in the memorial building at Vincennes, Ind.; to the Committee on the Library.

10939. By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of the Minnesota State Conservation Commission, urging the designation of Birch Comfort Park in Minneapolis as a state memorial cemetery; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

10940. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of Lodge No. 717, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, favoring the passage of House bill 11508; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10941. By Mr. DeROUEN: Petition of the Church of the Brethren, Roanoke, La., adopted at their 1935 annual conference, regarding war; to the Committee on Finance.

10942. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the Detroit Community Fund and board of directors of the Detroit Council of Social Agencies, suggesting a long-time relief program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10943. Also, petition of the Detroit Housing Commission, Detroit, Mich., endorsing the Wagner bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10944. Also, petition of the Wayne County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Detroit, Mich., protesting against the ruling of the Works Progress Administration perpetrated on veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10945. By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of the Utopia Society of America, requesting Congress to institute an official investigation of the activities of the American Ambassador, Jefferson Caffery, for his lack of protection of the rights of American citizens in Cuba, and for his suppression of the real facts on Cuba; for his support of the bloody Fascist regime of Sergeant Batista; and demand the immediate freedom of thousands of political and social prisoners who are being held in Cuban dungeons; and demand the immediate recall of Jefferson Caffery as Ambassador to Cuba, and substitute a real representative of the American people as his successor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10946. Also, petition of the Central Labor Council of Allegheny County, denouncing the action of officials of the United States Bureau of Reclamation who have required workmen to dry drill in seven silica rock tunnels located near Kenneth, Calif., thereby knowingly exposing these citizen workmen to the identical dust hazards of disease and of death that took its deadly toll in the Oakley Bridge, W. Va., tunnel; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10947. By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the permanency of the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10948. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachu­setts, relative to affording the privilege of entry into this country to those persons who are being persecuted and discriminated against in Germany; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

10949. By Mr. TREWDAY: Resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the permanency of the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10950. Also, resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts, relative to the entry into this country of certain persons from Germany; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 22, 1936

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

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

Merciful Father, invisible and yet the Eternal One, Thou art everywhere save in the hearts of Thy wicked children. Thou art in the majesty of the heavens and in the wide-spreading earth, in the beauty of the flower, in the radiance of the sun, and in the mellow light of the stars; may these things cause us to think of thinking and living. Teach us to be conscious of Thy nearness, and so may we never be afraid. We pray that we may greet this new day with newness of joy. Help us to fill these hours with wise thoughts and generous deeds, and thus make human life a little stronger, sweeter, and richer. Inspire us to be brave and earnest to seize the opportunities of these passing days. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11741. An act extending the time for making the report of the Commission to study the subject of Hernando De Soto's Expedition.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8455. An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

MEMORIAL TO OFFICERS OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. Res. 430) authorizing the erection in the Department of Labor Building of a memorial to the officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and Immigration and Border Patrol who, while on active duty, lost their lives under heroic or tragic circumstances, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Lines 3 and 4, strike out "Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital" and insert "Director of the National Park Service."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to proceed for 5 minutes to deny a malicious falsehood that the Washing­ton Post printed about me this morning, stating that I am unfriendly to the President of the United States, when I am as good a friend to the President as he has in this House.

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

There was no objection.
Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact well known to the Members of this House that the newspapers of Washington deliberately and maliciously play me up daily in a false light, simply because I am chairman of the subcommittee handling the District of Columbia appropriation bill and have refused to give them a $5,700,000 contribution out of the United States Treasury. They are trying deliberately and mendaciously to put me out of Congress; but they cannot do it, as my constituents want me here.

Mr. Speaker, there is no man in this House more friendly to the President of the United States than I am. I was against the Wagner bill and against the Guffey bill, but that does not interfere with my friendly relations with the President. I may not always agree with the President, but I am his friend.

This was a malicious lie that the Post printed about me this morning. It is mad because I am one of those who will not give in to the Senate on all of the 87 amendments they have put on the House bill.

In order to get a bill and not deprive the District of Columbia of some new projects badly needed to which it is entitled, and which projects we gave to the District in the House bill, our House conferees yesterday, as a last resort, proposed to the Senate that if they would recede on just 3 of their 87 amendments the House conferees would recede on the other 84 Senate amendments. That was more than fair, as the Senate does not want a bill; its conferences, as usual, are trying to bulldoze the House, and we are not going to give in to the Senate on matters of fundamental principle any more. The Senate conferees and the Washington newspapers prate much about carrying out the President’s Budget. If we held them to that there would be no Eastern High School, no Chain Bridge, no needed fire trucks, and no new police-court building, as none of them are in the President’s Budget. They are not sincere in that foolish contention.

Mr. Speaker, on the other question of character education and communism in the schools, the House having refused to give another $78,660 to be wasted and misspent by Dr. Ballou, and the Senate wants to waste this $78,660, I already have the permission of the House, and there is printed in the Record a carefully prepared speech with much information on that subject.

I hope those interested will look on pages 6551-6552, where they will find ample evidence for keeping this $78,660 out of the appropriation bill and for keeping communism out of the District school curriculum. Communism is something that ought not to be there. My colleagues will find ample reason for voting against the “sissy” bill next Monday, and for not repealing the law that stops communism in the schools.

Character is formed in the home under the direction of the mother and father, and not in a public school under the direction of teachers, and this Washington Post and these other Washington newspapers ought to quit lying about me because I am upholding the rights of the House of Representatives on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

I ask every person who has access to the Congressional Record, and who may read my remarks, to turn back to page 6551 and read my speech printed in the Record, and they will then understand fully all the facts about the “red rider” and the “sissy” bill, which seeks to repeal it.

A DISTINGUISHED PHYSICIAN OF YORK, PA.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, 51 years ago in my district a young practicing physician, just 50 weeks out of school, administered the first oxygen gas ever administered to a human being. This is one of the great contributions to human welfare.

This gentleman is 74 years old today, and in the city of York distinguished citizens from far and near have gathered to pay tribute to this fine man. Without taking the further time of the House, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in response to a request on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Congress to award a Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. George E. Holtzapple, of York, Pa., for his great contribution to medical science and humanity.

On March 6, 1888, Dr. Holtzapple was called to the bedside of a Mr. Fred Gable, residing in Loganville, York County, Pa., who was suffering with pneumonia. He found the man nearing death from the ravages of this disease after all known methods had failed to help. Dr. Holtzapple, then only in his fifty-first week as a practicing physician, returned to his office, where he gathered together chemicals, test tubes, and a blow torch, and equipment to produce oxygen. Returning to the bedside of the victim, and with the help of Mrs. Gable, he produced the oxygen, and in 30 minutes the patient showed improvement and later recovered entirely.

As a recognition for his work there is now placed in the Army Medical Museum a sketch depicting the birth of oxygen treatment for pneumonia sufferers. The story of Dr. Holtzapple's introduction of the oxygen treatment is a tale of triumph by perseverance, science, and confidence over the ill mankind.

It seems to me to be most fitting that the Congress should award such a medal during the lifetime of this great man.

Dr. Holtzapple was born in York County, Pa., on May 22, 1832. His ancestry goes back to the Revolutionary days. His father, a poor man, was first a shoemaker—when shoes were made by hand—and later a farmer.

He attended schools of his birthplace, graduating from the York Collegiate Institute. He took a course in philosophy at Lebanon Valley College, located in Annville, Pa. He was given a degree, doctor of science, by the Susquehanna University in 1856, as a special honor.

Dr. Holtzapple took his medical course at Bellevue Hospital Medical College in New York City, from which he was graduated in 1884 with the degree of doctor of medicine. Later he took post-graduate courses at Johns Hopkins Medical School, Baltimore, Md., and the New York Post-Graduate Medical School and Hospital. The first 16 years of his medical career were devoted to general practice. Since then his work has been confined to internal medicine. He has been given testimonial dinners by members of his profession in recognition of his services and contributions. He is connected with the University of Pennsylvania and the Army Medical Museum, and for 24 years has lectured to nurses in training. He is former president of the York County Medical Society and is a member of both the American Medical Association and the American College of Physicians.

For many years he has occupied a prominent place in the American Association for the Advancement of Science. During the World War he was the first physician to offer his services, so far as the section of our community is concerned, but could not meet the physical requirements and consequently was rejected. However, that did not stop him. He rendered great services at home; was chairman of the medical advisory board and was a member of almost every local committee. He was director in the York County Chapter, American Red Cross and chairman of the first-aid courses. This fine gentleman deserves all the honor that his generation can bestow upon him, while he lives.

As his Representative and at the direction of a great host of his constituents, I appeal to the Congress for the Medal of Honor, feeling that this fine gentleman richly deserves it.

My bill, H. R. 5762, was before the House on the Private Calendar, but was objected to by two Members on the minority side, but my understanding is that these objectors wanted an opportunity to make further study of the bill. I have again appealed to the Committee on the Library, asking that this bill be included in its omnibus bill so that the House may again have an opportunity to pay tribute to one of
America's great contributors to human welfare. The Committee on the Library submitted the following report to accompany the bill.

This is a bill to authorize the President to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Dr. George E. Holtzapple, York, Pa., who on March 6, 1885, administered oxygen in the treatment of pneumonia, thereby saving the life of a human being and blunting the trail of one of the greatest achievements in medical science.

On March 6, 1885, Dr. Holtzapple was called to the bedside of a Mr. Fred Gable, then residing in Loganville, York County, Pa., who was ill with pneumonia. He returned to the man nearest from the ravages of this disease. After all known methods had failed to help, Dr. Holtzapple, then only in his fifty-first week of life, returned to the bedside of the patient and administered oxygen by the new method of treatment for pneumonia, as he had been taught by Edgar Erskine Hume, major, Medical Corps, United States Army, librarian, at the Library of Congress.

As a recognition for this work there is now placed in the Army Medical Museum a sketch depicting the birth of oxygen treatment for pneumonia sufferers as a lasting memento for his work. Edgar Erskine Hume, major, Medical Corps, United States Army librarian, at the Library of Congress, acknowledged this sketch in the following letter:

"It is to be regretted that our Government has no other or similar award which can be made in recognition of the achievements of men like Dr. Holtzapple. We can reward bravery and distinguished service in the Army and in other parts of the Government service, but pure scientific merit goes unrecognized by the United States Government, although appreciated by his fellow men. If we only had a medal for distinguishing achievements in medical science, one might be appropriately awarded to Dr. Holtzapple."

The following is a summary of my own statement to the Committee when I appeared before them asking them to report favorably my bill:

Some years ago Dr. Holtzapple wrote to the American Medical Association to find out if anyone had a claim prior to his in administering treatment for pneumonia. The Association informed him that, according to its records, which go back to a period preceding 1888, there had been a number of cases in which oxygen was administered in the treatment of pneumonia in the first published series of the library catalog, published in 1888. The first edition of the catalog contained some little time, as in this series they are not classified under the title of treatment. 1888, the second edition includes approximately the years 1888 to 1906. I think, therefore, that you can safely claim priority in your publication, at least, of information regarding this method of treatment for pneumonia.

In 1932 the Associated Press released a story of the incident that was published throughout the entire Nation, which statement was never challenged or denied. On July 14, 1932, the National Broadcasting Co. enacted a scene over the radio, and the audience at the CBS studios in New York, and in other points of the country, heard the story of Mr. Gable and Dr. Holtzapple. The broadcast from coast to coast was not challenged or denied. Dr. Holtzapple also has been the subject of the report of the Special Committee of September 18, 1887, aroused the medical world, which led to a long series, extending to the present time, of articles by other scientists.

The script of the National Broadcasting Co.'s coast-to-coast broadcast will also be deposited in the medical library here in Washington to be a part of the record.

My colleagues, I believe that this Congress should approve awarding the medal of honor to this fine gentleman in recognition of his great contribution to humanity while he lives, and I further believe that the evidence submitted after careful review will justify this action. Certainly we can give no less to those who have contributed so much to human welfare than the personal recognition that is ensured by the award of this medal.
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this kind to come in here this session of Congress. It is surely the beginning of Democratic inflation, and I warn the Members of the House to beware. [Laughter and applause.]

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the issuance of the charter to the city of Lynchburg, Va., there shall be coined at a mint of the United States to be designated by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 20,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition and of a special appropriate single design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, but the United States shall not be subject to the expenses of making the necessary dies and other preparations for this coinage.

Sec. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear the date 1936, irrespective of year in which they are minted or issued, shall be legal tender in any payment to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of the Lynchburg Sesqui-Centennial Association upon payment by it of the par value of such coins, but not less than 5,000 such coins shall be issued to it at any one time, and no such coins shall be issued after the expiration of 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by such association, and the net proceeds shall be used by it in defraying the expenses incidental and appropriate to the commemoration of such event.

Sec. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the process of coinage, providing for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for the security of the coins, or for any other purpose, and all such laws are preserved, or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE INDIANA HARBOR SHIP CANAL AND THE GRAND CALUMET AND LITTLE CALUMET RIVERS.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to take this opportunity to address the Members of the House for a few minutes to explain a situation which exists in my district—the First Congressional District of Indiana—with regard to efforts I have made to obtain Federal funds for deepening, widening, and improving the Indiana Harbor Ship Canal and the Grand Calumet and Little Calumet Rivers.

The district is located on the southern shores of Lake Michigan. It has a population of approximately 300,000 persons. The district is highly industrial, with industries so diversified that practically every commodity used by mankind is manufactured in Lake County, Ind. Because of the many different industries the region has often been referred to as "the workshop of America."

It was my pleasure the other day to read an item in a newspaper which stated that the steel mills of East Chicago and Gary had passed Pittsburgh in the production of steel during the last 6 months' period. This is a good sign, and news of this character is welcomed by the people of my district and the people of the Chicago area. When production is stepped up in the steel mills of East Chicago, Indiana Harbor, and Gary, not to mention the various other industries in Hammond, Whiting, and other cities, times are good, business is brisk, and my people are content.

As I mentioned before, efforts have been made to secure an appropriation to improve the Indiana Harbor Ship Canal along with the Grand Calumet and Little Calumet Rivers. However, efforts to secure sufficient funds have been to no avail due to the fact that the United States Army Engineers will not approve improvements deemed necessary to keep pace with the growth and progress of my district. At this time I would like to compliment all officials and citizens who have aided in their efforts to secure funds which would allow us to carry on the work that we need desperately to the welfare of the people of my district.

Now the point I am trying to make is this. If the Army engineers would cooperate with us and see the necessity of such improvement, there is no question but that the improvement would be such a boom to industry and commerce that within the next decade the population of my district would exceed a half million people. It has been pointed out to the Army Engineers that even now, with the crowded condition of the ship canal, there is more tonnage going in and out of the canal than from a great many bigger and larger ports of the United States where the Government has not spent millions of dollars widening, deepening, and dredging the Alleghany, Monongahela, the Ohio, and Hudson Rivers. I am sure that the need for expenditure of an appropriation to make the improvements in my district is as dire as when Members of this Congress voted to make improvements of the above-mentioned rivers. I feel that since the Government allowed such improvements to be made in other parts of the country that the people of my district should be granted the same concessions, and that the Members of this body should, when the time comes, approve such a measure, since there was no objection to the other grants being made.

Since the building of the canal in 1903, location of various industries has increased, with the result that a great many dollars of money have been spent by industry in the building of plants and docks. It should be obvious that these industries would have to have come to this area if it were not possible to obtain water transportation, and with the vision to the future, that needed improvements would be made, and increased water service would be made available as time and progress permitted.

As it is today, a great many industries have been lost to my district because of the fact that this Government will not appropriate needed funds to carry on the work of deepening and widening the ship canal and the two rivers. I feel that now is the time I would like to have cooperation of the Members of the House in connection with a bill authorizing this Government to proceed with the work that we in the Middle West deem is necessary.

Improvement of this project will not only bring industries to this region but will give employment to thousands of persons now idle. Situated as this region is in close proximity to the Indiana coal fields, the rich Mesabi ore ranges of Minnesota, there is every reason to believe this improvement would not only enhance the commerce of the Calumet region but the entire Middle West.

No doubt there may be some opposition to this improvement from some of the transportation systems owing to the fact they will say it will eliminate the long haul by a number of the railroads. However, this will more than offset the increased number of men that will, of necessity, be employed on switch engines to switch the cars in and out of the industries in the hauling of raw materials and the finished products.

The march of time and the wheels of progress demand that this Government appropriate sufficient funds to make this improvement now. It is necessary, and the people of my district are demanding it. They want action. Officials of the cities and civic organizations approve of these plans and are demanding that this Government allow us to keep pace with the trend of business improvements, and the signs of prosperity which are seen on every hand. To make this improvement now will allow the great Middle West to enjoy an expansion, which is so necessary to the welfare of my district, and a prosperity never before realized within the Calumet region, the hub of all activity in the Middle West.

The people of the Middle West demand that the resources of the lake be utilized, and that this Government improve this water transportation.

I wish at this time to give you a brief outline of the history of the Indiana Harbor Ship Canal, located in the cities of East Chicago and Indiana Harbor on the shores of Lake
Michigan, which was prepared by E. W. Wolfe, secretary-manager of the East Chicago Chamber of Commerce:

**History of the Indiana Harbor Ship Canal, 1888-1935**

In the year of 1886 the population of the city of East Chicago was only 775. However, these far-sighted citizens realized the potential possibilities of the natural advantages and the geographic location of the district from an industrial standpoint, provided that the necessary facilities were made available. The discussions reached a point in that year where a movement was started to build a ship canal.

The construction of the canal was started during 1888 and 1889 by Caroline M. Forsythe and husband, the Calumet Cement & Improvement Co., the Standard Steel & Iron Co., and these works were duly reorganized.

In 1901 the work on the harbor was started and was carried on with rapidity until 1903. In the year of 1901 the Chicago Land Co. commenced the building of the canal, building 7,700 feet in a southwesterly direction from Lake Michigan and thence to an angle of 5° 14'3" east from White Oak Avenue, constructing a small turning basin just northeast of the Canal Street Bridge, dredging the channel to a depth of between 20 and 22 feet. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the completion of this branch of the canal consumed several years and was not finished until the year of 1914.

The navigable branch of the ship canal, that part running from Lake Michigan to White Oak Avenue, was built to a width of 300 feet from the breakwater to the railroad bridges of the E. & O. and the L. H. Ballaine, and the width, at a depth of 200 feet, over the balance.

The building of the ship canal was started several hundred feet south of Canal Street Bridge and built 1/2 mile south to the junction of the Grand Calumet River, which had been designated by the United States Government as a navigable stream. This branch of the canal was dredged to a depth of 15 feet and to a top width of 200 feet to One Hundred and Forty-first Street, the transmissorial 350 feet top width from that point to the Grand Calumet River.

Records on file indicate that the right-of-way for the entire canal was accepted by the Secretary of War in compliance with the provision in act of Congress approved June 5, 1910, for and in behalf of the United States Government, and from that time the canal has been maintained by the United States Government, assisted, however, by the different industries up until 1929.

Since the building of the canal the location of industry along its frontage has been one of the chief factors in the growth of East Chicago. Many millions of dollars have been spent by industry in the building of plants and docks, and these industries would never have located in East Chicago (Indiana Harbor) had they not been able to obtain water transportation and with the future thought that additional water service would be made available to them.

The navigable portion of the canal has been in general use from 1914 up to date. A great deal of difficulty was experienced with the turning basin, it being small and not properly protected. On January 11, 1929, during the second session of the Seventieth Congress, House bill 16169 was passed, which authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to, for $5,000,000, purchase a 1/2 mile strip of land along the north side of the canal at Canal Street, building its plant and dock as a unit at a cost of about $45,000,000.

During the year 1916 the Associated Box Corporation located on the north side of the ship canal, occupying a frontage of 377 feet, all improved, at a cost of $45,000,000.

During the year 1916 the Mark Manufacturing Co. started to build their big plant on the north side of the ship canal at its mouth, just opposite the Inland Steel Co., occupying 2,000 feet frontage of 3,200 feet. This plant was taken over by the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., who built off their 1931 improvements, and at a cost of $67,000,000, and has been operated by the Inland Steel Co. since its completion.

During the year 1927 the Standard Steel Refining Co. located its largest refinery on the north side of the canal at Indianapolis Boulevard. They occupy a frontage of 1,760 feet. They have been unable to secure the improvement cost; however, there were many thousands of dollars spent on their improvements.

During the year 1918 the Consolidated Oil Co. built its refinery on the south bank of the canal at Indianapolis Boulevard. The properties of this refinery were purchased by the Bartles-McGuire Oil Co., who operated these properties until 1932, when they were merged with the Waddams Oil Co., occupying 777 feet, and then up to 1934, when they merged with the Standard Oil Co. of New York. They occupied 625 feet of canal frontage and it was improved by them at a cost of more than $80,000,000.

During the year 1925 the United States Gypsum Co. located its large plant on the north side of the canal at Canal Street, building its plant and dock as a unit at a cost of several hundred thousand dollars and occupying 990 feet, all covered by improvements. I cannot give the exact cost of this improvement due to the type of its construction.

During 1928 the Shell Petroleum located its docks along the south bank of the canal, between Indianapolis Boulevard and Youngs Avenue and these had a very large turning basin, occupying 604 feet, fully improved by them at a cost of $47,000,000, not including the cost of the heads and pipes that had to be built in to do dock property.

During 1928 the East Chicago Dock Terminal Co. built large docks on the south side of the canal between the turning basin and Canal Street. They occupied 625 feet of canal, which they have fully improved at a cost of $115,000.

During 1929 the Empire Oil Co. built into the canal, on the south side of the canal, between the turning basin and Indianapolis Boulevard, occupying a 600-foot frontage, and fully improved by them at a cost of $150,000.

During 1934 the Texas Co. built its docks and bulk station on the south side of the canal at Canal Street Bridge. They occupy a frontage of 308 feet, fully improved at a cost of $14,000,000.

In addition to the vast amounts spent by industries for dock improvements they were also called upon during the years up to 1929 to stand a portion of the yearly dredging expenses. For example, during the years of 1924 to 1929, inclusive, the Inland Steel Co., the Standard Oil Co., the Empire Oil Co., and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. spent $60,000 for the dredging of the canal channel, which was in addition to the $25,000 spent by the Government for maintenance purposes, which has shown a constant yearly increase, as indicated by the following tabulation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tonnage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1,355,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1,500,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1,272,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1,621,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1,305,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1,346,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1,271,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1,270,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1,939,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>2,790,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>3,882,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>4,576,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>4,240,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>3,494,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>5,054,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>5,121,666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the years of 1929 to 1936, inclusive, I am shown in the following table the tonnage handled by the different industries located on the canal, and only the number of ships using this canal channel, by showing, the total tonnage by year and also the total for the 7-year period.
Along the south branch of the ship canal—that portion which is un
navigable and which is included in the ship canal, Grand Calu
met River, and the Olentangy development project. The whole
section extends from the turning basin to the junction of the Grand Calu
met River—there are located a great number of heavy-type as
well as light-type industries, where investment along the south branch
of the canal reaches high into the millions of dollars. These indus
tries are all potential users of waterway transportation; they,
for the most part, are unable to do so by reason of the exis
ting water service at the present time due to excessive costs in getting to dock
facilities. Even under these extenuating circumstances a number of indus"ries,
being forced to use the existing service, have found a way to do so by reason of
fact their competitors have waterway service, and if our concerns are to stay in certain markets they are forced to meet this com"petition.

One industry in particular which is located a short distance
from the canal on the Grand Calumet River is the Grasselli Chemi
cal Co., which during the past year handled 23,797 tons, and from 1922 to 1930 handled 224,626 tons.

Many of the industries that have located along the south branch
of the ship canal and a strip along the Grand Calumet did so be
cause all land along the harbor canal had been taken and they felt
that after long that south branch would be made navigable.

The industries of which I speak, and whose plants or properties
fining Co., Graver Tank & Manufacturing Co., and the East Chicago City Dock.

A committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 3531 to amend the act entitled
"Provided, The Chief of the Bureau of Mines of the Department of Labor, shall, at the expense of the United States Government, construct a system of levees and reservoirs to ade
quately control the floodwaters of the Scioto and Olentangy Rivers in Ohio: And provided further, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $40,000,000 for the carrying out of the above project." was offered to page 2, line 1, section 4, of the bill, which has already been passed. The only way under the rules in which it can be entertained at this time is by unanimous consent. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.
Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This flood proposition is beginning to be a very important matter in this country. In my State in 1913 the flood waters of the Miami River Valley were controlled and the costs thereof were paid entirely by benefited property. At the present time in Ohio we are making an improvement in the Miami River Valley. The legislation to pay for an appropriation through the P. W. A. of $24,000,000, and under a State law that we have there was created a conservancy district, and the conservancy board has assessed against the property benefited by this improvement $12,600,000. In many cases the assessment is greater than the value of the property. In New York, in a small city, there is a concern which is on the tax duplicate for $137,000. The assessment against the property is $90,000. There is another concern there whose property is valued at $47,000 and the assessment against the property for that improvement is $50,000. I contend that if we are going to have a flood-control program in this country we cannot assess benefited property in such a way that, in effect, means confiscation, and that is what will happen if the benefited property is supposed to pay a great part of the cost of flood improvement and flood control. Gentlemen ought not to fool themselves when they talk about a flood-control program and come out into the daylight and give us an intelligent definition of the duties and responsibilities in the adopted legislation by thinking the property benefited is not going to be assessed enormous amounts. I know in a little town that I was born and raised in in Ohio the benefits assessed against property are more than the property is worth.

I call attention to another thing. We have the Home Loan Bank Board and gentlemen know that we loan money on homes up to 80 percent of the assessed value. I know one property that has a home loan on it for $4,000, 80 percent of its value. Along comes the flood-improvement program and assesses that property $2,000 more, so that the assessment and mortgage against that property today is more than its value. The Home Loan Board cannot exercise any power in the private individual, and you will be doing the same thing if you assess the cost of improvement against farms. You will assess them for more money than they are worth. In the Miami Valley, in Ohio, there is not a single farm which, as a result of the 1913 flood, as a result of the 1913 act, is worth the money today that the assessment provided for.

Here we are down in the Mississippi Valley making an appropriation for $272,000,000, while up in Arkansas we voted in an amendment, which I voted for, which provides for an expenditure of $126,000,000, and I am here to tell you now that you will never collect $126,000,000 from Arkansas for the improvement made on those two rivers, because the land is not worth that much.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment. I shall direct my remarks in line with what my good friend Mr. Lamnek has had to say, and that is to call the attention of the House to the fact that we are in this bill entering upon a very dangerous policy, especially when we consider what was done in the Senate yesterday. I tried to impress upon the membership here that this is a very important bill, and the most important thing about it is that it has no definite policy as to State or local participation. On several of the projects named the bill provides that the Government shall pay for all damages and also for the flood control. On other projects in the bill it provides that the State or local beneficiaries from the improvement shall furnish the rights-of-way and assume all damages. Yesterday the Senate passed a very important bill, known as the Copeland omnibus flood-control bill, providing for construction of improvements and the flood control in the Pittsburgh territory in 1919 the White Rivers is entirely wrong. I voted for that amendment; but if that is the situation, it is entirely wrong, because there the Federal Government is going to pay for everything. I am calling upon those on the Democratic side who have responsibility for this flood-relief program to come forward with a consistent, constructive program. Let us not find ourselves confronted with a situation that will inevitably result in a flood in the President of the United States, and we will have no flood relief anywhere.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the members of the committee to propose the amendment pointed out how you were making a mistake in passing that amendment and making discrimination on those two rivers yesterday?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I do not want to take any of that blame myself, because I am for flood control. The country needs it. I am calling upon the Democratic authorities, the Democratic leaders, the Democratic President, and the Democratic administration to get out of this inconsistent position in which they now are, get out of this aura of inconsistency, and come out into the daylight and give us an intelligent program that the President and the Nation will support, and that will be right and consistent and just.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DRIVER. There is no one who can misunderstand the definition of the duties and responsibilities in the adopted program for flood control on the Mississippi River. It is written into the law. The people there themselves contributed and turned over to the Government $292,000,000. In addition to that, they paid $41,000,000 for land damages that were required under this bill, and we protested as vehemently as anybody possibly could against the inclusion of projects that were based on some other separate definition of responsibility, and the gentleman supported it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman no doubt helped write the bill, and for that reason knows more about this bill—S. 3531—than I do, and I call upon him and his able assistants to redraft this bill or amend it so that it will contain a consistent policy.

Mr. DRIVER. Yes. I know all about it.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. That neither of the projects for the flood control of the St. Francis River, other than those authorized, shall be undertaken until the States, or other qualified agencies, shall have furnished satisfactory assurances that they will undertake, without cost to the United States, all alterations of highways made necessary because of the construction of the authorized reservoirs, and meet all damages because of such highway alterations, and have agreed also to furnish without cost to the United States all lands and easements necessary to the construction of levees and drainage ditches constructed under this project; Provided, That the reservoirs for control of headwater flow of the Yazoo River system may be located by the Chief of Engineers, in the discretion: And provided further, That the Chief of Engineers may, in his discretion, substitute levees, floodways, or auxiliary channels, or any or all of them, for any or all of the seven detention reservoirs recommended in his report of February 13, 1914,
for the control of floods of the Yazoo River: And provided further,
That the Chief Engineers, when the approval of the Secretary of War, may modify the project for the flood control of the St.
Francis River as recommended in said report, to include therein
"Tributary with reason of such detention reservoir.
Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this so that I may take up this argument
that I was having with the gentleman from Arkansas a moment ago, and to bring out this point: As I said, I am not as
familiar with this bill as the gentleman from Arkansas is. I
do not claim to be; but, as I look through this bill, I find
there are several projects where the Government pays everything.
For certain other projects you have stipulations to the effect that the territory benefited thereby must come forward with some contribution. How is it that you do not have a consistent program in this bill?
Mr. DRIVER. It is consistent, if the gentleman will stop
to take into consideration the necessities and the engineering
recommendations with regard to it. On all levees all dam-
ages, the local interests are required to pay it and to main-
tain the completed structure. That is generally true until you come to the floodways. When this water is taken out of the river and excess carried through these diversion channels, imposing a burden on the Government there it does not protect but condemns the land. Neces-
Sarily the Government assumes that responsibility. I call
attention to the fact that these lands involved here are lands
that are protected by levees and have been for many, many
years, but because of the increase in the flood heights, the engineers find it necessary to take out of the channels of the Mississippi River this excess water, so the balance of it can pass safely between these levees in the channel. They take that burden out of the Mississippi River and pour it into this protected area, and this development will be of use to those people for that diversion, for the common good. Of course, you have no basis to cause a contribution on the part of those people who are not benefited but who are destroyed.
Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. So that I may get it plain, let me ask the gentleman this question. Yesterday we passed a
resolution to an ordinance protecting the people who are not benefited but who are destroyed.
Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Now, you state that this bill pro-
vides, before this amendment was put on, the same thing, that the Government must pay everything except the
$41,000,000 which these States have heretofore contributed.
Mr. DRIVER. Oh, no, no. Now, let us get that straight. When the act of 1928 was passed, under which the Govern-
ment assumed responsibility for building the structures, the local interests had expended $292,000,000 on the levees along the river that were used under the adopted project, and were simply increased in grade and sections. In other words, they were built up higher and stronger by the Government, but the people put those levees there out of their own money, $292,000,000.
When that project was adopted there were certain rectifi-
cations the engineers thought necessary, together with some
additional levees in order to connect up and make a consist-
tent line of them. They imposed the burden on local interests to pay for every acre of that land, damages, and to maintain the completed structures. Under that responsibility the local interests since 1928 have paid out $41,000,000 and are con-
tinuing to pay for and maintain the structures.
I have the gavel in my hand. The Clerk read as follows:
Sec. 5. The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the
Secretary of War, shall at the expense of the United States Gov-
ernment determine the amount of levees, flood control works
with general plan shown on map designated as sheet no. 1 entitled
"Tributary Levee Location Survey—White River Levee District—Proposed Levee Location" accompanying report dated April
3, 1928, and filed in office of first and second Mississippi River com-
mission districts, Memphis, Tenn. The Chief of Engineers shall
have the right to alter, change, or modify said plan as to the
grades and levee sections; Provided, however, That no work shall
be commenced on the above-mentioned project until the State,
local boards, or other responsible local interests have given assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that they will (a)
provide without cost to the United States all rights-of-way necessary for the construction of said levees, (b) provide drainage facilities made necessary by construction of levees; (c) acquire and pro-
vide without cost to the United States all flowage
rights and easements over, upon, and across all proper
Necessary
reservoir; (d) hold and save the United States free
from liability for damages on account of the use of said area for
reservoir purposes during said emergency.
Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:
Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 4, line 1, strike out section 5.
Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I believe all the Members
realize it is absolutely necessary to have some nonpartisan
organization take care of flood control, an organization in
which the Members of the States and the people of the country will have confidence. I do not know of any body of
men who can handle flood control to the satisfaction of the people of the country generally better than the Corps of
Army Engineers, a nonpartisan organization.
Coming now to section 5, I want to read what Secretary
of War George H. Dern wrote on February 15, 1928, to
Senator COPELAND:
Section 5 of the bill authorizes the construction of a system of levees to protect land in the backwater areas of the White River and provides for payment by the United States of the entire construction cost of the system. This work is not recommended in the report. The requirement that the Government bear all construction cost is not as favored by Congress in similar cases. Section 6 of the act of May 15, 1926, provides for the construction by the United States of levees protecting lands in areas subject to backwater influences of the Mississippi River on condition, among others, that local interests contribute 303 percent of the costs of the work. This is a reasonable requirement in all cases of like character, and the Department is unable to recommend that the entire cost of the construction of levees in a backwater area be borne by the United States.
Secretary of War Dern objects to section 5 of the bill, as
you note from this letter. I also want to call your attention
to a statement contained in a letter written by E. M. Mark-
ham, major general, Chief of Engineers, War Department, to
the Chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Louisi-
a (Mr. Wilson):
WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, April 30, 1936.
HON. RILEY J. WILSON, Chairman, Committee on Flood Control,
House of Representatives, Washington D. C.
DEAR JUDGE WILSON: In compliance with your request to me at
the hearings before the Flood Control Committee of the House on
April 30, 1936, I have to inform you that bill S. 3831, a bill to
amend the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the
Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes", ap-
proved May 15, 1928, as amended and passed by the Senate on
April 21, 1936, with the exception of section 5, now conforms to
views of the Department, and satisfies the objections urged
by the bill in the report of the Secretary of War of February 15,
1938, to the Commerce Committee of the Senate, which report
was made prior to the amendments that were adopted by the
Senate.
Yours very truly,
E. M. MARKHAM,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.
With the exception of section 5. This is the section I
strike out by my amendment. Now, are we going to permit
the Corps of Army Engineers to handle this flood-control
situation under the plan adopted in 1928 or are we going to
repeat in the bill features contrary to the well-considered
plan of the War Department?
Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman
yield?
Mr. RICH. I yield.
Mr. WHITTINGTON. I agree with the statement made by the gentleman, but it is only fair to say that the gentleman voted against the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers on yesterday when he voted for the Miller amendment, adding $126,000,000 to this bill. That is a fair statement, according to the Record, is it not?

Mr. RICH. That is right, and I want to tell the gentleman why I did it. Whenever I can by spending twice the money do eight times the amount of good that could be done by spending half the money, I want to do it. That is sound business.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a member of the committee. This is an important part of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RICH. I want to answer the gentleman's question first. I realize that the Miller amendment provided that the rights-of-way for the 26 reservoirs were to be paid for by the Federal Government, but I was under the impression that an amendment would be offered striking out that feature on the Arkansas, the White, as well as the Yazoo and St. Francis Rivers.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the amendment was not modified and did not provide that the cost of rights-of-way should be borne by local interests at the time the gentleman voted for the amendment.

Mr. RICH. Yes; but even now several Members on our side are trying to work out an amendment that will accomplish that result. The amendment will soon be presented; just be patient. If we can do that, it will then be in accordance with the plan of the Army Engineers.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Just a moment. The gentleman voted for the amendment.

Mr. RICH. I voted for the amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is a member of the committee, is against the bill, signed the minority views, and has done everything he could to try to kill the bill.

Mr. RICH. We want to perfect the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is exactly what the gentleman is doing; trying to kill it.

Mr. RICH. If an amendment is adopted striking out the obligation of the Federal Government to pay for the right-of-way for these reservoirs and section 5 not approved by Army Engineers, I will vote for the bill. If such amendments are not adopted, I will not.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But the gentleman signed the minority views and is against the bill with or without the amendment.

Mr. RICH. We are against certain features of the bill that are contrary to the established plan and policy of 1928, and we are trying to get the Members of the House to adopt a bill that will be satisfactory to the Army Engineers. The people in the Mississippi Valley should be treated the same as we treat everybody else. When it comes to the matter of flood control the people in the Mississippi Valley have gotten the lion's share. Now they are trying to secure the inclusion of these other rivers and steal a march on the other people of the country and make the other people pay their burden, a burden they should stand themselves.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not a fact that the president of the Mississippi River Commission recommended section 5, the section the gentleman has moved to strike out?
of Engineers, Gen. E. M. Markham. It does have the approval of General Ferguson, who is Chairman of the Mississippi River Commission, in his report to the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. DRIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. DRIVER. Is not the same thing true of the amendment adopted yesterday?

Mr. CARLSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DRIVER. I am not using the gentleman's own yardstick.

Mr. CARLSON. I say to the gentleman from Arkansas that I expect him to demand a roll call which will take that amendment from the bill.

Mr. Chairman, here is a section of the bill that in my opinion should be eliminated for the reasons just stated. The testimony of General Markham shows this is a proclamation work.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House votes to strike out section 5 and eliminate $12,000,000 of the expenditure.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt to discuss the merits of this bill. However, all this discussion has impressed me with the necessity of national planning. Here we are pouring millions and millions of dollars into building levees and digging ditches, establishing basins, and so forth, to take care of water that flows into the river down at the bottom of the slope. I think we should reverse the policy. I do not suppose that can be done at this time, because I presume the necessity for this bill is such that we cannot change the policy at this moment. Every barrel of this destructive water that flows into the lower Mississippi River is of great value in the West and Northwest, and if we could impound this water on the upper Missouri River and its tributaries it would be of great benefit. The water has tremendous value for irrigation purposes in Montana, the Dakotas, in many parts of Oklahoma, Kansas, and Nebraska, and all through the West. If this water were impounded near its source it would protect the moisture of those semiarid territories, and it also has a tremendous value in the development of power which is very greatly needed in those sections of the country. The development of power at the sources, or along the course, of these rivers would defray the entire cost of many of these dams and projects.

Mr. Chairman, I make this comment in order to call the attention of the Members of Congress to the necessity of revising our policy to point out the value of national planning and to try to get away from the building of levees and ditches, and to that greater plan and system of national planning that has already been established on the Tennessee River and its tributaries. As I view it, flood-control, navigation, irrigation, and power development should be correlated.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I understand this section is in the bill contrary to advice of the Army Engineers. Is it not a fact only four times in the history of the Nation has the Congress ever acted diametrically opposite to the advice and information given by the Engineers on matters of this kind?

Mr. COLDEN. I assume the gentleman is correct, but my purpose was not to discuss the merits of the bill but to get an idea before the Members.

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

Mr. COLDEN. I yield to the eminent gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. DRIVER. For the information of my colleague from Michigan, I desire to say that the Engineers made a special study of this particular area, and it is incorporated in a report they made to the Congress, House Document 292, of the United States, to that greater plan and system of national planning which respects this particular problem which is on all fours with the matter we have discussed here.

Mr. COLDEN. My idea is that we ought to have a Missouri Valley authority, we ought to have a Platte Valley authority, and we ought to take all of these great basins and develop them under a system of national planning, and this would take care of the floods on the lower Mississippi and that water could be used for conservation of moisture, navigation, irrigation, and power. The Boulder Dam is a combination of flood-control and power development. The Boulder Dam will repay its entire cost and eventually produce a profit. Why not apply this policy in the Mississippi and Missouri Valleys?

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

Mr. COLDEN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If the Army Engineers approved this, why did Secretary Denn write the letter I read on the floor here, and why did Gen. E. M. Markham write the letter that I read on the floor a few moments ago disapproving it?

Mr. COLDEN. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I cannot read the mind of either one of the authorities he has quoted. To build basins and reservoirs for the control of floods in the flat lands of the Mississippi Valley not only destroys the use of great areas of fertile soil but serves only for the promotion of bullfrogs and pony mosquitoes. To store these floods at the source in basins and reservoirs will add greater prosperity to semiarid regions and add to our national wealth. The development of power will repay the cost of many of these projects and add to the convenience and comfort of a large population. Water at its source can be utilized and controlled from the mountains to the lowest points at which the flow unharmed and unrestrained, it carries but destruction to those below.

(Here the gavel fell.)

The pro-forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That the United States shall provide the drainage necessary by the construction of floodway levees included in the modified project.

SEC. 7. That the United States shall construct at its own cost one railroad and one highway crossing over the Atchafalaya floodway and not to exceed three railway and two highway crossings over the Morganza floodway, and not to exceed one railway crossing (together with suitable physical connections therewith) and one highway crossing over the floodway west of the Atchafalaya River provided for in the modified project: Provided, That equitable agreements can be made with the railroads concerned and that the appropriate railroad or highway agencies agree to accept and maintain and operate these crossings without charge to the United States: Provided further, That the railroads crossing the Morganza and West Atchafalaya floodways agree in consideration for the crossings constructed to waive all claims and damages that may arise by reason of the increased frequency of overflows in the Morganza and West Atchafalaya floodways: And provided further, That other railroad and highway damages shall be adjusted as provided for in section 12.

SEC. 8. That, in addition to the construction by the United States of roads in connection with floodways as herefore provided, the Federal Government may, in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, and within the limits of available funds, construct additional roads to afford access to those portions of the levee lines not otherwise accessible.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: After section 8, line 6, page 6, insert:

"Sec. 8. (a) That no money appropriated under authority of this act shall be expended on the construction of any project until States, political subdivisions thereof, or other local agencies have given assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that they will (a) provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the project, except as otherwise provided herein; (b) build and save the United States free from all claims for the construction works; (c) maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War; Provided, That whenever expenditures for lands, easements, and rights-of-way by States, political subdivisions thereof, or responsible local agencies for any individual project or useful part thereof shall have exceeded the present estimated construction cost therefor, the local agency concerned may be reimbursed one-half of its excess expenditures over said estimated construction cost: And provided further, That when benefits of any project or useful part thereof accrue to lands and property outside of the State in which said project or part
thereof is necessary thereafter he has received from the States, local subdivisions thereof, or responsible local agencies the present estimated cost of said lands, easements, and rights-of-way exceeds the estimated construction costs thereof, and provided further, that the Secretary of War shall determine the proportion of the present estimated cost of said lands, easements, and rights-of-way that each State, political subdivision thereof, or responsible local agency should contribute in consideration for the benefits to be received by each. And provided further, that whenever not less than 75 percent of the benefits as estimated by the Secretary of War of any project or useful part thereof accrue to lands and properties within the State in which said project or part thereof is located, provision (e) of this section shall not apply thereto; nothing herein shall impair or abridge the powers now existing in the Department of War.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is not germane. The amendment, if at all germane, would have been germane to section 1 of the bill, which undertakes to provide for methods of financing the projects authorized and which does provide for the financing of the projects authorized in this bill. The amendment is not germane for another reason. As I understand, the gentleman proposes it as a separate section, and the proposed amendment undertakes to deal not only with flood control but with other matters over which the War Department has no supervision.

If I caught the reading of the amendment aright, it is taken bodily from the omnibus bill that passed the Senate yesterday as an amendment of the bill passed by the House last session. It is not germane to this bill, which is confined to flood control and to navigation only on the lower Mississippi River, and has nothing to do with the benefits that may accrue to power or to irrigation.

So, I say, Mr. Chairman, that section 1 is the section that deals with the financing of the projects and with the conditions on which they shall be financed, and I remind the Chair that section 1 adopts paragraph 43 of Committee Document No. 1 and enumerates the projects and refers to the terms upon which they shall be financed. So, if the amendment were germane to the bill at all it would be germane only to section 1, which has been passed, and is not now under consideration.

It is not germane, I repeat, as an independent section because it deals with matters wholly beyond the scope of this bill, which is limited to flood control and navigation along the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is absolutely germane, because it puts a real heart into the bill. Every bill like this providing for an appropriation states how the money shall be expended. That is what the bill does. It is a limitation on the manner and method of spending the money.

This amendment is taken bodily from a bill passed yesterday in the Senate. That was a flood-control bill and nothing but a flood-control bill. This is a flood-control bill and nothing but a flood-control bill. The amendment meets every test to germaneness.

If this amendment is adopted it will give some consistency to the bill so that it will be fair and reasonable and so the President will approve it. It will provide that every project in the bill shall be paid for in a certain way—that is, every project named in the bill shall be paid for in the same way—not paid for by the Government in one instance and by individuals or communities in another instance. It will give consistency to the bill.

This is the language put in the other flood-control bill in the Senate, language that the President has approved, and the Army Engineers have approved, and that the concurrence of the Nation will approve.

If you want a bill that is consistent, you should adopt this amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Ohio mentioned a yardstick, the only discrimination has been for those projects along the Ohio River.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Oh, no; my amendment provides that all similar improvements should be paid for in the same way, regardless of where they are located, and you ought to be willing, if you share the benefits, to share the expense, just as is required of sections in Pennsylvania and Connecticut and Illinois.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio has no application to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. As the Chair views the matter, the amendment is a limitation on the expenditure of money appropriated in the bill, and therefore the Chair holds that the amendment is germane and overrules the point of order.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, in this bill so far we have 26 reservoirs and 10 or 15 different projects, and, as far as I am able to find, there is no set yardstick to measure the local or governmental participation. Each project stands on its own feet. One project in one State might be paid for by the Government in its entirety, while an exactly similar project in the same State or in a different State might be paid for partly by the Government and partly by the State or by an assessment upon the parties or property benefited.

The Senate has been busy for the last 3 weeks formulating a bill which passed the Senate yesterday, and that is as similar in many ways as the Copeland omnibus flood-control bill. It is not a Republican Senate, it is a Democratic Senate. This bill contains a definite plan whereby the expense of the construction of the projects is provided. It provides a yardstick by which each project is to be built and paid for. The Chair has ruled my amendment germane. The amendment is germane. It is reasonable and sensible. The language of my amendment is consistent, and it has been approved by the President. The committee should vote for it and every Member should vote for it,

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. LAMNECK. Is it not true that this is in line with the Senate bill passed yesterday?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is correct. This will make it in line.

Mr. LAMNECK. Yes; and I hope every Democrat will vote for it.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. RICH. This is the amendment that we are trying to get through in order that we might put this bill in line with the Senate bill, as requested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Wurzburger] a few moments ago. I hope all Members will support the amendment.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is one thing the gentleman is overlooking when he is talking about local benefits as affecting the lower Mississippi Valley and compelling them to make additional contributions. Certainly, those landowners are not going to pay for these benefits to the limit of their ability, but they have already done it. They have spent $330,000,000 trying to get protection for this valley. To that extent it does place them upon a different basis from territory that has never paid anything.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. There is no question but that the Army Engineers can take that into consideration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the amendment does not take that into consideration.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It will be construed in that way.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It has the effect of placing a burden on the people and property owners of the valley that they have heretofore fully discharged by paying their share of the expense.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be adopted. This bill proposes to carry out the projects adopted in the act of 1928, when the declaration of Congress was made that all requirements for local contributions had been complied with, that $252,000,000
had been paid by the local interests, and that no other local contribution should be required. That was adopted as a national problem. I think it would be unfortunate to change it, since it was laid down in the legislation. The purpose of the pending bill is to carry out a policy of flood control along the Mississippi River, and it is not clear how this bill accomplishes the purpose of that great project.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. How is the gentleman, as chairman of the committee, going to proceed in bills next week and defend this program which the Senate has adopted as applying to the Ohio and other various other States, and oppose it for Louisiana?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Because the contribution required in that bill, even a greater burden, has been already placed upon the people of the alluvial valley, and they have already discharged it. That is the reason I can defend it. They are burdened with debts now for the payment of it, and the act which we are simply amending stated that on account of the contributions made no other local contribution should be required for the carrying out of the project. That was a declaration of the Senate, a declaration of a national program to be completed on that basis. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think the amendment should be adopted, in line with trying to get a policy that affects all parts of the country alike. We quibbled a lot here yesterday about whether the Army Engineers or someone else should approve this report. In the bill passed in the Senate yesterday, which applies to all the country, except this special Overton bill territory, it was provided that the flood control not be considered, and their reports are clear out. The thing that will be considered is what the President wants. He will allocate the funds, he will suggest which works shall have priority, regardless of the Army Engineers' report. I think the only thing this Congress can do, to do justice by all the people of the country, is to adopt a policy that affects all of the country alike, not a policy which says you shall have a system one in each of the States, but a system for the whole country, and it should be all alike. All should get Justice in spending flood-control money. North, South, East, or West, it is one land and one people affected in each region alike by flood waters. Legislation should apply to all alike. It should be a proposition of flood control, and not flood waters. [Applause]

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. There is great necessity for flood-control legislation. The best thought in this country on the question of flood control is to be found in the Flood Control Committee of the House. The most important work done by the Congress in the effort to deal with this national problem was begun under the chairmanship of Frank Reid, a Republican from Illinois. The policy of the Government in dealing with this question was laid down in the act of 1928, and unless you know something of the background of this legislation and the conditions that brought it about, you are unable to appreciate the importance of adhering to the bill that has been reported by your committee. There were no mistakes made by the Congress than recognizing the problem of flood control as purely a Federal problem.

That has not been done. It was not done in the bill of 1928. It is not here sought to be done. The amendment that was adopted yesterday was most unfortunate. That amendment itself probably wrecks the bill. If the pending amendment should be accepted, it will undoubtedly destroy the legislation. The purpose of the pending bill is to carry out a policy of flood control as thus defined. It is no indication of an intention to accept the problem of flood control along the Mississippi as purely a national responsibility, and nothing is proposed by way of benefit to that area that in any way discriminates against any other area of the country. The people along the Mississippi or have been dealing with this flood problem for more than a hundred years. They have expended millions of dollars, running up to nearly $300,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Pending that request, Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask what is the parliamentary situation, and how does the gentleman gain the floor? I understood it was made by making a motion to strike out the paragraph. I have no objection to his proceeding, but I want to reply.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. The contribution that it is proposed the Government shall make in this bill is, in a measure, to make the contribution already made by people in the affected territory. The people erected their own protective works. They were taken over by the Government and further improved. There is no suggestion coming from that area that the people affected be forever relieved of further contribution to any protective measures to be adopted by the Government.

Mr. Chairman, if we should accept the principle of the amendment adopted yesterday as the policy of the Government and should follow it to its logical conclusion, it would impose a burden of in excess of $11,000,000,000 upon the people of this country.

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

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The amendment adopted yesterday is an exact copy of the provisions of this bill with reference to the Yazoo Reservoir.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I was for many years a member of the Flood Control Committee of this House and am interested in securing proper legislation. I hope the committee will reject the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENKINS of Ohio) there were ayes 57 and noes 34.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. Wilson of Louisiana and Mr. Jenkins of Ohio to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 76 and noes 44.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The sum of $15,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be allocated by the Secretary of War on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in excess work or in the repair or maintenance of any flood-control work on any tributary of the Mississippi River threatened or destroyed by flood heretofore or hereafter occurring: Provided, That the unexpended and unallotted balance of said sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be allotted by the Secretary of War, on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, in the reimbursement of levee districts or others for expenditures heretofore incurred or made for the construction, repair, or maintenance of any flood-control work on any tributaries or outlets of the Mississippi River that may be threatened, impaired or destroyed by the flood of 1927 or subsequent flood; and also in the construction, repair, or maintenance, and in the reimbursement of levee districts or others for expenditures heretofore incurred or made for the construction, repair, or maintenance of any flood-control work on any of the tributaries or outlets of the Mississippi River that may have been impaired, damaged, or destroyed by caving banks, or on any of the tributaries or outlets of the Mississippi River that may have been impaired or destroyed by caving banks, or on any other any of the tributaries or outlets of the Mississippi River that may have been impaired, damaged, or destroyed by caving banks, or on any other any of the tributaries or outlets of the Mississippi River that may have been impaired, damaged, or destroyed by caving banks or on any other any of the tributaries or outlets of the Mississippi River that may have been impaired, damaged, or destroyed by caving banks.
Sec. 10. After the Eudora floodway shall have been constructed and is ready for operation, the described easements now at the head of the Echateflys Basin and the Tensas Basin shall be constructed to the 1914 grade and the 1928 section. The fuse-plug levees at the head of the Echateflys Basin on the west side of the Echateflys River shall be constructed to the 1914 grade and the 1928 section. The fuse-plug levees at the head of the Echateflys Basin on the east side of the Echateflys River shall be constructed to the 1914 grade and the 1928 section. The fuse-plug levees, at the head of the Echateflys Basin, and at the head of the Tensas Basin, shall be reconstructed and maintained as herein provided, subject to the proper shape of the floodway, so as to be so located as to afford adequate space for the passage of floodwaters without endangering the levees opposite on the east side of the river and shall be constructed contemporaneously with the construction of the Eudora floodway; except that, until the Eudora floodway is in operative condition, there shall be left in this back levee north of the head of the Echateflys floodway openings which shall be sufficient, in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, to permit the passage of all floodwaters without causing a liability contingent in the event of any break in the riverside fuse-plug levee prior to the time the Eudora floodway shall be in operative condition.

5. In the United States in the acquisition of flowage rights and rights-of-way for levee foundations, the Secretary of War is authorized to enter into agreements with the States, political subdivisions thereof, and other political subdivisions, or other agencies, for the acquisition and transfer to the United States of such flowage rights and levee rights-of-way, and for the reimbursement of the States, political subdivisions thereof, or other agencies, for the cost thereof at prices previously agreed upon between the Secretary of War and the governing agencies, within the maximum limitations hereinafter prescribed: Provided, That no money appropriated under the authority herein provided for the construction of the Eudora floodway, the Morganza floodway, the back-protection levee extending from the head of the Eudora floodway, or the levee extending from the head of the Echateflys floodway to the head of and down the east bank of the Atchafalyas River to the point of the intersection of said Morganza floodway until 75 percent of the value thereof, and the rights and rights-of-way for levee foundations, as estimated by the Chief of Engineers, shall have been acquired or options or assurances satisfactory to the Chief of Engineers shall have been obtained for the Eudora floodway, the Morganza floodway, and the area lying between said back-protection levee and the present front-line levees; Provided further, That easements required in said areas in connection with roads and other public utilities owned by States or political subdivisions thereof shall be provided without cost to the United States in the condition that the United States shall provide suitable crossings, including surfacing of like character, over floodway guidelines for all improved roads now constructed or the construction of the State highway system, and shall repair all damage done to said highways within said West Atchafalyas floodway by the sale of such floodways for diversion: Provided further, That no flowage easements and rights-of-way for levees by the United States over properties subject to frequent overflow in the Atchafalyas Basin below the approximate latitude of Krotz Springs: Provided further, That payment for rights-of-way, easements, and flowage rights acquired under this section, or reimbursed as provided for by the United States for any further damage by reason of diversion or floodwaters; except that, if the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine to acquire any of the properties or easements found necessary thereof shall be provided without cost to the United States for any further damage by reason of diversion or floodwaters; except that, if the Secretary of Agriculture will provide such easements and flowage rights as are required for the disposal of floodwaters herein referred to, for national forests, wildlife refuges, or other purposes of his Department, the Secretary of War may, upon recommendation by the Chief of Engineers in lieu of acquiring flowage rights, advance to or reimburse the said Secretary of Agriculture sums equal to those that would otherwise be used for the purchase of easements and flowage rights, the authorization of the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use these sums for the purpose of acquiring properties in the floodways in question.

Sec. 11. That $727,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the carrying out of the modified adopted project, and all unexpended balances of appropriations herefore made for the prosecution of said flood-control project are hereby made available for the purposes of this act.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER: Page 12, line 20, after the word "east," strike out "$272,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$398,719,000."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment merely provides for an increase in the authorization in accordance with the amendment adopted yesterday.

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. I thought it was $126,000,000 additional.

Mr. MILLER. It is. It simply adds $126,000,000 to the $722,000,000. That is the only purpose of the amendment.

I will say frankly that the entire sum will not be necessary, in view of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Jenkins]; but in order to keep the bill in proper shape, the authorization ought to be made, so that the money can be appropriated as and when needed. That is the only purpose of the amendment.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I would oppose the approval of the additional authorization for $126,000,000, because I hope we can formulate the bill so as to keep within the recommendation of the Department. I think it is $398,719,000. The amendment is not necessary.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman will admit that the amendment ought to be agreed to now in view of the amendments that have been adopted by the committee.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, but I want to be consistent in voting to keep either one out of the bill.

Mr. MILLER. That is all right, but it ought to be agreed to now.

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

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARLSON to the amendment offered by Mr. MILLS: After the word "that," in line 20, strike out "$398,719,000," in the Miller amendment, and insert "$398,719,000."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to amend this bill with no modification of the Eudora floodway and not appropriate the funds for it at this time. This bill as we have now drawn it contains 26 reservoirs, and in the discussion yesterday it was brought out that they would materially reduce flood dangers through that terrane.

I am going to read some testimony in regard to the need of immediately constructing the Eudora floodway. This is
found on page 74 of the hearings in the United States Senate on this bill, and is the testimony given by General Ferguson.

Here is the testimony:

Senator Overton. General, do you think that it is desirable to have a comprehensive flood-control plan adopted now or do you think it would be more convenient, say another 2 years, to determine the effect of cut-offs and reservoirs and additional outlets and bank-stabilization or other works?

General Ferguson. I think there should be a plan now, and I reported so last year.

Senator Overton. Is it practical to proceed with the works recommend in the lower section—the Atchafalaya and the Morganza, leaving the middle section in its present condition and for future determination?

General Ferguson. As an engineering problem, yes, sir. As a political problem, that is another question.

Senator Overton. Well, of course, from an engineering standpoint you could undertake to work on any section of the river and ignore another section?

General Ferguson. Yes, sir.

I wanted to call your attention to that testimony. We put in those reservoirs, we authorize the construction of this floodway; and if the commission that is now studying the flood problems of the United States make a report next December to the President of the United States that we need this floodway in addition to other reservoirs in the Mississippi Valley Basin I will be for the appropriation; but I do not believe we should pass it today. I think this bill should be passed with the authorization I have offered as an amendment.

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

The bill carries an authorization of $272,000,000. On yesterday the committee adopted an amendment which provided for an additional $126,000,000 for the construction of 26 reservoirs along the Arkansas and the White Rivers. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] proposes an amendment to increase the authorization carried in the bill by $126,000,000. I oppose that amendment. Other gentlemen today opposing the Miller amendment but voting for it yesterday were attempting to correct what they said was an error in passing the so-called Jenkins amendment, under which the people in the floodway districts are required to furnish the rights-of-way. With all deference to my colleague from Kansas, the increase of this authorization by $25,000,000 will by no manner of means eliminate the Eudora floodway.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point that I may correct his statement?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment, I am saying that if $272,000,000 will provide for the Eudora floodway, certainly $395,000,000 will provide for it. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. My amendment was for $103,000,000 instead of $21,000,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman's amendment made the total carried in this section $285,719,000; or, I repeat for emphasis, approximately $23,000,000 more than carried by the bill.

Mr. CARLSON. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Under the terms of the bill, with an authorization of $272,000,000, the Eudora floodway is provided for. Pray tell me how you are going to eliminate it by making the authorization $395,000,000? There is no way on earth to eliminate the Eudora floodway except through legislation, and it is now too late for such an amendment. The Eudora floodway is already provided for in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that in my judgment a mistake was made in the adoption of the Miller amendment. This mistake was further accentuated by the adoption of the Jenkins amendment. The adoption of these two amendments will probably require less than $272,000,000; and I respectfully submit that at least the authorization should remain as reported by the committee, $272,000,000, because all additional amounts that may be required by the Miller amendment are offset by the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]. I submit that both amendments, that of the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], should be voted down.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; gladly.

Mr. RICH. If we cut out the Eudora floodway authorization of $102,000,000 we can build those 26 dams for the people out there in the Arkansas and White River Valleys.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But on yesterday the gentleman voted for them, even though he was opposed to the bill.

Mr. RICH. I am going to vote for this money to help those people out.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The trouble is the gentleman is not doing that. We cannot eliminate the Eudora floodway; it is utterly impossible to eliminate the Eudora floodway unless we go back and revise and amend the bill.

Mr. RICH. Then let us go back and amend the bill accordingly.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We will cross that bridge when we get to it. The trouble with all amendments favored by you is that they are for the defeat of the bill. At the present time you must admit that the two pending amendments are not in order.

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

Mr. Chairman, for my own benefit and, I hope, for the benefit of some of the Members of the House, I want to call attention to some of the significant things about this bill. The first section, apparently, is the meat of the bill, yet I defy anyone on reading the first section of the bill to get the slightest comprehension of what we are attempting to do. It refers to section 48 of a letter from the Chief of Engineers under date of February 12, 1935, and that section appears on page 13 of the Flood Control Committee Document No. 1. It does not mention any figures or allocate any funds for any of these projects.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I fail to see how any appropriation or authorization in this bill is going to allocate any portion of the funds to the Eudora floodway. Yesterday we specifically designated $126,000,000 for the reservoirs on the White and Arkansas Rivers. So far so good. But I would like to have some information on the subject of the status of funds involved in the proposed authorization for the Eudora floodway. I do not find it in the bill, and I do not find it in section 43 of the report of the Chief of Engineers under date of February 12, 1935.

On page 28 of a supplemental report in Document No. 1 of the Flood Control Committee, coming from some gentleman with headquarters at Vicksburg, Miss., we find a figure of $103,000,000 as the estimate recommended for the Eudora spillway. But that is in section 44 of a supplemental report on page 28. I find no specific information in the bill or in the section referred to in the bill which throws any light upon this proposed allocation of $103,000,000 for the Eudora spillway.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 14. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof, to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have now completed the reading of the bill, and the Committee will soon rise. On yesterday the Committee adopted an amendment to provide for 26 reservoirs offered by the gentleman from Kansas. Today, in the language of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], the Committee undertook to correct that mistake by adopting an amendment which he proposed. The amendment which the
gentleman from Ohio offered is taken bodily from an amendment adopted by the Senate to the so-called omnibus flood-control bill, passed by the House in July of last year.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion that amendment has no place in the pending bill. The omnibus bill passed by the House and Senate does not undertake to deal with the lower Mississippi Valley. When the Republican Party was in control in 1928 it was ordained by statute that in the lower Mississippi there should be a floodway through the Boeuf control in 1928. When the Republican Party was in control in 1928 it was ordained by statute that in the lower Mississippi Valley there should be a floodway through the Boeuf Basin. Some of us who lived in that area then and live there now feel that the provisions were inadequate and indefinite. There is no provision for floodways or diversions in the omnibus bill. Only the pending bill provides for floodways.

Mr. Chairman, what is the effect of the language inserted by the Jenkins amendment? It is nothing more or less than that the people living in the Eudora floodway, an area 10 miles wide and almost 100 miles long, will be required to pay the cost of their own destruction. Mr. Chairman, after your Flood Control Committee has considered the pending legislation for a year and a half, will the House now crucify the bill to clarify the Flood Control Act of 1928, passed when the Republicans were in control? In the Overton bill we are undertaking to clarify and to perfect the act of 1928, and the same yardstick will be applied to the amendment of the Chief of Engineers, except as to section 5, which is recommended by the Mississipi River Commission.

As pointed out by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mc Clellan], there are pending suits aggregating millions of dollars because of defects which the Senate bill undertakes to correct; moreover, there are two floodways in the lower Atchafalaya Basin. Is it reasonable to suppose that the people in the lower Atchafalaya Basin, in the Tensas Basin in Louisiana and Arkansas, called upon to furnish 1,000,000 acres of land, will furnish their land and at the same time pay the cost of their own destruction? Such is the effect of the amendment so far as floodways in the pending bill are concerned adopted by the committee today, as proposed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Jenkins].

The Government is protected as to land values in the pending bill. The Senate modified the bill providing for those floodways so as not to permit more than $20,000,000 to be paid for 75 percent of all the land, the flowage rights, the utilities, schools, churches, drainage systems, and all public and private improvements because the Government of the United States made a monumental mistake in ever permitting the Cypress Creek diversion near Arkansas City to be closed in 1901.

I urge that the Jenkins amendment be eliminated or modified in order to prevent the destruction of the bill.

I extend my remarks, under leave granted, by saying that under the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, the States and local interests are required to provide rights-of-way for levees along the main river, but under the terms of the act, floodways and spillways were to be constructed at Federal expense. Such a floodway was constructed and took a large area of land in southeast Missouri. The Bonne Carre spillway in Louisiana has been constructed, but the Boeuf diversion in the vicinity of Arkansas City, which will really constitute a new river some 15 miles wide and 100 miles long, has not been constructed because no provision has been made to compensate property owners for damages and flowage rights to approximately 1,000,000 acres of land. The provision for diversion through the Boeuf Basin remains, but a suggestion has been made for millions of dollars in damages are pending. The pending bill to provide for a smaller diversion at less expense to the Government substitutes the Eudora floodway for the Boeuf diversion. The Eudora floodway is approximately 10 miles wide; the land is located in southeast Arkansas and in the Tensas Basin in Louisiana. The floodway embraces approximately 822,000 acres of land.

There are two additional floodways in the Atchafalaya Basin in Louisiana; they embrace about 175,000 acres.

There are no such projects in the omnibus flood-control bill. The lower Mississippi River is not provided for in that bill. The pending bill carries $72,000,000 for navigation and the remainder is largely for flood-control works; only a small amount will be paid to property owners for damages to property.

The same is true of the St. Francis River project, located wholly in the alluvial valley, if levees are constructed, the local interests will pay for the rights-of-way. The same situation will obtain along the Yazoo River. In the St. Francis, reservoirs can only be substituted for levees provided the expense to the Federal Government will not exceed the costs in the event the levee system obtains along the St. Francis River.

The amendment provides for the policy in the omnibus flood-control bill as adopted by the Senate. That bill embraces other rivers in practically every State in the Union. The same yardstick will be applied to all of the States and to all rivers, but in the pending bill floodways are to be provided to accommodate the waters that come from 31 States of the Union and without flood-control works, in maximum floods the entire lower Mississippi Valley constitutes a mighty river 50 miles wide and 1,100 miles long. The floodways are made necessary because of the floods that accumulate largely in the State of Louisiana from 31 States of the Union. They constitute a national flood-control works which are inadequate. The Yazoo River is affected by the backwaters of the Mississippi River. I repeat, to emphasize, that the Chief of Engineers recommends both the Yazoo and the St. Francis projects just as they appear in the pending bill.

The case is different with the 26 reservoirs along the Arkansas and the White. The areas protected by these reservoirs do not now contribute, nor have they ever contributed, to flood-control works along the Mississippi River. According to the Chief of Engineers, while the Federal Government has expended some $20,000,000 for flood-control in the lower Mississippi Valley and $160,000,000 for navigation along the Mississippi River, in all of the history of the Government, the local interests have fully complied with the principle of local contribution by having paid prior to 1928, $292,000,000, and by having paid since 1928, according to the Chief of Engineers, more than $41,000,000 additional.

I agree that a mistake was made in inserting the reservoirs along the Arkansas and the White. Protection will be provided for the tributaries without any local contribution for rights-of-way. The same is not true of the lower Mississippi Valley. There the people must pay for the rights-of-way for levees along the Mississippi River. The cases of these reservoirs are altogether different from the reservoirs along the St. Francis and the Yazoo; they are not in the alluvial valley; they have never paid for protection in the valley that they are not now receiving.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Jaworski] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. East] have both stated that they voted for the 26 reservoirs along the Arkansas and White under a misapprehension. The answer is that they voted for the amendment with their eyes open. It was a mistake. The amendment requiring the local interests to provide floodways is another mistake. The answer is that they voted for the amendment with their eyes open. It was a mistake. The amendment requiring the local interests to provide floodways is another mistake. The answer is that they voted for the amendment with their eyes open. It was a mistake. The amendment requiring the local interests to provide floodways is another mistake. The answer is that they voted for the amendment with their eyes open. It was a mistake. The amendment requiring the local interests to provide floodways is another mistake. The answer is that they voted for the amendment with their eyes open. It was a mistake. The amendment requiring the local interests to provide floodways is another mistake.
to pay for lands and for flowage rights in the floodways and reservoirs along the lower Mississippi River, should both be eliminated from the pending bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON of the United States (Mr. Wurtenberg) in an effort to undo what we did a little while ago after a long, stubborn, and fair debate. He is making this speech with the hope that when the bill comes up for final passage he will demand a separate vote on the Jenkins amendment that you will undo with a record vote of yourself, by voting down my amendment. You will not be so fickle as to change your minds just to save the pride of the committee. In 1928 this House voted more than $300,000,000 for the improvement and protection of the Mississippi Valley floodway. At that time it was not contemplated that the improvement we are voting on today was absolutely necessary. We spent that much money, and we did everything that the Army Engineers said at that time should be done.

Let us have this out on a fair argument. We voted that amount of money and spent that amount of money in the lower Mississippi Valley. They come forward today with a bill calling for approximately $300,000,000 more, and to that was added yesterday another $126,000,000. This makes a total of nearly $500,000,000 which this Congress is going to appropriate for three or four States in that territory down there. That may be all right and if it is right I am in favor of it, but I say it is not all right to vote that much money and then come in here next week and vote for an omnibus flood-control bill which takes in Colorado, Iowa, Pennsylvania, New England, Ohio, and practically 55 percent of the United States, and put upon them a different yardstick and a different burden by which they must pay for improvements in their respective sections. That bill will provide for every dollar's worth of improvements which the Government puts into the projects provided for therein. The people must provide the rights-of-way and must provide for the payment of damages. That bill will provide just as my amendment seeks to have this bill provide; it will provide that the Government will not construct any project unless some local authority, State, or municipality will come forward with a substantial contribution.

Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Mississippi mean to say that he the conventionally stands up here this week, when the other flood-relief bills come up for consideration, and as a member of the Flood Relief Committee, say to the Pittsburgh district, to Pennsylvania, and to all other parts of the United States that they will have to pay for their own floodways, while down in the Southland in the meantime he has provided that the Government shall pay the total cost of their projects without any State or local participation whatsoever? Is this a battle between the Northland and the Southland? But why should the three States of Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana have an appropriation of over $400,000,000, free from local participation, while all the other 45 States will be getting about one-half that much and will be called upon to match in most instances dollar for dollar with the Government for all projects constructed in these 45 other States?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No; I prefer not to yield at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask in all frankness, are we going to say to one section that we will build their improvements, we will pay everything, and then say to the Ohio Valley, the Connecticut Valley, the Pennsylvania Valley, the Missouri Valley, and all other sections of the United States that if they want the Government to put in improvements they will have to put up dollar for dollar? No; that is not fair; it is not reasonable; it is not just and will not prevail.

I appeal to the Members on the other side to maintain their position on the Jenkins amendment, because the President has put his stamp of approval on it. The position of Senator COPELAND and the action of the Senate yesterday indicate what the position of the President is. He will not approve any plan that does not call for local contributions and local participation. He has already made his position, and if you want your bill passed you should leave the Jenkins amendment in it, because it provides for what the President thinks is right.

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is there any project in the amendment to which the gentleman has referred, passed by the House, that provides for three floodways 10 miles wide and taking 200,000 acres of land and put upon them a different yardstick and a different burden by which they must pay for improvements in their respective sections. That bill will provide for every dollar's worth of improvements which the Government puts into the projects provided for therein.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is not the point. We have not recognized or challenged the merits or the necessity of any of these projects. We have no special interest in that floodway. If that floodway is so necessary, why did you not build it with the $325,000,000 that we gave you last year and the year before? That is simply a continuation of a project that is going to call for about $1,000,000,000, and you want this Congress to vote $1,000,000,000 to your section, and you do not propose to contribute a nickel, but whenever the floods come 25 feet high in the business districts of Pittsburgh, and rise 25 feet in the business districts of New England, and when the beautiful, prosperous, and thickly populated Ohio Valley is inundated from hill to hill with a great sea of murky water 1,000 miles long, carrying danger, sickness, and death to hundreds of its citizens, and hundreds of millions of dollars in damages to the people, the municipalities, and the States, you want them to stand for this loss year after year; and when they ask for relief from the Government you want to say to them, "You shall not have any relief unless you match dollar for dollar with the Government." No, my friends, do not be misled.

You should stay with your vote on this amendment, because it is reasonable, it is fair, and it is just. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is very unfortunate to have these controversies, but we ought not to proceed here with a misunderstanding and on misstatements of facts put into the Record by the gentleman from Ohio.

Those who are now determined to defeat this bill make the statement that back in 1928, when this legislation came up, $325,000,000 was appropriated to carry out and execute this project. I say to you that was only appropriated as a part of the expense then known to be necessary, and the position of the Army Engineers was that at the time so reported, and it was known by the Congress in passing on the legislation that an expenditure of $750,000,000 would be necessary to complete this project. The 1928 act was adopted with that knowledge in the possession of Congress at the time and an appropriation was made to carry on the work as far as $325,000,000 would go.

Almost all of this money has been expended, and the Army engineers, acting pursuant to a resolution adopted by your Flood Control Committee, after having made a further study of the matter, report that if you will substitute the Everson floodway for the Bœuf, the cost of which was included in the estimate of $775,000,000, the work can be done at less expense and at a saving of millions of dollars and that it will conserve 500,000 acres of the most fertile lands of the Mississippi Valley and keep it for utilization instead of converting it into a floodway. The highest authority on the part of the President of the United States must rely and the authority upon which you and I, as Members of Congress, ought to rely for guidance upon technical problems of this sort, has so recommended.

So this is not a plea for more money. It is only legislation for the authorization of the money that was contained in the act of 1928, and a plan for the control of floods in the lower Mississippi.

May I make this observation in conclusion? Mr. Chairman, we have a fight here for flood control. This Nation
is flood-control conscious. They want flood-control legislation. Here is an adopted project that has been recommended by the proper authorities. Vote against this bill today and you vote to retard the progress that this Nation is looking forward to in flood-control legislation. Here is your right on the Republican side of the House. Are you going to follow them today? The chairman of the Flood Control Committee that reported out the original 1928 act and passed it was a Republican. We are trying to carry out the program then adopted. Today you find the opposition to a progressive flood-control program for this Nation over there on the Republican side, where we might expect it. I call upon you as Democrats who sympathize with flood-control legislation, not to crucify this bill with this Republican amendment that will destroy it and delay and postpone the day when we may have protection in this great valley and when you will get flood relief in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and in other States and valleys of the Nation. I ask my Democratic friends to support the bill.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, all I wish to say to the committee at this time is that I am not trying to obstruct flood-control legislation, not to crucify this bill with this Republican amendment that will destroy it and delay and postpone the day when we may have protection in all the country. The Mississippi Valley now has $63,900,000 to spend at the present time and they will not suffer. We have done more for them than any other section of the country regarding flood control.

I want to see a flood-control bill for the lower Mississippi, but it ought to be handled in the same way that it is in all other sections of the country. Let us treat everybody in this country alike, regardless of where they live.

I am free to say that

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from Arkansas precipitated a partisan question. This is not a partisan matter. Waters that come down the Wabash, waters that come down the Ohio, waters that come down through Pennsylvania and Connecticut, are a partisan question, and we are only asking justice for those States. Under this bill the reservoirs should be paid for in the same way that flood control is paid for under the omnibus bill passed by the Senate on yesterday. We want to help these people in the lower Mississippi. If it is proper to pay for them, it is proper to help those in other sections who have lost their farms because they could not pay the damages caused by the flood and taxes too.

We want those in other States to have the same rights that you give the people in the lower Mississippi. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Let us have it that way. Let us make this Overton bill conform to the omnibus Senate bill as the Jenkins amendment does make it.

The omnibus flood-control bill was passed and went to the Senate last season. For some reason it was held up until the Overton bill came out. The Overton bill was never introduced until this session. That bill passed the Senate and came to the House. It gave the omnibus flood bill the "run around." There was a gentleman in the other body who took the attitude, when the Overton bill was up, that only the Engineers' report could be accepted, and that same gentleman yesterday voted to take the projects in the omnibus bill out of the Engineers' hands and put it in the hands of someone else.

Let us make this bill as it should be. Let us have a national policy. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. (Applause.)

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want this bill to have a fair and reasonable consideration, but I do not know any way by which we can do it satisfactorily with the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio in the bill. That amendment is connected with the Senate omnibus flood bill, but it has no place in this bill. This project in the lower Mississippi Valley, authorized by this bill, is not on the same basis as any other flood-control project in America.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. When we passed the omnibus bill last year—the bill the gentleman speaks of—the bill went over to the Senate, and the Senate put it on the shelf by reason of a speech by Senator Tydings, did it not?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I do not know what it did. I know that we passed it, and that we expect to carry it out, and that we have spent in the Ohio River, without any local contribution, over $160,000,000.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is it not a fact that the Senate put it on the shelf by reason of Senator Tydings' speech, and he made fun of it because it did not have any yardstick in it or measurement at all? That is what they put in the bill yesterday in the Senate.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. We are not responsible for that. Take the Ohio River. We spent over $160,000,000 there, without local contribution, but in this alluvial valley the Government, after close consideration, acknowledged a national responsibility to carry out that project to completion. There are some 30,000 square miles of territory that must carry the drainage of practically 43 percent of the Nation. The local communities that have contributed much more than others will under the basis of the Jenkins amendment. They have already complied with it, and because of that and in acknowledgment of this national obligation we come forward here with a recommendation for the completion of the project. I appeal to the membership against the amendment that will destroy this opportunity.

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

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Something has been said about the President's view. Does not the Chief of Engineers recommend this bill, as it is advocated by the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes; and in the floodways is where the burden is placed by carrying the water. Take the lower Atchafalaya Basin. There are 60,000 acres in one floodway to carry the water, sometimes as high as a million cubic feet per second. The Government has allotted a little over $2,000,000 to pay for the flowage rights there for all time. In the Eudora floodway there are 22,000 acres, and less than $15,600,000 is allotted to provide for the flowage rights for all time to come. So it is not upon the basis of the other projects. I have advocated those and expect to do so to carry out a comprehensive program. I am free to say that you are getting more relief, more Federal assistance, under the Senate bill for those areas outside of the Mississippi Valley than has been given to the lower Mississippi Valley.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired. All time has expired. Under the rule the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLANNAGAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill S. 531, and, pursuant to House Resolution 561, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote upon the Jenkins amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put the other amendments en gros. The question is on agreeing to the remaining amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.
The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Jenkins amendment.

The Clerk reported the Jenkins amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JARVES of Ohio) there were—ayes 74, noes 61. So the Jenkins amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the third reading of the Senate bill. The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WITTMER) there were—ayes 88, noes 79.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nay votes were demanded.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 161, nays 156, not voting 109, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll No. 106</th>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>NAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boland with Mr. Burnham.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Sears with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Cary with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Samuel B. Hill with Mr. Risk.
Mr. Corning with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Granfield with Mr. Perkins.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Britt with Mr. Ferguson.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Moreau.
Mr. Weyer with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Dingle with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Buhl with Mr. Andrews of Massachusetts.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Doughton.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Briscoe with Mr. McKeough.
Mr. Deen with Mr. Kennedy of New York.
Mr. Gearhart with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Robinson of New York with Mr. Deen.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Robinson of New York.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Robinson of New York.
Mr. Boillette with Mr. Goodrich.
Mr. Engel with Mr. Goodrich.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Ferguson.

General pairs:

Mr. Boland with Mr. Burnham.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Sears with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Cary with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Samuel B. Hill with Mr. Risk.
Mr. Corning with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Granfield with Mr. Perkins.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Britt with Mr. Ferguson.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Moreau.
Mr. Weyer with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Dingle with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Buhl with Mr. Andrews of Massachusetts.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Doughton.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Briscoe with Mr. McKeough.
Mr. Deen with Mr. Kennedy of New York.
Mr. Gearhart with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Robinson of New York with Mr. Deen.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Robinson of New York.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Robinson of New York.
Mr. Boillette with Mr. Goodrich.
Mr. DELANEY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."
Mr. THOMASON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."
Mr. McFARLANE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."
Mr. RYAN changed his vote from "no" to "aye."
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion by Mr. Wilson of Louisiana, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 10630) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, and I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to amendments 24, 53, and 54, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman from Colorado moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments 24, 53, and 54, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AYERS. What is this conference report?

The SPEAKER. The conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Mr. AYERS. The conference report from the Senate of Colorado. It is on the three amendments still in dispute between the Senate and the House. We have agreed upon 88 of the amendments, but there are three upon which we have not agreed.

Mr. AYERS. Is the gentleman asking that we yield all the rights that we have on irrigation and reclamation?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No, the gentleman from Colorado. We must go back to conference. We do not yield any of the rights.

Mr. AYERS. I want to know if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations still maintains his right that the House insist on its disagreement to all of the Indian irrigation program amendments that were put in by the Senate.

Mr. AYERS. I state that this motion is to appoint conferees to consider those three amendments again. We have forfeited no rights, and before they can be adopted they will have to be brought back here for a separate vote.

Mr. AYERS. But when the gentleman says "we have forfeited no rights," it means that you have not forfeited any right that is against all of us from the irrigation districts. Is that right or not?

Mr. BUCHANAN. We have to come back to the House. When I said "we" I meant the entire membership of the House. Whatever is done has to come back to the House for the final decision before anything can happen.

Mr. AYERS. Does that mean the same steam-roller program that was put over on us Wednesday?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not know why the gentleman calls it a "steam-roller program." It means the same character of fight, if you insist on those amendments passing. I will state that to the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. This is the regular procedure, and the only course we can adopt is to further insist on our disagreements and have a further conference.

Mr. AYERS. All I want to know is, are we 11 States going to have a chance for our "white alley" or are we going to be subdued by New York and the Northeast and Texas, which State has forgotten its rights to us and has gone "New England." Good-bye, Texas; we thought we were associated, but we were wrong. You belong to New England.

Mr. AYERS. We are sorry to lose you, but Tammany says what you shall do. And God forgive you—but do it.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TAYLOR).

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments to the Senate bill (H. R. 9496) for the protection of the United States against loss in the delivery through the mails of checks in payment of benefits provided by laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order on the conference report that it includes an appropriation which is contrary to the rules of the House and Senate.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order until the statement is read?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I will reserve the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEAD) that the statement may be read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

DISCRIMINATION IN MERCHANDISING

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following report (Rept. No. 2753, H. Res. 523) for printing in the Record:

House Resolution 323

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 8442, a bill "Making it unlawful for any person engaged in commerce to discriminate in price or terms of sale between purchasers of commodities of like kind and degree of quality, to prohibit the payment of brokerage or commission under certain conditions, to suppress pseudo-advertising allowances, to provide an effective and prompt means of redress, and to provide for the administration of this act," and to move for the previous question after the reading of the bill, and to ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means to be printed for consideration by the House.

The request was agreed to.

The Speaker announced the following conferees: Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, Mr. JACOBSEN, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. WIGGLEWORTH.
connection it is to be noted that 15 officials, assistants in various capacities to Cabinet officers, are receiving salaries of $10,000 per annum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of State</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Interior</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the so-called independent agencies, where administration is similar in many respects to that of the regular departments, officials and assignments to those of the Assistant Postmasters General are receiving salaries ranging from $10,000 to $12,500 per annum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Salary (per annum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Commerce Commission:</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 at 11 at 12 at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping Board, 3 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Power Commission, 4 at 5 at 6 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Trade Commission, 4 at 5 at 6 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Tariff Commission, 4 at 5 at 6 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Accounting Office, 1 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Tax Appeals, 16 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction Finance Corporation:</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 at 24 at 25 at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Home Loan Bank Board, 6 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans’ Administration, 1 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Communications Commission, 7 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Joint Commission, 3 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Claims Commission, 2 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Recovery Administration, 3 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, 1 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Emergency Relief Administration, 1 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Security Board of Loan, 5 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Credit Administration, 8 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Coordinator of Transportation, 8 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Trade Adviser and head of Export-Import Banks, 1 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Alcohol Control Administration, 3 at</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Labor Relations Board, 3 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Housing Administration, 1 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities and Exchange Commission, 5 at</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are approximately 143 officials in the executive branch of the Government in these categories. This group does not include the judicial or legislative branches of the Government.

JAS. M. MEAD, DONALD C. DOBBINS, PHILIP A. GOODYEAR, MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas again state his point of order?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the conference report on the ground that it includes an amendment of the Senate not germane to the bill and on the further ground that the Senate amendment carries an appropriation, which is not permissible on a legislative bill other than a general appropriation bill.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is for the purpose of enabling the Post Office Department to carry on its work in connection with the distribution and redemption of the adjusted-service certificates.

The House passed the bill some time ago. When it was considered by the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads an amendment was inserted increasing the salaries of the four Assistant Postmasters General from $9,000 to $10,000 a year. It is not, in my judgment, an appropriation, but is an authorization; and I am advised by the Post Office Department that it will be carried out without requesting an appropriation from this Congress. It will be carried out in the next fiscal year.

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

Mr. MEAD. Gladly.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not contend that the raising of the salaries of the four Assistant Postmasters General is an appropriation. The appropriation is contained in the original of the bill, whereas the Postmaster General is authorized to estimate the administrative expense of performing certain duties and authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to allot the money to the Postmaster General, Mr. MEAD. With regard to that section of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the gentleman from Texas has any objection. His objection is lodged against the last section on a roll which authorizes the four Assistant Postmasters General. I maintain this is an authorization rather than an appropriation.

The SPEAKER. Had the House acted on that? Was that matter in conference between the two bodies?

Mr. MEAD. The House and Senate conferences agreed—

The SPEAKER. That is not the question. The question of the Chair is whether that matter was in conference between the two bodies at the time the conferences met.

Mr. MEAD. Yes; it was a subject of the conference, brought to the conference by an amendment of the Senate.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. AYERS. The gentleman proposes to raise the salary of the four Assistant Postmasters General but not the salaries of the postmasters, I understand?

Mr. MEAD. It pertains only to the four Assistant Postmasters General.

Mr. AYERS. Does not the gentleman think he should include the postmasters who do the work?

Mr. MEAD. Some postmasters in the field now receive more pay than the Assistant Postmasters General.

Mr. AYERS. I disagree with the gentleman. I think the gentleman should include the postmasters out in the field.

Mr. MEAD. We ought to put them under civil service.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD], chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, presents a conference report signed by the conferences on the part of the Senate and the House. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] makes the point of order that the conference report is out of order because the conference on the part of the House in conference agreed to an amendment of the Senate providing an appropriation contrary to the rules of the House.

Senate amendment no. 1 contains the following language:

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to advance, from time to time, to the Postmaster General, from the appropriation contained in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936, approved February 11, 1936, for "administrative expenses, adjusted-compensation payments Act, 1936, Treasury Department, 1936 and 1937", such sums as are certified by the Postmaster General to be required for the expenses of the Post Office Department in connection with the handling of the bonds issued hereunder. Such bonds—

This amendment also contains the following language:

The Secretary of the Treasury shall reimburse the Postmaster General, from the aforesaid appropriation contained in said supplemental appropriation act, for such postal and other service fees as may be required in connection with such transmission.

Rule XX, clause 2, of the rules of the House of Representatives, reads as follows:

No amendment of the Senate to a general appropriation bill which would be in violation of the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI, if said amendment had originated in the House, nor any amendment of the Senate providing for an appropriation upon any bill other than a general appropriation bill, shall be agreed to by the managers on the part of the House unless specific authority to agree to such amendment shall be first given by the House by a separate vote on every such amendment.

It is clear to the Chair that the managers on the part of the House in agreeing to a conference amendment no. 1 violated the provisions of rule XX, inasmuch as the amendment provides an appropriation.

The Chair therefore sustains the point of order. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, if the conference report is out of order, how can we consider it?

The SPEAKER. The amendments are before the House and must be disposed of.

Mr. SNELL. I supposed that the whole report went out.
The SPEAKER. The report goes out, but that leaves the amendments before the House, and some action must be taken on them. It is for the House to say what action it will take.

Page 3, after line 5, insert:

"Sec. 2. Section 4 of the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"At the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General may, in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, designate postmasters and other employees of the Post Office Department and of the Postal Service to perform, without extra compensation, such fiscal-agency services as may be desirable or necessary in connection with the redemption and payment of the bonds issued under this section; and the Postmaster General may require an indemnity bond from any postmaster or such other employee as he may determine for the faithful performance of such fiscal-agency duties."

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to advance, from time to time, to the Postmaster General, from the appropriation contained in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936, approved February 11, 1936, for "Administrative expenses, Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, Treasury Department, 1936 and 1937," such sums as are certified by the Postmaster General to be required for the expenses of the Post Office Department in connection with the handling of the bonds issued hereunder. Such bonds, when received by postmasters for purpose of redemption and payment, shall be handled by the postmasters under such special regulations as may be promulgated by the Postmaster General. They shall be transmitted between post offices or from the Post Office Department, or fiscal-agency services, without advance payment of any required postage. The Secretary of the Treasury shall reimburse the Postmaster General, for the fiscal-agency services furnished in connection with the handling of such bonds as he may prescribe, issue a duplicate thereof without requiring the furnishing of an indemnity bond."

Mr. MAPES (interrupting the reading of the Senate amendment). Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, supplementing what the gentleman from New York [Mr. Sneed] has said, an attempt was made to get this bill before the House by calling up the conference report and the conference report was held out in order to move that the amendment be adopted. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, in answer to the gentleman from Michigan, reads from section 3257 of Cannon's Precedents:

"When a conference report is ruled out of order the bill and amendments are again before the House as when first presented, and motions relating to amendments and conference are again in order.

The Chair thinks that completely answers the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. That seems to cover the matter.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Mapes] has asked whether or not the amendment, if it is adopted by the House, will pass it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Are amendments put on a House bill by the Senate privileged?

The SPEAKER. After the stage of disagreement has been reached they are. For this reason it is necessary that the House take some action upon the amendments at this time.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Is it in order to move that the amendments of the Senate be referred to the appropriate legislative committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will pass on that question in due time.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I make such motion at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from New York [Mr. Mapes].

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. SNEILL. Mr. Speaker, is that the first amendment?

The SPEAKER. The first amendment; yes.

Mr. SNEILL. Section 2?

The SPEAKER. Section 2.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, after line 5, amendment no. 2, insert:

3. The salary of any Assistant Postmasters General is hereby fixed at a rate of $10,000 per annum, effective on the date of the passage of this act."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division of that motion.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Buchanan].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, during this entire session of Congress, so far as I have been able to do, I have objected to and done everything I could to prevent the increase in salary of any Government employee, and so far as I know, unless it happened when I was in the hospital, no salaries have been increased.

Mr. Speaker, this bill went over to the Senate with no salary increases in it. It has been sent back here with salary increases to four Assistant Postmasters General, allowing them an increase of $1,000 each per annum. These Assistant Postmasters General are now receiving $9,000 a year. Their offices cost them nothing. They are handed the money and then for the faithful performance of the fiscal-agency duties they demand an increase of $1,000. And so far as I know, it is the demand of every Assistant Postmasters General and we have the comparison of salaries in this country for the last few years. They are all salaries of $9,000 a year, and the Postmaster General is $10,000.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is not the time nor the occasion to start increasing the pay of $9,000-a-year Government employees.

Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of South Carolina. Does not the gentleman from Texas think that this tendency would delay the time when we may return the 2 cents postage back to the people of the country?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Maybe so.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the report of the Senate committee.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Are these increases due to the fact that the Assistant Postmasters General are compelled to do additional work while the Postmaster General himself is traveling all over the country making New Deal speeches?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I cannot answer the gentleman’s question, but I may say to him the Senate committee offered two conclusions in justification of these increases, and these conclusions are as follows:

Your committee being of the opinion that the salaries of these four Assistant Postmasters General, $9,000 each, should be the same as the Assistant Postmasters General, recommends the passage of this section making the salaries $10,000 each.

Now, let us see what are the facts. You know some sub-committees that are anxious to do a particular thing, for some cause that I know not of, often reach conclusions and advance reasons hastily without examining the facts. There is one Assistant Secretary in the Government service who is getting $10,000, and that is The Assistant Secretary of...
Mr. BUCHANAN. I said Assistant Secretaries and did not say Under Secretaries or Over Secretaries, or Secretaries either. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, I will read this list of Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries:

Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Tugwell, $10,000; and one Assistant Secretary of Agriculture at $9,000.

Department of Commerce, two Assistant Secretaries at $9,000 each.

Interior Department, Under Secretary, $10,000; and two Assistant Secretaries at $9,500 each.

Department of Justice, six Assistant Attorneys General at $9,000 each.

Labor Department, two Assistant Secretaries, one at $9,000 and one at $9,000.

Navy Department, one Assistant Secretary at $9,000.

Post Office Department, four Assistant Postmasters General at $9,000 each.

State Department, one Under Secretary at $10,000, one Assistant Secretary of State and three Assistant Secretaries at $8,500 each.

Treasury Department, one Under Secretary at $10,000 and three Assistant Secretaries at $8,000 each.

War Department, one Assistant Secretary at $10,000.

Adopt this amendment and every Assistant Secretary throughout the Government service will come in and say, "You have given the Assistant Postmasters General $10,000 each, whether they are principal assistants or not, and you should give us $10,000."

I have never yet heard anyone on the floor of this House say that salaries are too much and that they ought to be decreased. The statement is always made that they are too small and ought to be increased. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there is a real and important responsibility devolving upon the House here today in the matter presented by the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. It is really a serious question when you talk about raising salaries at the present time, in view of the present condition of the Federal Treasury. It is not just the amount of the salary of these four men, but a question of policy. Is there any reason at the present for raising salaries of all Assistant Secretaries?

The Federal Treasury during the time that the present administration has been in power has actually spent a little more than $2 for every dollar that has been received, to say nothing about the contingent liabilities. This is actual money that has gone out, according to the reports of the Treasury Department.

Your party came into power with a definite promise to the people of the United States, and every one of you said that you accepted your platform 100 percent and went before your constituents with this promise. You have done nothing for the last 3 years but increase salaries and create new positions.

There is no reason that any man on God's footstool can advance for raising these salaries from $9,000 to $10,000. According to the statement which the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has just read, there are 19 other Assistant Secretaries who are entitled to have their pay raised to $10,000 if you are going to raise the four assistants in the Post Office Department. I doubt that any of these assistants are going to resign, and I doubt that there would be any trouble in filling the positions at this salary. If you have $10,000 to give, I will agree to furnish some able men to do the work at that figure. [Laughter.]

I appreciate the fact it is up to the majority here what the House is going to do. You have the votes, and if you have made up your minds that you have no responsibility in the spending of the taxpayers' money, you can do it, but I call the attention of the House and the country to what you are doing today. There is not a single reason in the world why this should be done, and every one of you knows it. The argument that there will be delay in the payment of the soldiers' bonus is so silly that the man who presents such an argument ought to apologize to the House. The only other argument—that the Senate has done this and discharged its conferences—is equally weak. When did we surrender to the Senate all our rights to act according to our own judgment in the matter of spending the taxpayers' money? The committee has put up a pretty poor reason in support of its position, and I trust it will be voted down. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I would like to ask the gentleman where he is going to get the money. [Laughter.]

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, this is a fight against paying $4,000 in the carrying out of a measure that requires an expenditure of over $3,000,000,000.

I expected some opposition to this amendment, and I anticipated that perhaps the question of politics might enter into the discussion.

I want to say to you, however, that I have not heard a word either for or against this bill from the Postmaster General, nor have I been importuned by any Assistant Postmaster General in favor of this bill.

Let me tell you something about the history of this amendment. It was not considered by our committee when the bill was before us, but was inserted by the Senate committee, by unanimous consent of Republicans and Democrats, after the measure passed the House.

It has taken before the Senate, adopted by Republicans and Democrats without a dissenting vote, and was then sent to conference on the part of the House and the Senate, all in accordance with proper order and procedure. The Senate conference insisted on its retention, and the House conference agreed to report it back to the House, where we now have it under consideration.

We are anxious to pass this measure because it is imperative to prepare for payment of the bonus. The conference report has been adopted in the Senate and the Senate conference has been discharged. There is only one more necessary step, and that is the one now before us. We have but a short time before the bonus payments will be made, and it is necessary that we act expeditiously on this matter.

A question was raised in regard to the payment of salaries for comparable positions in other bureaus or departments. I have here an Official Register of the United States for 1932—remember that prior to 1932 most of these increases were adopted by the party that preceded the present administration. According to that record there are in comparable positions in various departments and commissions of the Government over 140 men whose salaries range from $10,000 to $12,500 a year.

A breakdown to more easy terms will show that there is one of these positions in the State Department, seven in the Treasury Department, one in the War Department, two in the Justice Department, one in the Interior Department, and three in the Department of Agriculture.

In addition to that there are assistants, as follows: 4 in the Interstate Commerce Commission, 3 in the Shipping Board, 16 on the Board of Tax Appeals, 52 in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, 3 in the Federal Alcohol Administration, 5 in the Securities and Exchange Commission, and so on all the way down the line, according to the score, which I have at my hand. When this salary amendment came before us we discussed it with the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget.

We had no opposition from that source. In fact, I believe I can say to you that we had the approval of that Bureau.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have had no approval from him, and I discussed it with him one way or the other.

Mr. MEAD. Perhaps the gentleman from Texas would have had that approval if the matter had been before his committee, but, fortunately or unfortunately, it is a matter
our committee had to consider as it was inserted in our bill by the Senate. I claim it is not an unusual request, because the House has gone out of its way to do this in a 190 official's salary increasing that range all the way up from $10,000 to $12,500 a year.

Let us for a moment inquire into the activities of the various bureaus of the Post Office Department, and then in your mind compare them with the activities of the governmental agencies in departments. Within the last 10 or 12 years we have loaded the Post Office Department with many difficult tasks and assignments. The Post Office Department has control of ocean-mail contracts and subsidies. We have also given them jurisdiction of domestic and foreign air mail, with all of the ensuing contracts and subsidies needed to keep up that service. We have called upon the Post Office Department to classify, handle, and distribute mail for a large number of Government agencies, a task which was not theirs a few years ago. We have called upon them to distribute, sell, and account for the migratory bird hunting stamps, amounting to some $600,000 annually and entailing a great deal of detail work. We have authorized the Post Office Department to become the bond-selling agency of the Treasury, and we are now selling approximately $350,000,000 of bonds through the post offices of the United States. And after June 15 the Post Office will be collecting taxes and the custodial care of 1,800 Government buildings located all over the United States has been taken over from the Treasury Department by the Post Office Department. That work alone costs $20,000,000 and employs thousands of additional workers.

Mr. LUDLOW. For the purpose of clarification, just what is the justification for this increase of salary of the Assistant Postmasters General? Is it due to the general increase of the postmasters? or is it directly to the increased work imposed upon them by the bonus?

Mr. MEAD. It is my opinion that it was inserted in the bill by the Senate because of the fact that we have assigned to the Post Office Department many additional tasks, and also because the executives of these four bureaus are doing more work with heavier responsibilities than is the case in comparable positions in other departments paying higher salaries. It was the merit and the justice of the case that brought about the unanimous adoption of this amendment by both the Republicans and the Democrats in the Senate. Mr. LUDLOW. Our subcommittee that brings in the appropriation bill spent week after week in exhaustive hearings. In those hearings we are not bound by any rules of evidence. The sky is the limit. The testimony brings out everything that is relevant to the Postal Service and many things that are not. In all of that great volume of testimony, on the record and off the record, not one word was said and not even an intimation was given that the four Assistant Postmasters General were not receiving adequate compensation for their services.

The regular way to bring this matter before Congress would be to submit it to the House Committee on the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill spent week after week in exhaustive hearings. In those hearings we are not bound by any rules of evidence. The sky is the limit. The testimony brings out everything that is relevant to the Postal Service and many things that are not. In all of that great volume of testimony, on the record and off the record, not one word was said and not even an intimation was given that the four Assistant Postmasters General were not receiving adequate compensation for their services.

The regular way to bring this matter before Congress would be to submit it to the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, which is the legislative committee having charge of legislation for the Postal Establishment, but as far as I can learn there were no hearings in that quarter and it was never proposed to that committee. Instead we suddenly find these increases attached by a rider in the Senate, and we would least expect them, and where they have no business to be.

I think the Members of the House should stand by the chairman of our Appropriations Committee, Mr. BUCHANAN, who is making such a valiant fight to maintain the integrity of our appropriating and legislative system. If the friends of these capable postal officials will come before our House committees in the regular way and present facts showing that they are entitled to salary increases, I, for one, will be responsive to the merit of their claim, but I do not approve this strange and extraordinary way of trying to attach these increases as a rider to a bill that has no relevancy to salaries in the Postal Service. I dislike to disagree with such good friends as the officials referred to and those Members of Congress who are on the other side of this proposition, but I have a duty to perform, and I am trying to perform it.

Mr. MEAD. I presume, in that connection, but I may be incorrect, that it is the prerogative of the Gentleman of Individual Members, just as it is the prerogative of the gentleman's committee or of any other committee of the House, to bring to the attention of the Congress not only this matter but every matter that recommends itself to the individual member or to the committee.

Mr. LUDLOW. Does not the gentleman understand that, if this carries through here, every assistant secretary of every department will come here for an increased appropriation?

Mr. MEAD. That question should have been raised years ago when they increased the salaries of 140 others whose
work, in many instances, in my judgment, is not comparable to the work and responsibility of these four bureau heads.

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

Mr. MEAD. I think so; yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are their salaries of $9,000 fixed by law at the present time?

Mr. MEAD. I should like to finish my statement, Mr. Speaker, and the committee on Appropriations?

Mr. McCORMACK. As I said before, in my judgment, these matters, along with other similar matters, become the responsibility of every Member of the House and the Senate, and I really believe that we are within our authority in considering and approving this amendment.

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

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. TABER. The work on the bonus will not last over 2 or 3 months, and these people are being paid what they have been paid for years. There is no real, legitimate reason for any increase.

Mr. MEAD. It is no doubt true that a large part of the bonus payments will be completed in a few months, but it will take many months to complete the task and attend to the numerous details.

I want to finish the account of the added responsibility that I was enumerating to you when I was interrupted. In many instances these are permanent duties. While the bonus task is a temporary and passing one, although a major one, the other matters I am bringing to your attention are permanent tasks assigned to these bureau heads. A number of years ago we organized the Interdepartmental Building Committee, and today the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General is the representative of his Department on that committee. That committee has charge of the spending of a large appropriation in the selection of sites and the construction of Federal buildings in the carrying out of vast public-building programs all over America.

In addition, the Post Office Department conducts the largest bank in the world, the Postal Savings Bank, which comes under the Third Assistant Postmaster General.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MEAD. I should like to finish my statement, if I may.

Our postal executives conduct the largest business in the world. We distribute business, with over a quarter of a million employees. It is the most efficient business in the world, and the performance of the present administration, the record of those four men involved in this small, minor authorization, has earned the approval of this House. When they took over the conduct of the Post Office Department they found a net deficit amounting to approximately $150,000,000 a year, but I am pleased to advise that in a year they took the Post Office Department out of the red and put it in the black. In 1934 the surplus amounted to $12,000,000 a year. In 1935 it amounted to $5,000,000 a year. In 1936 the service will approximately carry itself.

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

Mr. MEAD. I must refuse until finishing my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Now, summing up, where in the Federal service is there an administrator, an undersecretary, an assistant secretary, or anyone else, whose duties can compare with the tremendous responsibility lodged in the authority of these four men? They have specific duties. They have duties that are tremendous.

The Congress of the United States on frequent occasions in the passage of measures affecting the Post Office Department, has placed on them the burden of administration in the Postal Service. They have the ocean and air subsidies. They administer the largest express business in the country. They are the biggest bankers in the country. They are the biggest bond-selling agency in the country. They operate the biggest business on earth, and they have made that business, formerly a drain upon the Treasury, one that is paying its own way.

I say to you, if we are paying 143 men in other departments more money than we are paying these four men whose records stand out so well, we ought to adopt this conference report in its entirety and quit quibbling over $4,000, when we are assigning them a task that amounts to $3,000,000,000.

The Senate has disposed of this measure. It has discharged its conferrees. The envelopes are being prepared for the disposition of this huge bonus-paying task. We want to take care of it promptly, and expeditiously, and I ask you not to hold up the payment of the bonus to the veterans by quibbling over a minor matter contained in the bill that is before us by the approval of both parties in the other Chamber.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must yield some time to my colleague [Mr. Dossares], and therefore I think it would be an imposition to yield to other Members at this time.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Speaker, I think, from inquiries that have come to me, there is some misapprehension as to the purpose of this amendment. This is not an award of the Assistant Postmasters General of $1,000 a year for their work in helping pay the bonus. This bill, which was carefully studied during the adjournment of Congress, in conference between the Treasury and Post Office officials, was introduced at the very last of this session of Congress. The purpose of this bill is to provide for the use, in this three and one-half billion dollars of bonus payments, of that same form of envelope that has been in use for 50 years in the payment of pensions to Civil War veterans, and later to other veterans. It provides safety in the delivery of these payments, and places a penalty upon any postal employee who delivers them to the wrong person. It is necessary in the administration of this law. The Senate attached to that as a rider this provision increasing, quite justly, in my own individual opinion, the salaries of these four Assistant Postmasters General from $3,000 to $10,000. The conference met with this statement and we insist on the House amendment. It may take a long while to dispose of this matter if we send this bill back to the Senate again.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman mean to tell the House and the country that payment of the bonus will be delayed for one single minute if we do not increase the salaries of these four Assistant Postmasters General?

Mr. DOBBINS. Because of the parliamentary situation—

Mr. SNELL. Answer my question, please.

Mr. DOBBINS. It is not because of that, but because of the parliamentary situation that will ensue if we refuse to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. SNELL. I cannot follow the gentleman in his reasoning.

Mr. DOBBINS. Concurrence of the Senate is needed in this bill to provide needed machinery for the payment of the bonus and the Senate may not concur in its adoption unless we adopt this amendment. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further.

Mr. SNELL. Could not the Senate rescind and adopt the House bill?

Mr. DOBBINS. Yes; but they have dismissed their conferences and would have to go through the procedure all over again. It might take a week or 10 days.
Mr. SNELL. They could appoint new conference in a minute.

Mr. DOBBINS. When the question of the payment of the adjourned-service certificates was under consideration in Congress the President was not in favor of it, but immediately after the act was passed and became a law he started the machinery in motion for the prompt payment of the bonus. From that day to this the Treasury Department and the Veterans' Administration have been exerting every effort to get this payment out promptly on the 15th day of June, but I seriously apprehend that they cannot get it out promptly unless we adopt the motion of the gentleman from New York.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAxel].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing to the story that the payment of the bonus will be delayed if we do not adopt this amendment. The bill can go back to the Senate and on Monday the Senate can recede on section 3, proceed to a conference and send it to the White House. There is absolutely no question about that; it does not have to go to conference again.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

The previous question was ordered. Mr. Mead, of course, could do that, but they will not accept the bill as it passed the House. They will insist on their amendment.

Mr. TABER. They will not insist.

Mr. DOBBINS. We are delaying the payment of the bonus.

Mr. TABER. We are not delaying it a minute.

Turning now to the 140 officers who draw more than $9,000 a year, their salaries were fixed by legislative action of the House after careful and scientific investigation. These positions relate to such administrative bureaus as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and similar branches of government.

I am not going to discuss anything of a political character here because I think it would be unseemly. I will not discuss the question of the administration of the Post Office Department. I could suggest that perhaps the Postmaster General might spend more time there, but I am not going to do that.

[Laughter.]

It is absolutely ridiculous for us under these circumstances to increase to $10,000 the salaries of men who have never occupied administrative positions of the character calling for even as much, let alone more, money than they are now receiving as salaries, especially with conditions in the country as they are. I hope the House of Representatives will stand for at least a semblance of economy and vote down these increases.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to use any additional time. I merely want to point out that it is not a very serious offense to consider a question like this, because the Republican Party increased the salaries of the Assistant Postmasters General when they were in power.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 2.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Skell) there were—ayes 22, nes 106.

So the motion to recede was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 2.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIR CORPS TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 515, a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of consideration of S. 3398, an act to establish an Air Corps Technical School, and to acquire certain land in the State of Colorado as a site for said Air Corps Technical School, and as an aerial gunnery and bombing range for the Army Air Corps.

And all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may be made, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Martin], and at this time I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is an ordinary, open rule for the consideration of S. 3398, which is a bill to establish the Air Corps Technical School in the State of Colorado. The bill provides:

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to establish in or near Denver, Colo., the Air Corps Technical School, and to accept on behalf of the United States, free from encumbrance or conditions and without cost to the United States, for the site for the Air Corps Technical School, a tract of land, the area of which shall not be less than 30 acres of land, or more or less, within the city limits of the city of Denver, Colo., including the property known as the "Agnes (Philips) Memorial Sanitarium", together with existing buildings and equipment located thereon; and also a tract of land within the State of Colorado, suitable for use as an aerial gunnery and bombing range by the Army Air Corps: Provided, That in the event a donor is unable to perfect title to any land tendered as a donation, condemnation of such land is authorized in the name of the United States, and payment of any and all awards for title to such land as is condemned, together with the cost of suit, shall be made by the donor.

In short, the bill does two things. It establishes the Army Air Corps Technical School in Denver, Colo., and it authorizes the United States Government to accept as a donation, free of expense, a site of 1 square mile on the edge of the city of Denver, including some valuable buildings and also a bombing and machine-gun range of 100 square miles, 10 miles by 10 miles, on the plains east of the city.

The bill seeks to consummate a report and recommendation of a board of Air Corps officers, which board was appointed by the Chief of the Air Corps by direction of the Secretary of War, to investigate the entire United States in order to find the most suitable place for the permanent establishment of this school. The function of the Technical School is the training of officers and enlisted men in the care, maintenance, and repair of Air Corps equipment, including armament—and particularly machine guns and bomb racks—and also instruction in radio and in aerial photography.

The school is now located at Chanute Field, adjacent to the small town of Rantoul, Ill., and has been so located since 1921. The War Department advises me that the reasons for using Chanute Field were that in 1921 there existed at Chanute Field buildings which could be utilized for this purpose, and that the War Department was without funds to build the school at any other location. Some of the work of this school had previously been performed at St. Paul, Minn., in temporary facilities, which had to be abandoned. A part of the personnel of the school was located at San Antonio, Tex., in a location which also was most desirable to utilize in order that the city of San Antonio, Tex., could be consolidated with the supply depot at San Antonio. Therefore, as the most suitable buildings available existed at Chanute Field at that time, and, as the War Department was without funds for any other buildings at any other location, the school was temporarily established at Chanute Field. These buildings were wartime buildings and by this time have become so dilapidated and so worn out that, in any event, whether the school is retained at Chanute Field or
whether it is moved to another location, a new set of buildings must be constructed.

The present location has never been satisfactory for this particular instrumentality. This, of course, is no reflection on that splendid locality in the State of Illinois where the school is now situated.

The present location is in one of the richest, most fertile, and most productive agricultural regions in the United States, if not in the world. However, the high precipitation and the high humidity, which make for productiveness in agriculture, militate against the availability and suitability of this particular location for the particular purposes of the school and its curriculum to which I have referred. The high humidity as well as the haze interferes with photographic work and weather conditions interfere with everyday flying, which should be done in order properly to carry out the curriculum of this school. Furthermore, it is not possible, except at prohibitive expense, to secure an adequate bombing and machine-gun range, which is absolutely essential for the carrying on of the work of this school. The War Department says that is not an essential thing. As illustrating the value of the land where this school is now located, during the war when the Government secured a square mile of land for the purposes of a primary flying school, the price paid by the United States Government was $235 per acre. It would be impracticable at the present time to provide an adequate bombing and machine-gun range at the present location of the school, to wit, a range of 10 miles by 10 miles, or 100 square miles, except at prohibitive expense.

Accordingly, a board of officers was appointed in February 1934 by direction of the Secretary of War for the purpose of making an investigation throughout the country with reference to the most suitable location.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the members of this board of officers were selected because of their high standing in the Air Corps and because of their knowledge of the requirements of the service. They visited 87 cities throughout the United States and collected a large amount of data concerning 18 or 20 localities in addition to those they visited personally. After having studied this matter from February 1934 to August of the same year they presented a confidential report to the Chief of the Air Corps. The Chief of the Air Corps and his assistants in turn studied the report for some 2 months. The report, strongly approved and recommended by the Chief of the Air Corps, was sent to the General Staff. From October 1934 until March of 1935 it was studied by the various branches of the General Staff and by the Secretary of War. On or about the middle of March of 1935 this report was sent by the Secretary of War to the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and made public; at least, its contents were divulged to the Members of the Congress. Needless to say, I was pleased to find that the city of Denver, Colo., had been chosen as the most available and suitable location for this particular instrumentality of the War Department.

I may say that at the outset, and before the board went out on personal inspections, it sent to various communities in the United States a questionnaire indicating what were the general requirements for an ideal site. This questionnaire was received by our people at home, and I was convinced about it. I said to our people at home, "It would seem to me that with our 350 to 390 flying days in the year in Denver, with our excellent all-the-year-round climate, and with the availability on the plains of an area adequate for a bombing and machine-gun range of 100 square miles—10 miles by 10 miles—we should have a very good chance", but I also said, "This is a matter of national defense. If we are chosen, fine; if we are not chosen, I hope there will be no complaints from you, because you will not get one bit of support from me if this board of experts decides against us."

Pursuant to the request of the Board for a statement as to the terms upon which the site could be secured, our people said that if perchance the city of Denver should be chosen, Denver would give a square mile on the edge of the field which would install adequate railroad facilities and would give also, without a cent of expense to the United States, 100 square miles on the plains east of the city for a bombing and machine-gun range. At a municipal election held May 21, 1935, the tax-paying electors of Denver voted $750,000 bonds to purchase the site and bombing range and to install railroad facilities.

I may add that this offer is no better than those made by some other cities. Two or three of my distinguished friends from Texas know full well that their cities made equally good offers, but the Board decided that Denver was the most suitable place for the permanent location of the school.

One thing more, and I am through. This bill was passed by a very large majority in the Senate of the United States. This was after prolonged hearings in the Senate Military Affairs Committee. Prolonged hearings were also held in the House Military Affairs Committee, and I may say that none of our good friends from Illinois made the objection that this report was incorrect, that it was biased, and that it was absolutely inaccurate, but after hearing all these objections and complaints throughout three prolonged hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, the subcommittee voted it to the whole committee that nothing had been found to impugn the accuracy or integrity of the report of the board and the whole Senate committee ratified the action of the subcommittee. Prolonged hearings on the same alleged grounds were had in the House Military Affairs Committee and the House Military Affairs Committee made a favorable report.

The bill and the report are now before you and I trust the House will carry out the recommendation as made. I may add further that during the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee the chairman of the committee requested an unequivocal statement from the Secretary of War as to his position, and there is printed at pages 8 and 9 of the committee's report a strong, unequivocal statement by the Secretary of War that the War Department favors the enactment of this legislation as it stands.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Recess, I include the following statement by Colonel Chaffee, of the General Staff of the War Department, to the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on January 31, 1936. This statement, which was expressly authorized by the Secretary of War, sets forth the reasons why the War Department favors the enactment of the bill to establish the Army Air Corps Technical School in Denver, Colo. (H. R. 9087, S. 3398):

The War Department has been called upon by your committee for a report upon the advisability of enacting this legislation, H. R. 9087 (S. 3398). The report of the War Department is now in the hands of the Bureau of the Budget in order that we may ascertain whether or not the legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

On the telephone this morning, I endeavored to expedite action by the Bureau of the Budget on the written report, but was informed that it would be some time before the matter could be considered. However, the War Department was authorized to state its own position, with the understanding made clear to the committee that this statement in no wise prejudiced the program of the President.

The Secretary of War, therefore, authorizes me to state under the above conditions that it favors the enactment of this legislation as it stands. The impelling reasons behind the position of the War Department in this matter are as follows:

First, in order to have proper facilities at the school itself it must be entirely rebuilt. Our report shows that it will cost $400,000 less to build these permanent facilities at Denver than it would at Champaign Field.

Second, the site at Denver gives us without charge an extensive bombing range 10 miles square within quick flying distance from the school, and a site is absolutely necessary for proper carrying out of the curriculum of the school. It is of an extent enabling operations from the air with machine guns and live
The report of the board of Air Corps officers concerning Denver is as follows:

DENVER, COLORADO

The board visited Denver on May 26-28, 1934, and inspected four sites in that vicinity. Three of these sites were rolling and would require a considerable expenditure of funds for grading and drainage. It was stated that there would be practically no building development in this direction at least for many years. The trend of building construction in Denver is to the northeast and southwest. The site considered best is that marked "A" in the attached brief and is generally known as the Agnes (Phipps) Memorial Sanitarium site.

I. SITE

1. Size and shape: The site is 1 mile square and is situated just within the eastern city limits of Denver.

2. Site: The center of the city from the northwest corner is 6½ miles by paved road.

3. Character of soil, drainage, and suitability for foundations: The soil is a mixture of sand and loam which drains readily and is suitable for building foundations without the necessity of concrete mats.

4. Samples of soil which the committee states were tested for physical characteristics show that it is capable of producing a soil that is adequate for landscaping.

5. Average rainfall: Only 14.7 inches. This would make it necessary to irrigate the building and housing area in order to grow flowers, trees, fruits, etc., as well as vegetables for local consumption.

6. Site is gently rolling with slight slope to north and west providing for natural drainage.

II. LOCATION, ENGINEERING, AND CLIMATE

1. Location: Denver maintains several municipal parks in the interior to home post headquarters, school headquarters, hospital, and barracks for at least 100 students. In addition, there is a heating plant which could be expanded, and the superintendent's house which would make an excellent junior officers' set of quarters. It is roughly estimated that at least $200,000 could be saved by utilizing these buildings.

2. Terrain and snow: The average precipitation for the past 60 years is 14.10 inches. Denver may therefore be classified as a dry region.

3. Wind: The average wind velocity for the past 60 years has been 7.4 miles per hour, with the prevailing direction being south. Denver is not generally subject to high winds. The highest wind velocity recorded in 1933 was 38 miles per hour.

4. Temperature: Over the period the average daily maximum temperature was 62.8°F, the average daily minimum 37.5°F, and an average 50.2°F.

During 1933 the highest recorded temperature was 97°F and the lowest 15°F. During the same period there were 112 days having a minimum temperature of 32°F or below and 3 days with a minimum temperature of 0°F or below. There were 23 days with a maximum temperature of 90°F or above.

5. Humidity: Over a period of 46 years the relative humidity has been 63 at 6 a.m. and 42 at 6 p.m. Over a period of 19 years the relative humidity at noon has been 80. The climatic factors of the area will therefore be classified as dry. The humidity rate, taken together with the average temperature, accounts for the fine climate both in summer and winter.

III. MORAL FACTORS

1. Relative cost of living: (a) Foods: The cost of staple foodstuffs appears to be about average. Fresh fruits and vegetables are available in season at reasonable prices. Colorado is noted for its excellent mountain lettuce, Rocky Ford melons, peaches, celery, potatoes, strawberries, and other similar foods.

(b) Other supplies: Denver has excellent shops of every description. The prices appear to be average.

(c) Domestic servants: Denver has a large number of reliable domestic servants. The wages paid are considered to be very reasonable and compare favorably with other cities of the same size.

2. Health and sanitation: Denver is one of the foremost health centers of the United States. There are numerous sanitariums specializing in the treatment of tuberculosis. It is the home of the Denver and the Rocky Mountain Foundation for the Study of Tuberculosis.

3. General: (a) Transportation: Adequate paved public highways are available to the site.

(b) Brief description of city: Denver maintains several municipal parks in the mountains, which are noted for their excellent scenery. L变形数}(c) Street railway facilities are available one-fourth mile from the site, and it was stated that they would probably be extended if the school were located in Denver.

The city is known throughout the country as a health center due to its close proximity to the mountains and its altitude of 1 mile.

4. Social and recreational facilities of the city are available in the vicinity of the site. Denver is a city of beautiful homes, fine trees and gardens, and excellent paved streets. (For complete description of city, see attached brief.)

(c) Health and sanitation: Denver is one of the foremost health centers in the United States. There are numerous sanitariums specializing in the treatment of tuberculosis. It is the home of the Denver and the Rocky Mountain Foundation for the Study of Tuberculosis.

(d) Schools: The school buildings were valued at $22,000. There are 62 elementary schools, 10 junior high schools, and 5 senior high schools.

Denver University includes a graduate school, college of liberal and department of art, and schools of chemical engineering, electrical engineering, commerce, and law. It has a total enrollment of 3,387.
The University of Colorado has its medical school in Denver, since the University of Colorado is in Denver. Other schools of higher learning are the Colorado Women's Col-
lege, Regis College (Catholic), Iliff School of Theology, Loreta High-
school, and a number of business, commercial, and technical schools. The University of Colorado is at Boulder, 30 miles dis-
tant. The Colorado School of Mines is at Golden, 15 miles distant.
Denver has several well-known schools of music and art and dating day and night courses.

It was stated that no tuition would be charged for Army children in the public schools.

2. Sewerage: An 8-inch sewerage line is already in operation on the
site, which is considerably below average. The city would have to be increased to 18 inches.

3. Fuel.—(a) Electricity: Electric power facilities are already on the
site, and new buildings are being supplied with electric power.

(b) Gas: Natural-gas mains are within one-half mile of the
site. Gas is piped from the Amarillo, Tex. fields. The average
rate at Pitsinimas Hospital for 1933 was 14.71 per 1,000 cubic
feet, which is considerably below average. The Public Service Co.
of Colorado agrees to extend the gas mains to the site at no
expense to the Government.

(c) Coal: Hard and soft coal is available from the Colorado
fields. The price is $15 per ton for the hard and around $8 per
ton for the soft coal delivered.

(d) Wood: Wood is expensive—around $15 a cord. Very little
wood is used for heating purposes.

4. Altitude and special features: Denver is approximately 1 mile
high. In the opinion of the board, this presents both advantages
and disadvantages, some of which are offset by the development of shallow or artesian wells at the site.

(e) Religious facilities: All denominations are represented, and
churches are being built at the site.

(f) The fire department is modern and would be available to
the site if required.

V. UTILITIES

1. Water: Water may be obtained from the Denver water supply
or by the development of shallow or artesian wells at the site.

2. Sewerage: An 8-inch sewerage line is already in operation on
the site, which is considerably below average. The city would have to be increased to 18 inches.

3. Fuel.—(a) Electricity: Electric power facilities are already on
the site, and new buildings are being supplied with electric power.

(b) Gas: Natural-gas mains are within one-half mile of the
site. Gas is piped from the Amarillo, Tex. fields. The average
rate at Pitsinimas Hospital for 1933 was 14.71 per 1,000 cubic
feet, which is considerably below average. The Public Service Co.
of Colorado agrees to extend the gas mains to the site at no
expense to the Government.

(c) Coal: Hard and soft coal is available from the Colorado
fields. The price is $15 per ton for the hard and around $8 per
ton for the soft coal delivered.

(d) Wood: Wood is expensive—around $15 a cord. Very little
wood is used for heating purposes.

VI. LOCATIONAL FACTORS

1. Relation to Air Corps stations: Denver is about 700 miles from the
present center of Air Corps population. Additional Air Corps
stations in the vicinity of Denver would add considerably to
the 300,000 or 1,000,000 in the city of Denver. The same
situation would exist in many parts of the country, was unable to get satisfactory information
about the possibilities of an accounting and suitable location.

2. Altitude and special features: Denver is approximately 1 mile
high. In the opinion of the board, this presents both advantages
and disadvantages, some of which are offset by the development of shallow or artesian wells at the site.

3. Religious facilities: All denominations are represented, and
churches are being built at the site.

4. Fire department: The fire department is modern and would be available to
the site if required.
"Bombing and machine-gun range: No specific site was visited by the board, but it was stated that an accessible area could be secured within a nominal sum within a few miles from the site. This area would be in the mountainous country to the west of the city."

1. The following information anent bombing and gnnery range for proposed Air Corps Technical School, Denver, Colo., is hereby submitted:
   (a) Description of range:
      (1) Elche, 10 miles by 15 miles.
      (2) Location, approximately 12 miles east by southeast of proposed site of school; 19 miles from city of Denver.
      (3) Rolling prairie land.
      (4) Approach to range; no obstructions.
      (5) Emergency landing fields: At least four available on range.
      (6) Approach from school: Several lanes over unimproved area, with good emergency fields.
   (b) Terms. Those with whom you confer may be informed, if you deem it necessary, that the data now requested is for the purpose of completing the brief requested by the city of Denver.

By order of the Secretary of War:

ROBERT L. COLLINS, Adjutant General.

[First endorsement]
OFFICE OF THE AIR CORPS INSTRUCTORS,
COLORADO NATIONAL GUARD, LOWEY FIELD,
Denver, Colo., December 25, 1934.

To: The Adjutant General, Washington, D. C.

1. The following information anent bombing and gnnery range for proposed Air Corps Technical School, Denver, Colo., is hereby submitted:
(a) Description of range:
(1) Elche, 10 miles by 15 miles.
(2) Location, approximately 12 miles east by southeast of proposed site of school; 19 miles from city of Denver.
(3) Rolling prairie land.
(4) Approach to range; no obstructions.
(5) Emergency landing fields: At least four available on range.
(6) Approach from school: Several lanes over unimproved area, with good emergency fields.
(b) Terms.

The terms upon which bombing and gnnery site can be obtained cannot be stated at this time. I have contacted the chamber of commerce of the city of Denver and they advise me that they will immediately take the matter under consideration and notify me as soon as possible what they will do toward providing this land to the Government. Because of their action with regard to the present site of Pittsmons General Hospital and their proposed tender of land for the location of the Air Corps Technical School, it is my belief that the city of Denver will provide the gnnery and bombing range without expense to the Federal Government. The chamber of commerce reply anent the subject of terms relative to gnnery and bombing range will be forwarded immediately upon its receipt.

2. After both an aerial and a ground survey of the proposed gnnery range I am convinced that same is adequate and provides all requirements for its purpose.

NORMAN D. BROPHY,
Capt., Air Corps, Instructor,
Forty-fifth Division Aviation, Colorado National Guard.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. It gives me great pleasure at this point to yield 5 minutes to my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. DOSSENS].

Mr. LEHIBRAGE. Mr. Speaker, I also yield the gentleman from Illinois 5 minutes.

Mr. DOBBS. Mr. Speaker, following a time-honored custom I am going to discuss the merits of the bill rather than the advisability of granting or refusing the rule.

It happens that I have the honor to represent the district where the Air Corps Technical School is now located and where it has been located for many years. It happens by reason of this circumstance that I probably have more familiarity with this controversy and with its inception and with the peculiar reasons that lie back of the controversy than any other man on the floor of this House.

The proposition to move the Air Corps Technical School from Rantoul to somewhere else, no matter where, is not a new one. Our friends from Ohio know that for many years it was advocated that it be moved to Dayton, and as late as 2 years ago the Chief of the Air Corps, in testifying before the War Department Appropriations Subcommittee of this House, said that Dayton was the last choice he had for moving the school. He also stated at that time, and he repeated the statement a year ago, it was not absolutely necessary to move the school at all.

At first, when the moving of this school was proposed, the Army officers were quite candid and open as to their reasons for wanting to move it. They wanted greater social and recreational advantages. Human nature has not changed from that time to this. They still want greater social and recreational opportunities than they feel are available at the present site of the field, but they have learned that it is best to suppress all these motives and find some other specious reasons to advance for moving the school. So they come before you and come before the Military Affairs Committee of this House with a report by three Army officers saying that this reason and that another are reasons why the school should be moved from Rantoul, and in the same breath they advance reasons why Denver above all places is the only place in the world where it could be established. They were absolutely unanimous on that. Independently and collectively, they stated, they had reached the conclusion that Denver is the only place to put this field site.

Strange indeed, is it not, that 37 fine cities were bidding for the location and 3 Army officers independently reached the same conclusion in favor of just one of the 37?

They should make some satisfactory explanation why they made such great inconsistencies in their report. Gentlemen, they brought back photographs of our field at Rantoul showing this land with men standing waist deep in water, and presented them to the Secretary of War without any comment whatever. They did not frankly say that the photographs were taken immediately after one of the worst floods that section has ever known.

But sometimes a man will be trapped by his own deception. They overlooked the fact that anyone could tell that these photographs were taken from the air, and that therefore, the subcommittee should insist that the photographs, which the pictures were made were taken off from that same field while water stood on parts of it.

Gentlemen, is it not strange that we have got to the pass where our national defense must be entrusted to the tender mercies of a chamber of commerce somewhere in the United States?

This special board, according to their own testimony, in a space of only 39 days visited 34 cities, including Denver, where four sites were supposed to be inspected. Here is the story of their inspection of the Denver sites:

Colonel Yorw. We arrived in Denver and were met by a small committee of the chamber of commerce who were invited to a small dinner given at the Denver Club, attended by the president of the chamber of commerce and I think the mayor and four or five prominent citizens. We had a very delightful evening at which we discussed this school and its purposes.

The next day we were taken on a tour of inspection of the sites which were proposed, and for luncheon we were entertained at the chamber of commerce at a luncheon, I presume, of about 30 men, which was attended by the Governor and several prominent citizens, at which this matter was discussed in a businesslike way, after which there was a small meeting of the executive committee of the chamber of commerce, which was nothing but business.

On the next day we were taken on a tour of the city in order that we might see the parks, the schools, and the churches and have a good idea of the city itself.

We were taken on one short trip out into the mountains to see the recreational areas in that vicinity, and that consisted of our entertainment.

Can you see how, with less than 2 days at their disposal, this poor, overworked board of experts had any time left at Denver for looking into the technical aspects of the proposed location?

There was brought to my attention about a month ago an issue of the Denver Post published just after the bill had been reported to the House.

Here is what they said in an editorial:

Indications now are that the Army Air School located at Rantoul, Illinois will be transferred to the community of Denver under the investment by the Federal Government of between six and
eight million dollars. The successful campaign for the location of
this school in Denver was led by the chamber of commerce.

A news dispatch from Washington in reference to the
pending bill published in the same paper on the previous day
says:

The Denver Chamber of Commerce has been working steadily in
behalf of the bill. Mr. W. B. Redding, an official of the chamber
of commerce, has been here for several months.

A member of the chamber of commerce remains here to
promote a question concerned with our national defense, or
where this school should be located. I say to you that Con-
gress should face its responsibility in this matter, and we
should pass a bill conditioned upon the approval of the
recommendation brought here by a board of Army officers who
are deliberately concerned only with the social and recrea-
tional aspects of the question that concerns them. The point
where this school is located now is the center of the area
where the boys come from who attend the school. They are
bright young men, high-school graduates, and the waiting
list for admission there is long. It takes a year to get into
the school after one applies for admission. But two boys
came from Colorado last year, while from the eastern half
of the United States came about three-fourths of the boys.

There are limitations to the social activities around Rantoul. The
recreational and sports facilities for officers in the community
are very restricted and limited as evidenced by the follow-
ing statement appearing in the War Department board
report:

There are no water sports and practically no hunting. Two
country clubs at Urbana and Champaign offer limited facilities to
officers for golf and tennis.

I concede that the cities of Urbana and Champaign may
not compare in grandeur and mountain scenery to Colorado
Springs, so close to Denver, where it may be possible greater
social advantages and functions would be afforded to the officers.

In conclusion let me state that this House did not ask for
this investigation and the change is advocated by these
officers mostly for the reasons which I have given. I feel it
would be most unfortunate to impose additional hardship on
the deserving young men who are endeavoring to obtain
admission to our universities. I yield 5 minutes to the
gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDs].

Mr. ARENDs. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, by a far from
unanimous vote, the House Military Affairs Committee re-
ported out Senate bill 3398. Today we consider this bill
which provides a rule allowing 4 hours of general debate. In the time
allocted me I desire to bring some facts to your attention
regarding this bill and the intent thereof.

In the year 1921 there was established at Rantoul, Ill.,
an Air Service technical school, commonly known as Chanute
Field. Since 1921 it has been the purpose of which it was intended,
that of a technical ground school.

During the past several years, since 1928, there has been
much agitation here and there for the removal of this field,
requests being made to have it moved anywhere. Just so
that it would be dislocated from its present site in Illinois.

Just where this demand for its removal originated is no
longer a question, since a thorough investigation can lead
an individual to believe but one thing, namely, that the per-
soneel of the Air Corps would appreciate a different location.

After much bickering and a thumbs-down attitude by the
Department, although money was appropriated but never
allowed to be used to rehabilitate this school, a finding board
was set up to investigate and determine when and where
this school might be moved. I am wondering who said this
school had to be moved. But the board was organized and
proceeded to function. Now I make plain to you at this
point, if I may, that I do not question these gentlemen who,
headed by Colonel Yount, brought in this report on the
board findings. However, discrepancies appear in this re-
port which to my way of thinking can readily raise the
question of doubt in anyone's mind who might have the
time to read the full report and hearings, as to the neces-
sity for the removal of this field and what might be gained
thereby for the cause of the Air Corps.

Since my time is limited, I shall not attempt to give you a
digest of the board's report or to go into any detail con-
cerning the hearings on this matter. It is sufficient to state
that during the examination of witnesses before the committee many little side lights on the situation were brought to our attention.

The primary purpose for the removal of the school is given as "the necessity of a bombing range", which range site will be available at Denver. In my opinion, it is a truism that the Military Airs of Illinois were not informed of the necessity of such a site nor given an opportunity to learn whether additional ground might be made available at or near Chanute Field. Certainly little or no consideration was given the bombing range matter when Dayton, Ohio, the site of the Air Corps engineering center, was picked as the logical place for the technical school. I am not a prophet nor a prophet's son, so I hesitate to predict, in case the school is moved, as to just how much bombing practice will ever take place at the Denver site. But when we search the record and learn that the percentage of total hours of instruction, of enlisted men, for flying is 2.7 percent—page 69 of the hearings—and that such time for the Regular Army officers is less than 15 percent, one must begin to wonder how or when much bombing can be carried on at such an essentially ground school, regardless of its location.

Other Air Corps activities concerning the climatic conditions in Illinois which it was cited in many instances made flying and photographic aerial instruction almost impossible, to successfully obtain profitable results. Statements of the board show that they obtained weather reports, and so forth, from locations at Springfield and Peoria, Ill., whereas such necessary reports are available at the school at Rantoul. Then why did they not use their own facts taken from actual conditions of past history as found at Chanute rather than go approximately 100 miles distant to gather such information. Frankly, I do not understand such procedure, and it all tends to leave the impression with me that more care might well have been exercised in determining the report of this board.

The report cites such items as higher cost of food in Illinois, which was disproved. Morale was mentioned as being low at Chanute. It is very true that the state of buildings and equipment at Chanute is in a deplorable condition, which possibly has much to do with any low morale that might exist, but that, of course, is for someone else to stand accountable for besides those in charge at the field. Such conditions exist at many of our posts today.

If at any time in the future much flying time is consumed by the trained and experienced judgment of this board. Mr. Speaker, I might state that I am honest and sincere in my belief that no great benefit is to be derived from a change in location of this technical school. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee I have always shown my willingness and intent to promote any and all plans which have as their purpose the furtherance of necessary national defense. If there might be any such question of national defense involved in this bill, it has not been brought to my attention. If such is the case, I think it clear that the school could have so been informed, thereby allowing us to study the matter with such a viewpoint before us.

The officers of the school would, of course, much rather be located at Denver than at Chanute Field, for, as brought out and stated in the hearings, Denver was referred to as "the winter playground and the summer vacation land." I do not blame these officers for their zeal in desiring to move to Denver, but I do question the advisability of our acting on their wishes rather than the necessity and practicability of such a change. It is the duty of Congress to determine the question of removal of the school.

Furthermore, I am opposed to the principle of any chamber of commerce or municipality offering competitive inducements for War or Navy Department activities which might eventually prove detrimental to the best interests of our country.

When a judge issues instructions to a jury which is about to go out for a verdict on a case, he informs them that they must decide without a reasonable doubt. Mr. Speaker, in the same way, before us today does exist in my mind, and I am sure, if acquainted with all facts, that you will find yourself in the same position that I am today. I sincerely hope this bill will be defeated. [Applause.]

Mr. DIES of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Driscoll).

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I would not undertake to pass judgment on the suitability of either one of these sites. To do so would require a technical experience and knowledge which I do not possess, and which, so far as I know, no other Member of the House possesses; but I do know that a board of experts charged with the responsibility of selecting suitable sites visited many places in the United States, including my own town.

After careful and exhaustive investigation they arrived at the conclusion that Denver was the proper place. Certainly I would not undertake to go against my judgment in favor of the trained and experienced judgment of this board. Those who were not successful in securing this desirable school should, it seems to me, acquiesce in the judgment of those whose duty it is and whose qualification and training equip them to select these sites. The other body has passed this bill. The Military Affairs Committee of the House has reported it favorably. The Rules Committee has reported a rule. So it seems to me the least we can do is to authorize the consideration of this bill on the floor of the House and give an opportunity to the author and sponsor of the bill to present it on its merits.

[Here the gavel fell.]
Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this is the eighth year in which this House has been buffeting back and forth the question of the location of the technical school. During 5 of these years I have appeared and presented all of the claims showing that Wright Field at Dayton, Ohio, is the proper location for the school. I am safe in saying that this field at Dayton has every qualification that Chanute Field has because of its advantageous location. It also has some of the advantages that Denver has. However, a bureau of experts has gone over the United States and weighed all of these possibilities. After 5 years of political jockeying whereby we were getting no place, the net result of all our efforts was that the Air Corps was not having a suitable technical school anywhere. The Chief of Staff and Chief of the Air Corps, as between Chanute Field and Wright Field, testified frankly that Wright Field was the preferable place. The Air Corps and the Army refused to accept or use the appropriation to build up Chanute Field because of that controversial situation. The supporters of Wright Field, under the old conditions, had the merits of the case, and Chanute Field supporters had the capacity to hold up the thing, and as a result that is where we were, and we were getting no place.

In my opinion the world is in no condition for us to "play horse" with this question any longer. The best judgment of the War Department says that Denver is the place for this field. Our entire Air Corps is going to be of no service to us if we do not have a suitably trained technical school. In that case these planes of the Army and defense system is not going to be of any avail to us if we do not have an active Air Corps in the air, and it makes no difference how many planes we have in the shops. In the interest of our country we can no longer afford to permit our ships to remain in the air without an adequately equipped technical school.

I will take second place to no man in this House in fighting for my district as against any other district. I have done so on this question for 5 years; but when my district comes up against the interests of the United States and against the interests of our national defense and against the interests of our own sons who have a good prospect of being involved in the end of this session of Congress.

The Army at that time had no trained expert personnel to pass on the suitability of these fields. The Army at that time had no trained expert personnel to pass on the suitability of these fields. The Army had no other place to put the school. There were temporary wartime buildings at the field, and the War Department had to house the school somewhere, so it was put there simply because the housing necessary for the school happened to be there. Ever since I have been a member of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. HILL of Alabama], the War Department has insisted that Chanute Field was not the proper place for the school and has made many different efforts to get the school away from Chanute Field.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3960) to establish the Air Corps Technical School and to acquire certain land in the State of Colorado for use as a site for said Air Corps Technical School and as an aerial gunnery and bombing range for the Army Air Corps.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I regret to find myself in disagreement with the splendid Representatives in this House from the great State of Illinois, whom I claim among my best friends in this body. I particularly regret to find myself in disagreement with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dosannes]. I am sure that I express the sentiments of every Member of this body when I say that all of us regret to see him leave this body, as he will, voluntarily, at the end of this session of Congress. Whatever may be the outcome of the pending bill, I want to testify to the fact that although I do not agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dosannes] I have been a little newspaper writer may write in a news story, and we cannot let the interest of some community, large or small, in these United States be paramount in the consideration of the question before us. Our concern, first and foremost, must be the interests of the country as a whole, must be what is best for the defense and the safety of our people.

This bill comes here today because Chanute Field, at Rantoul, III., is not a suitable place for the technical school of the Air Corps. It does not meet the requirements for the school. The field at Rantoul was taken over by the Government during the World War.

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

Mr. HILL of Alabama. I shall try to yield to the gentleman a little later.

The Army at that time had no trained expert personnel to pass on the suitability of these fields. We had no Air Corps. We had Chanute Field where we were trying to do something in the air, but we had no Air Corps such as we have today and have had for the past 10 years; no trained prepared experts; and we had no one qualified as experts to pass on the suitability of these fields. Furthermore, during the war we had to act under the pressure of necessity and haste; we had to take these fields more or less haphazardly. In 1921 the Air Corps Technical School was placed at Chanute Field not because the War Department wanted to put the school there, but simply and solely because the War Department had no other place to put the school. There were temporary wartime buildings at the field, and the War Department had to house the school somewhere, so it was put there simply because the housing necessary for the school happened to be there. Ever since I have been a member of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. HILL of Alabama], the War Department has insisted that Chanute Field was not the proper place for the school and has made many different efforts to get the school away from Chanute Field.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my colleague on the committee [Mr. HILL of Alabama].
Some 2 years ago the War Department, at the suggestion of the Senate and House of Congress, appointed a board of officers to study the question and make recommendations as to a suitable location for the school. The board was composed of three of the most competent officers in the Air Corps of the Army. The board went over the country visiting some 37 cities trying to find the best location for the school. The board came into my State of Alabama, visiting at least three cities, and we tried to persuade the board that the best location for the school was in Alabama, but the board did not agree with us. After carefully studying the needs of the school and spending several weeks in Alabama, the board unanimously reached the conclusion that the war training school at Chanute Field was selected as the right place.

Mr. Chairman, or 3 or 5 years ago we witnessed in this country the terrible tragedy of the loss of human life when the officers and men of the Air Corps sought to carry the mail. Why did those men lose their lives? Because they had not been properly trained and prepared to use the equipment which was so necessary to protect themselves in flying through the terrible weather. This matter not only drags off the question of the technical training of the men, but the efficiency of the Air Corps, but involves as well the life and limb of those brave boys who go up into the air in these planes. If we are to meet our responsibility to the whole country, we cannot do less than pass this bill giving to the Air Corps that location for its technical school which the board of experts, the Military Affairs Committee, was so impressed with the fairness and the thoroughness and the correctness of the report of the board favoring Denver that he led the fight on the floor of the Senate when the bill was passed in the Senate moving the school to Denver.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Vermont a minute.

Mr. Hill of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the men in this school have to study this equipment on the ground, but that is not all. After they study the equipment on the ground they must take it in the air, and study it in the air, and fly it in the air, because oftentimes equipment functions differently at low altitudes than it does at high altitudes; it functions differently oftentimes on the ground from what it does under the stress and strain in the air; metals expand and contract depending on the temperature; and there are many problems of this kind that must be worked out. The only way this school can carry on its training as it should be carried on is by taking these men and the equipment into the air. As it is today the climate, the haze, the fog, the weather conditions are so bad at Chanute Field that in some of the courses the men are not able to finish 50 percent of the flying requirements.

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

Mr. Hill of Alabama. Not at this point; I have only 5 minutes; I am sorry. Furthermore, you have got to have a bombing range where the men can take these great bombing planes and machine guns and actually fire at targets. They ought to have a range 10 miles square. There is absolutely no way of getting such a range as this at Rantoul or in the State of Illinois, for the State is too densely populated.

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

Mr. Hill of Alabama. Not at this point; I have only 5 minutes; I am sorry. Furthermore, you have got to have a bombing range where the men can take these great bombing planes and machine guns and actually fire at targets. They ought to have a range 10 miles square. There is absolutely no way of getting such a range as this at Rantoul or in the State of Illinois, for the State is too densely populated.

The cost of such a range in Illinois is absolutely prohibitive.

Now, what do we find in Denver? We find that the city of Denver is giving the Government a piece of property, or offering the Government a piece of property, which is just as large as the field at Rantoul. In addition thereto there are buildings on the field which the Quarters Master Corps values at $400,000. There is not a single permanent building at Chanute Field. If the school is to remain there, entirely new buildings will have to be built. At Denver there are over $400,000 of permanent buildings already located, and, due to the unusual climate there, there are not over 2 days in a year when flying operations cannot be carried on.

In addition thereto, the school has to have a great bombing range. At Denver, or in its immediate vicinity, we will be able to secure 10 square miles where these men may get all the practice that is so essential to their complete education. Furthermore, Denver is a mile above sea level. As the War Department says:

(1) With the advent of the high-powered, highly supercharged aircraft engine, designed to operate at high altitudes, together with the development of the artoil and oil, it has been clearly evident for some time that the basic technical training of officers and men is of such vital importance in the care, repair, maintenance, and operation of aircraft material should be carried on in an area more closely simulating atmospheric and climatic conditions encountered in high-altitude flying operations.

Mr. DOEBER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. McLean. Mr. Chairman. I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, the report on this bill, which I filed on behalf of the preponderant majority of the committee, pretty well covers the situation. It is a summary of the facts which were made to appear before the Committees of the House and Senate on Military Affairs.

When the "red herrings" of commendable selfish interest, the inclination involved in personal and geographical friendships, social contacts, and political alliances, and other trivialities, superfluities, and generalities which have been drawn across the trail are disposed of, the road leads us, as members of Congress, selected a board of officers the most competent officers in the Air Corps of the Army. The board went all over the country visiting some 37 cities trying to find the best location for the school. The board came into my State of Alabama, visiting at least three cities, and we tried to persuade the board that the best location for the school was in Alabama, but the board did not agree with us. After carefully studying the needs of the school and spending several weeks in Alabama, the board unanimously reached the conclusion that the war training school at Chanute Field was selected as the right place.

Mr. Chairman, or 3 or 5 years ago we witnessed in this country the terrible tragedy of the loss of human life when the officers and men of the Air Corps sought to carry the mail. Why did those men lose their lives? Because they had not been properly trained and prepared to use the equipment which was so necessary to protect themselves in flying through the terrible weather. This matter not only drags off the question of the technical training of the men, but the efficiency of the Air Corps, but involves as well the life and limb of those brave boys who go up into the air in these planes. If we are to meet our responsibility to the whole country, we cannot do less than pass this bill giving to the Air Corps that location for its technical school which the board of experts, the Military Affairs Committee, was so impressed with the fairness and the thoroughness and the correctness of the report of the board favoring Denver that he led the fight on the floor of the Senate when the bill was passed in the Senate moving the school to Denver.
to be settled by the fact that board after board has been appointed for the purpose of considering all views and recommendations relative to the question of the location of the Air Corps Technical School. This in itself is evidence of the fact that the present location was not considered proper, adequate, or satisfactory.

Recognizing the inadequacy and unsuitability of the present location, the selection of the proper place has been a matter of study for years. The last official action taken by the War Department by order of the Secretary of War with respect to an investigation concerning the selection of a site is found in an order of the Secretary of War to the Chief of the Air Corps of date February 15, 1934, to appoint a board of officers to consider all views and recommendations relative to the question of the location of the Air Corps Technical School and submit a report setting forth the views and recommendations with its conclusions and recommendations.

At the outset, before making any personal inspections, the board of officers prepared a questionnaire and letter of instructions, copies of which were sent to chambers of commerce or designated representatives of many towns and cities in various parts of the United States. In this questionnaire and letter were embodied certain specifications and requirements which, in the light of experience and of recent rapid development of military aviation, the Air Corps and the General Staff regard as characteristics essential to an ideal location for this particular instrumentality—the Air Corps Technical School. The purpose of this questionnaire was to elicit detailed information relative to the proposed sites and the conditions to be found in the neighboring communities and environs in order that such information might be available to the board at the time of its arrival for personal inspection and that it might in turn aid the board in the preparation of its final detailed report.

The board personally visited 57 cities throughout the United States, inspected proposed sites, and personally gathered a large amount of data in addition to that furnished by the respective local communities. It also received and considered briefs and other information from 26 locals other than those personally visited. Under date of August 15, 1934, the board submitted to the Chief of the Air Corps its confidential and unanimous report and recommendation. This report and recommendation was checked and studied by the Chief of the Air Corps and was by him approved and recommended. In a memorandum dated October 12, 1934, the Chief of the Air Corps approved and recommended the report and recommendation was then referred to the General Staff, where it was given further careful analysis and consideration. In March 1935 it was transmitted by the War Department to the Military Affairs Committees of the House and Senate.

The board reaches the following conclusions and recommendations:

1. Conclusions: The board concludes that Chanute Field, Rantoul, Ill., is unsuitable as a location for the Air Corps Technical School and that the best location which it has been able to find is at Denver, Colo.

2. Recommendations: The board recommends that the site described in the Denver, Colo., brief be acquired by the War Department and that the Air Corps Technical School be located thereon.

Now, to repeat, may I say the Congress has had under consideration on several occasions the rebuilding of the Air Corps Technical School, now located at Chanute Field, Rantoul, Ill. This school was established at that place in 1921, in order to consolidate in the place then most convenient and in one school the mechanics school, which was located at Kelly Field No. 1, at San Antonio, Tex.; the communications school, then located at Post Field, Fort Sill, Okla.; and the photographic school, then located at Langley Field, Hampton, Va. The governing reasons for the selection of Rantoul, Ill., all things considered, were the availability of buildings on Government-owned land and the convenience of obtaining student personnel.

It is true that in 1928 a plan was considered to move the school to Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, but after several years of consideration that plan was abandoned. In the meantime, funds appropriated for rebuilding the school were withdrawn in 1933 by Congress, in view of the difficulty of determining where the school had best be located. Efforts made by the War Department since then to obtain funds for rebuilding the school have likewise failed, pending determination of its proper location. The buildings at Chanute Field, which were temporary buildings, constructed during the World War, have deteriorated rapidly in recent years to the extent that all are forced to admit that rehabilitation is no longer practicable or desirable.

Since the difficulty in obtaining funds was inseparably linked with the question of proper location of the school, the War Department, in 1934, presumably at the request of the Chief of the Air Corps, appointed a board of officers to make an extended survey of all suitable sites in this country with a view to recommending the best location for this school, facts considered. The board actually inspected 57 sites and considered a total of 82 sites, and recommended, as pre­eminently best suited, a site at Denver, Colo. The report of this board of officers is most thorough and convincing; and after detailed analysis in hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, it still stands as a report which, for comprehensive and logical analysis of all factors involved, cannot be ignored. The Denver site recommended by the War Department board contains material advantages which make it outstanding over other sites for the purposes intended. These advantages are clearly set forth in the report of the War Department, the Air Corps Technical School, and the Senate. The most outstanding advantages are provisions for a gunnery and bombing range within close proximity to the school, a climate which provides the greatest percentage of clear atmosphere for photographic instruction, an altitude which is in keeping with modern training requirements of the school, and buildings up to the value of $400,000.

Since the predominant purpose of the school is to train enlisted mechanics and skilled photographic and communications personnel, the proposed site at Denver, Colo., will provide not alone better facilities but better recreational facilities for the enlisted men. Officers are able to provide for themselves recreational features desired wherever stationed, and the War Department stated that little importance was attached to that feature.

A pertinent advantage to be derived by the Government in the establishment of the school near Denver, Colo., is the fact that the bill under consideration, is the donation to the Government not alone of the land for the school but also a tract of land for a gunnery and bombing range approximately 10 miles square. For aerial gunnery, in order to insure the safety of personnel on the ground, the tract of land must be large enough to permit the use of modern aircraft and have an ample safety zone beyond the range of modern .50-caliber aircraft machine guns. The saving to the Government will not alone be approximately $400,000, the difference in cost of reconstructing the school at Denver rather than at Rantoul, Ill., but also the saving in the cost of this large tract of land for gunnery and bombing purposes.

To summarize, a board of practical, as well as technical, experts specially selected because of their integrity, their high attainments in the Air Corps, and their specialized knowledge and skill, devoted 6 months to an intensive study of the availability and suitability of various localities, and personally visited and inspected 57 proposed locations and considered the facilities and advantages of 27 others, in various parts of the United States. Their exhaustive confidential report, after having been checked and studied for 2 months by the Air Corps, was emphatically as well as approved and recommended. The report was then rechecked and redrafted throughout 5 months more by the General Staff and by the Secretary of War. After this exhaustive study, extending over 13 months, the report was sent to the Congress for appropriate legislation. The mere submission of the report to the Congress by the Secretary of War is not enough; the approval thereof by the War Department. But in answer to a direct question by the chairman of your committee, the War Department has given its unequivocal answer that it favors the enactment of this legislation as it stands.
The Army regards this bill as major legislation involving not only the lives of men but also the national defense and hence the national safety. Proper solution of the question transcends personal, partisan, or local interests. It is a national problem. In arriving at its conclusion your committee has been controlled by facts, not by sentiment or by sectional or local considerations. The Air Corps Technical School is a highly important activity in the plan of national defense. It will increase in importance with the development of military aviation. Its permanent location and establishment in a place best suited to the carrying on of its own particular curriculum should be definitely settled without further delay. From the national point of view, it is of military importance whether the establishment of this school in one place or another will detract from or contribute to the welfare of any section or local community. It is of great, even vital, importance to the national defense that there be selected that location which is best suited for this particular activity, thereby contributing most to the welfare of the United States of America as a whole, to its safety and its adequate defense.

In the opinion of the War Department, in which I concur, the bill involves an important instrumentality in the plan of national defense. It involves a fundamental and underlying question of military strategy, and the War Department is charged with responsibility for the determination of such questions, has said that this field should be located at Denver.

The Secretary of War favors the enactment of this legislation. The War Department has been given to understand and has been authorized to state that its position in no wise prejudices the program of the President.

Personally and officially I do not care to take the responsibility of superimposing my layman's judgment as against that of military technicians, strategists, and experts of the War Department, nor to go against the recommendations of the Secretary of War. I shall follow the recommendation of the War Department, accept its findings and recommendations, and follow its judgment, because of the nature and importance of the questions involved. In taking this position I believe I voice the sentiment of a considerable majority of the Committee on Military Affairs, at whose direction I made the report.

I am reminded in this connection that—

Those of us who have had the privilege of hearing the late Mr. McSwain address this body have been impressed with the qualities of an active and effective mind. Mr. McSwain was a man who understood the science of aviation, the stratagems of war, and was familiar with the situation at Denver, Colo.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, when the Seventy-third Congress met it was my great joy to renew a friendship very dear to me, a friendship that had its origin when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dossman] and I studied together in law school. June 8 next will be the thirtieth anniversary of the graduation of our class from the law department of the George Washington University. Mr. Dossman, at the end of the present session, will retire voluntarily from Congress to resume his active law practice, and, if I know him as I think I do, to give to his home folks a large portion of his time and of himself in useful, unselfish, and patriotic public service. He brought to the House of Representatives a wide experience in the Postal Service born of many years as an inspector in that branch of our Government and an equipment for the public service gained by many years in the practice of law, and we have come to respect him for his sincerity and industry. He goes from us enriched by the experience he has had here, and with all our good wishes. He will leave with us that same respect and esteem, that same affectionate regard, that he left with us who knew him so well as a student in his youthful days.

Mr. Chairman, it is my great privilege under the circumstances to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dossman] the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. DOBINS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure you realize I am deeply appreciative of this tribute that comes to me from the gentleman on the other side of the aisle. It comes as a surprise, but none the less it is appreciated. I am also grateful for the compliments paid by the ranking majority member of the Military Affairs Committee and the Chairman of the Committee on Rules, and am soon to leave this Chamber, but I leave it with most pleasant recollections of the confidence I enjoyed from my colleagues, not only during the times we found ourselves in agreement, but during those times when unfortunately we found it necessary to disagree. [Applause.]

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBINS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, may I say that the fine things said by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] are most heartily shared by all of us from the West, and although we may differ on some matters of policy, we all regret that Mr. Dossman, of his own motion, has refused to be a candidate for reelection. We all wish him the best of success in whatever field he may engage. [Applause.]

Mr. DOBINS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members do not get the idea from these generous eulogies that this is a funeral service of laughter. In this case the corpse is very much alive and kicking, and expects to win his point today. He expects to win it deservedly upon the facts in the case.

You were told that in early life I chose the practice of law as my vocation. I have applied that to a study of this proposed legislation. Evidence has been presented today, and I intend to let you have the benefit of that study of this very peculiar report that lies in front of the chairman but which I suspect he has never read. I think only one or two Members of this House have read it. I grant that my good colleague from Colorado has read it, and I have read it, but aside from that I challenge anyone to tell me he has read that testimony thoroughly, and I fancy that as my colleague from Colorado recalls that evidence there are many things in there which he was not there.

They talk to you about a board of experts. Can any man apply to himself the title of expert and therefore be accepted as one? What is an expert? In this matter he is a man who understands the science of aviation, the science of military aviation and all the problems that go with it. There was a chairman of this board, Lieutenant Colonel Young. He has been in my hearing several times, and he has demonstrated that the man who has never once has he rendered an explanation of them. Perhaps he is within the hearing of my voice right now. This so-called expert who brings to you a report saying that a field 10 miles square, containing 100 square miles, is the absolute minimum for a bombing field, has had an investigation of various sites stated while conducting an investigation at Rantoul that a half square mile, a mere half section, was adequate for the purposes of a bombing field and machine-gun range; and the other two alleged experts belonging to that board sat there with him and did not
contradict or correct the statement. Why, there is hardly a man on the floor of this House today, nonexpert though he may be, who does not know that a half section of land is not adequate for a machine-gun and bombing range. I see the gentleman from Vermont pointing his hand straight up in the air and indicating that all that is necessary is to drop a bomb straight down and you can hit a half section of land; but that is not the way, I may say to my expert chairman, bombing is done in the Army. A bomb is dropped from a fast-moving plane and a plane that may be 10,000 or more feet in the air. As it is released it travels forward with the speed of the plane, and may land half a mile or more beyond a line perpendicular to where it was released.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. I yield, indeed, to the splendid chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will not the gentleman admit that he must have misinterpreted entirely the gesticulation I was making?

Mr. DOBBINS. I saw the gentleman, and thought I could correctly interpret his gesture and whispered comment.

Mr. McSWAIN. I submit the gentleman did, but he cannot read my mind, and he did not hear me say anything. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. DOBBINS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the distance from Chicago to Denver—something like 900 miles?

Mr. DOBBINS. About 900 miles.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there not plenty of room and need to keep this bombing field where it is and within the 2 years put another one out in Denver?

Mr. DOBBINS. If Denver must have one, there is plenty of room there for one, I am sure.

Mr. BLANTON. I am sure another one 2 years from now would not be needed.

Mr. DOBBINS. I do not think so, but let me tell my friend from Texas that the Army has a bombing field in California, a large bombing field, and it does not use it.

Mr. BLANTON. That is about 600 miles away from Denver.

Mr. DOBBINS. Yes; and it has one at Fort Knox in Kentucky, and our boys from Chanute Field go down there 10 days in the year. They pack up their trucks and go down there and practice bombing. That is all the time they have chosen to require, and I assume it is enough.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there not plenty of room and need to practice bombing? Why did not the letter from the Secretary of War appear in the report, instead of what some understrapper said? Why should we have to dig it out of the files of the Military Affairs Committee? I do not know, I submit it to my colleagues for their consideration.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILL] says it is a matter of life and death, that the country is going to the demission bowwows if this field is not transferred. Is not it strange that it will not be a matter of life and death for 2 years? For the Secretary of War advocates no moving of this field.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Is the Chanute Field available for Reserve officers?

Mr. DOBBINS. Yes. Chanute Field is close to the center of population in this country. In my State the only place the Reserve officers can get their training is down there, and they do not want to go out to Colorado to get it.
Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of talk has been indulged in about the poor climate of Illinois. Why, the colonel from the War Department admitted, as the facts compel him to admit, that there is not any better flying place in the country than in Illinois. There are emergency landing fields available everywhere, and they are available only in rare instances in Colorado. They never have mentioned this fact, that the students attending that school will have to travel on an average of about 900 miles or 1,000 miles farther to get to the base, if it is moved to the West away from the center of population, and the cost of that every year will be from $25,000 to $50,000. They have not mentioned the question or told this Committee and have made no calculation upon the subject of the cost of transporting quartermaster supplies to this center of population, and the cost of that or the increased upkeep cost of this new location.

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

Mr. DOBBINS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman perhaps knows as a matter of fact that I as one member of the Military Affairs Committee signed the minority report, the only one that I have signed since I have been in Congress. I signed that after reading carefully several times the report on this board on this particular ground, and I want to read to the gentleman from Illinois, if that report.

There are no water sports and practically no hunting. Two country clubs at Urbana and Champaign offer limited facilities to officers for golf and tennis.

Mr. DOBBINS. Why bring that up? Why embarrass further these discomfited gentlemen?

Mr. MAY. After reading that carefully I made up my mind that the motive back of it was not the training of these boys in a mechanical understanding of this plant, after they had testified that 90 percent of all the work they do is on the ground.

Mr. DOBBINS. Not 90 percent, but 99 percent.

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. DOBBINS. When I read that it made me mad. I know those golf courses and I know that they are good. I asked them what they meant by limited facilities, and their reply in the hearings was that as nonresident members they were not allowed to vote in the annual elections. Think of that!

Mr. O’MALLEY. Then it becomes a fact that you are not furnishing the right kind of social life at Chanute Field, and perhaps they can get a lot better social life in Colorado?

Mr. DOBBINS. Oh, Army officers are human just like the rest of us. The social advantages of Rantoul are not quite equal to what they are in Milwaukee or in the splendid cities of Kentucky or in my own cities of Urbana and Champaign, but they are only 14 miles away from the latter community, and since that prejudice was first formed, transportation facilities between my community and the field have greatly improved.

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

Mr. DOBBINS. Yes. I am glad to yield to my colleague and neighbor.

Mr. MEEKS. The gentleman knows something about drainage, nothing is said in the report about that. Knowing that the gentleman has had a great amount of experience with drainage matters in the State of Illinois and in the vicinity of this field, would he kindly make some statement in regard to that?

Mr. DOBBINS. I thank the gentleman for his observation, because that involves 1 of a list of 15 errors that I fear I am not going to find time to point out in detail. They did say in their report that the fall across Chanute Field is insufficient for adequate drainage. They admitted, when testifying in the Senate committee, that 19 feet to a mile is adequate for drainage, and then they submitted the data placed there in front of this gentleman, which involves a geological survey of this square mile occupied by Chanute Field, showing indisputably that the fall across that field is 15 feet to the mile. Also, they said that the cost of living at Rantoul is far greater than it is at Denver. My good friend Mr. Lewis has made a public school in Denver, if it is moved to the West away from the center of population, and the cost of that every year will be from $25,000 to $50,000. They did not know, these experts, that at Chanute Field the Army Signal Corps maintains a sort of Weather Bureau service; and when that was brought to their attention, what did they say? They acted just like all other experts on the ground that we had there. They said they had testified that Chanute Field is the center of population, and the cost of that every year will be $25,000 to $50,000. They did not know, these experts, that at Chanute Field the Army Signal Corps maintains a sort of Weather Bureau service.

On the proposed Denver field they submitted two estimates of the cost of grading that field, where the ground levels have a variable elevation of more than 50 feet. There was an estimate of $25,000 and an estimate of $75,000. There was generously accepted the $25,000 estimate. Later on, in their testimony before the Military Affairs Committees, they admitted that it would cost $100,000.

They say in this wonderful expert report, that insect pests are a nuisance at Chanute Field. The only testimony in this record here is by a medical officer who says the insects do not constitute a nuisance. In their report they said that the respiratory disease rate is excessive at Chanute. The medical officer testified to the exact opposite—that the respiratory diseases there were not excessive or different from what they were elsewhere. They testified, as to the area of the bombing range, of which I have told you, first saying that one-half square miles were all tangled up, and later that a hundred square miles was necessary. There you find that old trick of determining just what you want and then afterward writing the specifications, so that that is the only thing you can get. It is a trick. I understand, that has been practiced before even in our great War Department.

Then there was the ridiculing of our country clubs. They did not find golf facilities there. There were not swimming facilities.

They said they had to have a field where they could take off in the prevailing wind without any obstructions. The prevailing wind at this field in Denver is from the south. The square mile immediately south of this proposed field is occupied by a cemetery with tombstones on it, and my nonexpert opinion is that it would be a very poor place in which to make an emergency landing. [Laughter.] But, above all, to cap the climax, here comes our good friend, Mr. Hill of Alabama, saying it is necessary to put this school at Denver because it has a high elevation, and the flyers can go up high. Well, how high is the sky at Rantoul? [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Downey] has expired.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fallon], a member of the committee.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I do not have time to go into the matter of paying compliments, as I would indeed, to pay extended compliments to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Downey], but I must get to the matter at hand. I fear, however, that the vote upon this matter will be based more upon paying a
compliment to him than upon the real merits of the legislation.

Summing up this matter, it resolves itself into this question: A board of officers of the Air Corps of the United States Army was appointed to decide upon a proper site for the Air Corps Technical Training School. After extended examination of a great many localities throughout the United States, they handed in a very extensive and complete report. Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. FADDIS. I cannot yield. I do not have the time.

This report has been quoted in part today. I want to call the attention of Members of Congress to the fact that there is a great deal more to the report than that which has been quoted by the opponents of this legislation. This report is very thorough and is composed of a great many other subjects than that having to do with the recreational facilities at this field. It takes up the site. It takes up the climatic conditions, the moral factors, utilities, transportation and communication, geographical location, construction and labor costs, and then a general summary.

The same headings were gone into both as to the Denver site and as to the Rantoul site. I assure you that the Committee on Military Affairs approached this matter with great practical perception, and when they approached it with a great deal of reluctance insofar as they were up against the responsibility of making a decision as to whether this field should, in the interest of the service, in the interest of national defense, be moved from its present location to another one.

There has been an attempt to becloud the issue. There has been an attempt to lead the minds of this Committee off of the question at issue by referring to that part of the report having to do with the recreational facilities. There has been an attempt to impeach the sincerity of the board and belittle their motives. This is a most unworthy move, as I am sure that the board acted in accordance with their best judgment and with the utmost sincerity. There has been an attempt to imply that the board was influenced in its decision by the Denver Chamber of Commerce. That is an unworthy insinuation. The one essential point in the entire matter is, will the moving of this field be for the improvement of our system of national defense?

Let us just for a moment look into the purpose of this school. The Members of this Committee will remember their college or high-school days and their various studies. Let us face it. What you studied in high school, what you studied in college, you studied the theoretical side and then that study was supplemented by practical demonstrations in the subject matter covered in the study of the theory. The practical demonstration was for the purpose of fixing in your mind what you had studied in theory. It is important that the student be trained in proper time and sequence. This school is run exactly on that same plan. The students study the theoretical side of the question and that study is supplemented with practical demonstrations. You all know how important it is in such a course, that when you have studied the theoretical side, that the practical demonstrations shall be carried out at the proper time and in the proper sequence.

What your Committee on Military Affairs took into consideration above all other things was the very fact that in this course of instruction, while they are pursuing this theoretical instruction, if the weather is not proper to follow it up at the proper time with practical demonstrations, then the students have lost a great deal of the value of the course. The evidence presented to the committee was overwhelming that such is a frequent occurrence. The evidence before the committee showed that in a great many instances students had left that school where they had completed the theoretical course, but had been unable to complete more than 50 percent of the practical course. Their course in such cases was only three-fourths complete.

As to the letter from the Secretary of War, part of it was read and, if any part of it was not, I wish to read from the letter of the Secretary of War, dated February 24, 1936, in the third paragraph:

The above report was carefully studied in the War Department. The War Department arrived at the conclusion that the board's rating of the Denver field was fair and accurate, and that the site of the Chanute Field is, as reported by the board, unsuitable for the purpose.

Nevertheless, in view of the interest which had been shown in the matter by the Congress, the War Department transmitted this report to your committee without recommendation but with an expression of hope for an early decision in the case.

The need for some action in respect to construction of an Air Corps technical school is critical. It is the opinion of the War Department that action to determine the matter should not longer be delayed. The proposed bill offers what the War Department considers an admirable solution. There is a marked lack of Air Corps establishments in the Rocky Mountain States. The site at Rantoul, in addition to the many advantages enumerated by the board, the location at Denver of such a school, with airrome and bombing and gYnery ranges available for transient units, is considered desirable.

This board was appointed by order of the Secretary of War and pursuant to its duties has recommended the change in good faith to increase the efficiency in our Air Corps. Another important consideration is the relative cost of making either of the two locations into a suitable school. At Rantoul we must build from the ground up and in addition furnish a bombing range 10 miles square. Taking an average of the figures furnished for the Raccoon by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Downes], this range will cost $400,000. At Denver in addition to the school the city of Denver will furnish free at Denver, and this site will have in addition a building worth $400,000. This makes an item in favor of the proposed new location of $1,680,000, a very considerable sum.

The CHAIRMAN. All time, has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to establish in or near Denver, Colo., the Air Corps Technical School and to accept the title in fee simple of the property known as the Agnes (Philips) Memorial Sanitarium, together with all buildings and equipment located thereon; and also a tract of land within the State of Colorado, suitable for use as an aerial gynery and bombing range by the Army Air Corps; Provided, That in the event a donor is unable to perfect title to any land tendered as a donation, condemnation of such land is authorized in the name of the United States, and payment of any and all awards for title to such land as is condemned, together with the cost of suit, shall be made by the donor.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, this is an important matter. I think we ought to have a quorum present. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting:] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no individual in my advocacy of an adequate national defense, and, for a number of years, as a Reserve officer in the Army and as a member of the Illinois National Guard at the present time, I have taken considerable interest in this very important national question. I know something about the subject matter in hand. Camp Grant, Ill., is one of the most important and up-to-date Army camps existing in America. Every year they have 2 weeks of training with some 15 or 20 airplanes doing all kinds of maneuvering and stunts. We have a sufficient range to take care of all of the bombing practice necessary for those planes; yet, Mr. Chairman, to show the insignificance of that part of Army maneuvers at this particular time in our history, I have failed to see a single bomb dropped from a plane during the last 2 years at Camp Grant.

I have heard considerable about the air, the sky, the visibility, the clouds, and the low ceiling around Rantoul, Ill. I wonder if we were met with a similar argument when the same generals from the Army testified some 2 or 3 years ago that the weather conditions warranted the removal of this school from Rantoul, Ill. At that
time they wanted to move it into Ohio, where they had the same character of climatic and atmospheric conditions and with a population density the same as we have in Illinois. Within 2 years, however, we find the same group recommending that the field go west instead of east.

I am particularly interested in the observations that have been made by my distinguished colleagues from Illinois with regard to the recreational and social duties of these men connected with the Army. I know something about that, too, Mr. Chairman. That is the last thing this House should consider when it comes to transferring a school like the one at Rantoul away from that spot and to some place in the West, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. Barton) that if there is anything this country needs in addition to the fine program of defense that has been given us charitably by Republicans and Democrats alike during the present administration, it is a greater air force, more air schools, and not the transfer of a single one. As a Member of this House I would be happy to vote for any kind of an appropriation that would give Denver the type of school it seeks at the present time; but we in Illinois are asking that you not take away something that has been with us for a period of 20 years, an institution that was established by the War Department as a school worth while and one that we believe is still worth while for the people of Illinois and this Nation from the standpoint of national defense. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and on the bill close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I took only a couple of minutes on the bill, and did not expect, of course, that my remarks would be made to amend in this way. I thought we would come immediately to a consideration of the merits of the bill.

As I have said, and as you gentlemen know, I am in no sense at any time the echo of the War Department or any board of officers; but having heard this whole thing in and out for the last 8 or 10 years, being familiar with the ground, being familiar with the problem that confronts the Air Corps in the training of its officers and its enlisted personnel, I am convinced that it is to the interest of national defense that there be established at Denver, in accordance with the recommendation of this board of officers, an Air Corps technical training school.

The passage of this bill does not of necessity mean that there will not be any Army activities hereafter at Rantoul, Ill., at what is now known as the Chanute Field. This bill does not say it shall be removed. This bill does not say that Chanute Field shall be closed. The land there belongs to the Government of the United States and was bought by the Government at a good price; as a matter of fact, for more than it would bring today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say it is good land from a farm point of view. The land around there is as fertile as I ever saw anywhere, and it would be prohibitive to think of acquiring a bombing range which would include such valuable farm land as is located in that part of the country.

Let me give you a little information from a financial point of view. The buildings alone, which Denver offers to give the Government absolutely free, will save an expenditure of over $400,000. We must have a bombing range. There is no doubt about that. It is true, as stated, that we now have a bombing range in California, and it is being used now. I have seen them dropping bombs myself out there within the last few months.

Mr. Chairman, if we were to acquire the necessary area for a bombing range anywhere within a practical distance of Chanute Field it would require the expenditure of an additional $1,260,000. Add that to the $400,000 which the Government will save in the buildings already constructed out in Denver and there is an advantage of $1,640,000 in favor of Denver.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. MAY: I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, as I stated a while ago, in the 6 years I have been a member of the Committee on Military Affairs I have never filed a minority or dissenting report. I studied this case very carefully, however, and I am very reluctant to take a stand as between my colleagues from the State of Illinois and the State of Colorado. I have always believed in the rule that protects the under dog, and I am usually on his side of the fight.

Mr. Chairman, for 15 years this school has been maintained at Rantoul, Ill. Two or three efforts have been made to remove it from this location. This is perhaps the third effort.

Mr. Chairman, I want to answer very briefly, if I can, the argument made by my distinguished chairman, with whom I dislike very much to disagree, in regard to the question of improving this field at Rantoul, Ill. Our point of view is that if we were in his place at the end of the Seventy-fourth Congress on the flat that the young Army officers the Department of the Air now have a chance to go to another place and taking it to Denver and building a new school is $6,758,000. You will find this statement at the bottom of page 68 of the hearings had by the House Military Affairs Committee. In other words, that is $6,758,000 in favor of leaving the school at Rantoul, Ill., instead of taking it up root and branch and moving it 500 or 1,000 miles west so that these Army officers may have the benefit of a golf course or a tennis court. The prairies of Illinois are not broad enough for their use.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill because the testimony shows very conclusively that this school should not be moved. I asked about the question of atmospheric conditions so far as the two fields are concerned, and it was shown that there is very slight difference. Furthermore, the evidence shows quite conclusively that more than 95 percent of the activities of these students are in the mechanics on the ground and I am more interested in seeing that the young air-corps students learn something in the way of a useful career than I am that someone has a better and more desirable golf course. Finally, Mr. Chairman, may I refer to a personal consideration by which I have not been influenced, but to which I am pleased to refer. This school is located in the district so long and so ably represented by our distinguished colleague Mr. Doswell, and he has fought such a gallant fight to retain the school at Rantoul, and his zeal and good judgment as one personally familiar with the situation entitles his views to great weight in the determination of this important matter. He is leaving the House at the end of this session and I am sure he not only cares for him in the esteem and high regard of all his colleagues, but of him his people can truthfully say, "Well done, good and faithful servant." We must not send him down to defeat in this last great battle for his home community. We will not, and I shall do my small part by voting against this bill, which ought not to pass.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises. Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TAYLOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 7810)
To establish the Air Corps Technical School and to acquire certain land in the State of Colorado for use as a site for said Air Corps Technical School and as an aerial gunnery and bombing range for the Army Air Corps, pursuant to House Resolution 515, it reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McSWAIN) there were—eyes 36, noses 97.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yes 81, nays 206, answer "present" 1, not voting 138, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—81

Andrews, N. Y. 48
Bacon 1
Bland 1
Carlin 1
Carpenter 1
Catherine 1
Clark, Idaho 1
Clark, Iowa 1
Clayton 1
Cooper, Tenn. 1
Coop. 1
Crowford 1
Dempsie 1
Dewey 1
Duffy, N. Y. 1
Dunk, Pa. 1
Ricket 1
Kinstown 1

NAYS—206

Allen 24
Amile 5
Andersen 1
Anderson 1
Ashbrook 1
Ayers 2
Barry 1
Belter 1
Biermann 1
Binderup 1
Blackney 1
Blandon 1
Bloom 1
Boehle 1
Boileau 1
Boiland 3
Boylan 1
Brown, Ga. 1
Brown, Mich. 1
Buchanan 1
Buckner, Minn. 1
Butcher 1
Burke 1
Burdick 1
Burnham 1
Cannon, Mo. 1
Cannon, Wis. 1
Cattlow 1
Christianson 1
Church 1
Cochlan 1
Cohen 1
Cole, Md. 1
Cole, N. Y. 1
Connery 1
Cooley 1
Cooper, Ohio 1
Corning 1
Costello 1
Crowell 1
Croley 1

By the Speaker (Mr. McCORMACK) the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McCormack (for) with Mr. Dirksen (against).
Mr. Richards (for) with Mr. Chandler (against).
Mr. Colmer (for) with Mr. Schutzm (against).
Mr. Morser (for) with Mr. Schaefer (against).
Mr. Hope (for) with Mr. Kelly (against).
Mr. Dorsey (for) with Mr. Bean (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Scruggs with Mr. Hamlin.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Caldwell.
Mr. Peterson with Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma.
Mr. Carmichael with Mr. Ken.
Mr. Deen with Mr. Robertson of Utah.
Mr. Strother with Mr. McGary.
Mr. Utterback with Mr. Eagle.
Mr. Deer of Ohio with Mr. Sandlin.
Mr. genomcheck with Mr. Sanders of Louisiana.
Mr. Berlin with Mr. Cross of Texas.
Mr. Parks with Mr. Oliver.
Mr. Dunn of Massachusetts with Mr. Brooks.
Mr. Leskaick with Mr. Morris.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Woodrum with Mr. Perkinson.
Mr. Cary with Mr. Lord.
Mr. Green with Mr. Buchman.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Darrow.
Mr. Sears with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Stewart.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Andrew Massachusetts.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Esten.
Mr. Gammill with Mr. Thompson.
Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Brewer.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Samuel B. Hill with Mr. Hollister.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Mass.
Mr. Lambeth with Mr. Seger.
Mr. Weldon with Mr. Rusk.
Mr. Mitchell of Tennessee with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Droitcur.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Cavichila.
Mr. Deuelen with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Driessell with Mr. Mclntire.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Kiner.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Anglebright.
Mr. Ferguson with Mr. Owins.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Mackenzie.

So the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McCormack (for) with Mr. Dirksen (against).
Mr. Richards (for) with Mr. Chandler (against).
Mr. Colmer (for) with Mr. Schutzm (against).
Mr. Morser (for) with Mr. Schaefer (against).
Mr. Hope (for) with Mr. Kelly (against).
Mr. Dorsey (for) with Mr. Bean (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Scruggs with Mr. Hamlin.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Caldwell.
Mr. Peterson with Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma.
Mr. Carmichael with Mr. Ken.
Mr. Deen with Mr. Robertson of Utah.
Mr. Strother with Mr. McGary.
Mr. Utterback with Mr. Eagle.
Mr. Deer of Ohio with Mr. Sandlin.
Mr. genomcheck with Mr. Sanders of Louisiana.
Mr. Berlin with Mr. Cross of Texas.
Mr. Parks with Mr. Oliver.
Mr. Dunn of Massachusetts with Mr. Brooks.
Mr. Leskaick with Mr. Morris.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Woodrum with Mr. Perkinson.
Mr. Cary with Mr. Lord.
Mr. Green with Mr. Buchman.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Darrow.
Mr. Sears with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Stewart.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Andrew Massachusetts.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Esten.
Mr. Gammill with Mr. Thompson.
Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Brewer.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Samuel B. Hill with Mr. Hollister.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Mass.
Mr. Lambeth with Mr. Seger.
Mr. Weldon with Mr. Rusk.
Mr. Mitchell of Tennessee with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Droitcur.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Cavichila.
Mr. Deuelen with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Driessell with Mr. Mclntire.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Kiner.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Anglebright.
Mr. Ferguson with Mr. Owins.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Mackenzie.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. Dobins, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was rejected was laid on the table.

Mr. AND MRS. A. S. MULL. Mr. RAMSPEEK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3699) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman from Iowa should at least tell us what this bill does and what is the emergency for its passage at the present time.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with some land owned by my friend Mrs. Munn and her son, Dr. Munn, gave to the United States Government a few years ago for park purposes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. MAVERICK. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would the gentleman object to a request from me?

Mr. MAVERICK. I am objecting because the "red rider" bill is coming up Monday.

STATE PARK IN IOWA

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 11929) granting to the State of Iowa for State park purposes certain land of the United States in Clayton County, Iowa.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman from Iowa should at least tell us what this bill does and what is the emergency for its passage at the present time.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with some land owned by my friend Mrs. Munn and her son, Dr. Munn, gave to the United States Government a few years ago for park purposes.

It was to be under the authority of the Biological Survey. They admittedly have not done a good job of taking care of it for park purposes, and this bill would transfer the land to the Iowa Conservation Commission, which is our State park board. There is not a penny of expense involved, and the Committee on Agriculture has unanimously reported it out.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I may refer to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SNELL) that the Committee on Agriculture unanimously favors the bill. The committee went over it carefully yesterday morning.

Mr. SNELL. And there is no reason why this transfer should not be made?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Iowa should at least tell us what this bill does and what is the emergency for its passage at the present time.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with some land owned by my friend Mrs. Munn and her son, Dr. Munn, gave to the United States Government a few years ago for park purposes.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is a meritorious bill, and I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. SNELL. I have no objection to the bill, but I wanted an explanation of its purpose.

Mr. TABER. The objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., that there is hereby granted to the State of Iowa, upon the conditions and limitations hereinafter expressed, the following-described land of the United States lying and being in the Upper Mississippi River Wild Life and Fish Refuge, in Clayton County, Iowa, aggregating 544.37 acres, more or less, to be held and administered by said State for the purposes of a State public park:

Lots 2, 3, and 4, section 35, township 99 north, range 3 west, five-tenths of an acre, enacted, more or less, being the right-of-way of the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railway.

Lot 21, block 11; lot 21, block 13; lots 7, 8, 12, 14, and 17, block 14; and lots 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, block 9; all situate in the town of McGregor, Jr., addition to the town of McGregor, Iowa, containing according to survey 1,57 acres, more or less.

A parcel of land in section 29 and 30, township 95 north, range 3 west, fifth principal merit, described as follows:

Beginning at the corner of section 27, an unmarked stake; thence south 18°33' east, 2, a 2-by-2-by-15-inch oak stake beside fence corner of land formerly owned by Pearl Johnson; thence with boundary of land formerly owned by Pearl Johnson, north 44° 1.51 east, 7.99 chains to corner 3, an elm post 5 inches in diameter, 4 feet above ground; thence south 54° 36.93 east exactly 5 chains to corner 4, an elm post 4 inches in diameter, 4 feet above ground; thence south 44° 4.71 west exactly 4 chains to corner 5, an elm stake 3 inches in diameter, 1 foot above ground; thence south 54° 36.93 east, with quarter-section line and leaving land formerly owned by Pearl Johnson, 14.56 chains to corner 6, the quarter section between sections 28 and 30; thence south 90° 20.47 west, 30 chains, scribed "US", and a 1½-by-15-inch iron pipe above ground, in a mound of stone, a 10-inch red oak bears north 85° 8.53 east, thirty-eighty-eight chains, blazed, 5-by-5-by-3-inch white fir, south 2° 54' 1.51 east, with the line between sections 29 and 37, 37.90 chains approximate.

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

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.
Lots 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, block 40, in the James McGregor, Jr., addition to the town of McGregor, Iowa, containing according to survey 53.38 acres, more or less, subject to any existing rights or easements for roads over or across the above-described land.

Lots 7, 8, and 9, block 46, in the James McGregor, Jr., addition to the town of McGregor, Iowa, containing according to survey 10.13 acres, more or less, subject to any existing rights or easements for roads over or across the above-described land.

A certain parcel of land located in the northeast 100 acres of the Girard claim and within what would be section 27, town line 18, range 3 west, fifth principal meridian, described as follows:

Beginning at corner 1, the rear corner common to lots 9 and 10, sec. 27, town of McGregor, a 65-inch oak stake above ground, marked "US 1-5"; thence south 10°35' east, 3.03 chains to corner 2; thence south 89°59' east, 26.62 acres, more or less, subject to any existing rights or easements for roads over or across the above-described land.

Lands 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, block 40, in the James McGregor, Jr., addition to the town of McGregor, Iowa, containing according to survey 53.38 acres, more or less, subject to any existing rights or easements for roads over or across the above-described land.
The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
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Let me again mention the Revolution. After it came, the administrators, selfish men as they were, put over a mere contract for the preservation of property, omitting entirely any semblance of the Bill of Rights. But the influence of Tom Paine, Thomas Jefferson, and the other great men of that day was so strong that a Bill of Rights was written into the fundamental law of the Constitution. The American people are not to be deprived of freedom of religion, speech, assembly, and press.

Today these rights are as fundamental and as necessary as they were 160 years ago. We have had 6 years of depression and continued unemployment, and we are faced with a new American crisis. In Tom Paine's day there was scarcity and a reason for it. Today we have starvation in the midst of plenty and no reason—or at least no excuse—for it.

So there's one thing at least that we ought to have, and that is freedom of discussion. This is not only reaffirmed by Mr. Studebaker in Plain Talk but it is demanded, and a wise method of adult education and adult forums is proposed.

A BARBARIAN LAW WHICH INFESTS KNOWLEDGE

In the United States today there are such organizations as the American Liberty League, which have no other purpose than to strangle the fundamental rights vouchsafed to every American in the Constitution. Laws have been adopted to curb freedom of speech and freedom of teaching in the States.

In the District of Columbia there exists a law known as the "red rider," one of the most uncivilized and barbarous laws ever passed in the history of any government. This "red rider" has no parallel in the entire world's history and no such law has ever existed or exists now, except in the District of Columbia—that is, where one first takes an oath of allegiance and then must be constantly humiliated week after week and month after month by being forced to take additional oaths.

PLAIN TALK—GIVES BACKBONE TO TEACHERS

In view of all this, it is fortunate that a book should be published like Plain Talk. I got a copy and the price intrigued me. I wondered how one could be sold so cheaply. I had not read very much before I said, "Every teacher in this country ought to have a copy." Teachers are a timid lot—and why not? They have been bunged over the road by every special interest, every fanatic, every witch burner, every enemy of democracy, every braying ignoramus, for years and years. They have done the job for telling the truth; they have been bamboozled and persecuted to the limit.

TELLS HOW TO MEET THE SITUATION

The book has a splendid introduction by Morse Cartwright, Director of the American Association for Adult Education. Mr. Cartwright tells us that the author, John W. Studebaker, is not only United States Commissioner of Education, but the outstanding advocate of public discussion in the country. He points out that our ideals of democracy were of Anglo-Saxon origin and "were transferred through the red sword" to our Revolutionary Government.

He reminds us that there were two documents, not one: the Declaration of Independence as well as the Constitution of the United States, and that the former came into American history bringing a new conception of liberty to the young nation and to a none-too-hopeful world; and he further reminds us that the Bill of Rights is as much a part of the Constitution as its other parts.

NATIONAL HOME LIBRARY FOUNDATION

One hundred thousand copies of this book have been made available by the National Home Library Foundation in Washington. This organization, like the American Association for Adult Education, is a cooperative, and non-profit-making undertaking. It has, in the past 4 years, published and distributed, without any thought of profit, 3 million good books at a price within the reach of everyone. Plain Talk, like most of the other millions of books published, costs a quarter, but is a full fledged, A-1, well-bound book, and not a loosely bound, paper-covered affair. The program and policy of the foundation is carried out by a group of 66 of the most distinguished authors, educators, historians, and scientists living today. Its president and editor is Sherman Mittlell. He is an idealist who has refused persistently during the 4 years he has guided the foundation's home-library program, to accept a salary higher than $25 per week. But, with his idealism, he has combined a talent for organizing the best minds of America to work toward a common goal—a better informed and more civilized nation.

Plain Talk has been hailed by the National Education Association as the new bill of rights—the American teachers' bill of rights. It ought not to be necessary in a free country to have to print any such book, but at this stage of our national history it is good to have one necessary to have such a book in every teacher's or other person's hands that cares anything for liberty.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION FRANIES

In this month's issue of the Journal of the National Education Association, reaching over 250,000 American teachers, there is an editorial which deserves quotation.

It says:

A century ago Horace Mann labored for universal free schools so ably that he has been called the founder of our American system of public education. He and his followers have made elementary schooling universal and secondary schooling nearly so. But that is not enough under the conditions of today to save democracy from confusion and disaster. We need something more and greater.

Now comes a new prophet with vision to sense democracy's present need, with the gift of expression, with a genius for organization, and the courage of action which we have long associated with Horace Mann. It is the highest good fortune that this new leader, John W. Studebaker, is United States Commissioner of Education. It would be hard to overestimate the significance of his sustained championship of universal, tax-supported education of adults in the pressing problems of democracy.

This book is especially valuable for summer-school classes, for high schools and colleges, for parent-teacher associations, and for reading groups of every kind in home, school, church, and community.

Every citizen should have an opportunity to study this book.

Notice it says every citizen should read this book. In this I agree—for all persons should know their rights.

MILLION TEACHERS POTENT POLITICAL INFLUENCE

It is good indeed for the American teachers that there is an outstanding champion of academic freedom and that
he is placed as Commissioner of Education for the whole United States of America. This is a high office. And from this high office he will carry on this battle, Plain Talk, in a simple way, with hard rights and lefts, and pulls no punches. He is speaking for over a million American teachers who are rising now for their right to teach and to impart knowledge; to maintain their self-respect, and to really earn their money as giving learning to the children of America.

He is speaking for over a million American teachers who are rising now for their right to teach and to impart knowledge; to maintain their self-respect, and to really earn their money as giving learning to the children of America.

This shows that liberty is not an empty phrase. It is something precious, something active, and Studebaker realizes that in this complicated industrial civilization, more than ever we must maintain our democratic liberties because if they is to become not even a machine but a mere slave of a machine, life will not be worth living.

ROSE THEMSELVES IN NATIONAL COLORS

Dr. Studebaker knows every American teacher and parent ought to realize that the forces of privilege and those who robe themselves in national colors are making every effort to get control of the public-school system. This has been exposed a half-dozen times by numerous bodies and by the Federal Trade Commission in official investigations and reports. And this is true whether they control powerful newspapers or vast monoplies. These special interests attempt to distort other freedoms with some sort of misleading, snappy phraseology or labels to cover up their real motives. And this is true whether they control powerful newspapers or vast monoplies.

One thing is certain, and that is, that democracy belongs to the people who can make it work. We have a right to expect the labor movement to help. We have a right to expect the people who can make it work. We have a right to expect this to solve the problems of unemployment, poverty, and distress, it cannot survive.

BRAINS—MASTER FIGHTER, MASTER BUILDER

Mr. Justice Brandeis is a great American and concerns this story. He has not always been "Mr. Justice." As a young man he was not only a master fighter for human rights but a master builder for human life. He exposed the insurance racket in Massachusetts; he was the father of the savings, loan, and insurance laws of the State of Massachusetts wherein families can protect themselves cheaply and safely. His achievements long before he became a Justice were substantially for the whole American people. On the Court he has not become an osified automation but has lost contact with the heart and soul of America.

It is important for all students, citizens of all kinds to know this; that they have a friend in court. He is a man old in the concept of maturity and wisdom, but youthful and joyous of heart insofar as his ideas concern progress and human liberty. He is a man who quietly lashes himself to the mast of a ship in a roaring sea and quietly writes down on a piece of paper the truths that thunder in his soul.

THINK AS YOU WILL—SPEAK AS YOU THINK

The jacket of Plain Talk quotes Mr. Justice Brandeis on his opinion in Whitney against California. He said in that opinion:

Those who won our independence believed that the final end of the struggle was to make men free to develop their faculties, and to use their means of livelihood in a manner best calculated to secure to themselves and the community the greatest happiness; in its government the deliberative powers should prevail over the arbitrary. They valued liberty both as an end and as a means. They believed liberty to be the secret of happiness; that without free speech and assembly discussion would be futile; that with them discussion affords ordinarily adequate protection against the dissemination of false doctrines; that the greatest menace to liberty is inert people; that public discussion is a political duty; and that this should be a fundamental principle of the American Government.

DEMOCRACY HATES—HATE MINACES STABLE GOVERNMENT

They recognized the risks to which all human institutions are subject. But they knew that crime cannot be secured merely by threat of punishment; that instruction is not enough to discourage thought, hope, and imagination; that fear breeds hatred and revenge; that ignorance is the parent of hate, menaces stable government; that the path of safety lies in the opportunity for free discussion of grievances and proposed remedies; and that the fitting remedy for evil counsels is good counsel.
Believing in the power of reason as applied through public discussion, they eschewed silence coerced by law—the argument of force in its worst form. Recognizing the occasional tyrannies of majority rule, they amended the Constitution so that free speech and assembly should be guaranteed.

FORESIGHTED MEN DID NOT FEAR POLITICAL CHANGE

Those who won our independence by revolution were not cowards. They did not fear political change. They did not exalt order above the command of the Constitution. It is therefore always open to Americans to challenge a law abridging free speech and assembly by showing that there was no emergency justifying it.—Justice Brandeis, in concurring opinion, Walz v. California, 1927.

DEMOCRACY—THAT'S WHAT WE WANT

The American people, our teachers, our thinkers, must stand up and claim and demand perfectly obvious rights. We cannot solve any of our problems except by constant discussion. This can only be done by the full freedom of thought and discussion.

SPANISH WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION—$10,000 FOR EVERY SPANISH WAR VETERAN DEATH CAUSED BY ECONOMY ACT—$50,000,000 TAKEN FROM SPANISH WAR VETERANS BY ECONOMY ACT MUST BE REMODED

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill, H. R. 12918, to provide indemnity benefits to Spanish War veterans and their dependents while the Economy Act was in force, and H. R. 12918, the bill I am introducing, providing a refund of benefits to Spanish War veterans and dependent by the Economy Act. This amount, according to the Veterans' Administration, was divided between veterans and dependents in this way:

Spanish-American War veterans: $246,380,893.92 would have been paid from March 1933 to July 1935, inclusive, had no Economy Act been passed; $160,785,722.92 was actually paid from March 1933 to July 1935, inclusive; difference, $85,595,171, amount taken from Spanish War veterans by Economy Act from March 1933 to July 1935, inclusive.

Spanish-American War dependents: $42,490,343.23 would have been paid between March 1933 and July 1935, inclusive, had no Economy Act been passed; $26,163,319.76 was actually paid between March 1933 and July 1935 inclusive; difference: $16,317,023.47 taken from dependents by Economy Act.

The total amount taken from Spanish War comrades and their dependents, $101,912,194.47, is about one-tenth of the amount appropriated for war and war preparations in this present year of peace.

Both these bills should be passed. H. R. 9145, to refund pensions taken from Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents while the Economy Act was in force, and H. R. 12918, the bill I am introducing, providing a $10,000 indemnity for dependents of Spanish War veterans whose death is directly or indirectly the result of the Economy Act.

WHAT UNCLE SAM GAINED IN THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

Any cost to the Government which will result from the passage of the Lundeen Spanish War veterans' indemnity bill is insignificant compared with the huge gains Uncle Sam made as a result of the war in which these men were willing to lay down their lives. As a result of the Spanish-American War, Spain lost Cuba, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines. The islands and possessions gained were among the richest in the world. The war cost the United States about a billion dollars. The value of the possessions we gained was more than thirty billion. The Spanish-American War put $30 in Uncle Sam's pocket for every dollar spent.

WAS THE ECONOMY ACT CONSTITUTIONAL?

There is some doubt as to whether Congress constitutionally had the power to take from the veterans the pensions it had by previous legislation agreed to pay. The constitutionality of the act has never been tested. When Spanish War veterans were placed on the pension rolls it was taken as self-evident that they had a lifetime contract with the United States Government. They incurred their own obligations accordingly. They budgeted their incomes. Many of them bought furniture and homes on the installment plan. They invested on the income that had years ago been promised them by the Federal Government, whose obligations are supposed to be kept.

In the case of Perry v. United States (no. 532, gold-clause cases, decided Feb. 16, 1935), Chief Justice Hughes stated:

By virtue of the power to borrow monev "on the credit of the United States", the Congress is authorized to pledge that credit as an assurance of payment as stipulated, as the highest assurance the Government can give, its plighted faith. To say that the Congress may withdraw or ignore that pledge is to assume that the
Constitution contemplates a vaunt promise, a pledge having no other
sanction than the pleasure and convenience of the pledgor. This
Court has given no sanction to such a conception of the obligations
of our Government.

The prize cases decision just quoted also mentioned
the binding quality of the obligations of the Government as
presented in the Sinking Fund cases (90 U. S. 700, 718, 719),
in which the question was whether certain action was war-
rented by a reservation to Congress of the right to amend
the charter of a railroad company. Chief Justice Hughes,
in referring to that case, stated:

"When the Nation has gone to war, its action was sustained under the right of
amendment, the Court took occasion to state emphatically the
obligatory character of the contracts of the United States. The
Court in that case said: "The United States are as much bound by their con-
tracts as are individuals. If they repudiate their obligations, it is
as much repudiation, with all the wrong and reproach that term
implies, as if it would be the repudiator had been a State or a
municipality or a citizen."

When the United States, with constitutional authority, makes
contracts, it has rights and incurs responsibilities similar to those
of individuals who are parties to such instruments. There is no
difference, said the Court in United States v. Bank of the Metro-
city (15 Pet. 577, 592), except that the United States cannot be
sued without its consent.

Congress cannot abrogate war-risk insurance contracts

In Lynch v. United States (292 U. S. 571, 580), there was a
repeal without abrogation by the Economy Spent of
outstanding war-risk insurance policies which were contracts
of the United States. In this case, the Court also quoted the
"sinking fund cases", stating:

"Punctilious fulfillment of contractual obligations is essential to
the maintenance of the credit of public as well as private debtors.
Nor doubt there was in March 1863, great need of economy. In
the administration of all Government business, economy had be-
bcome urgent because of lessened revenues and the heavy obliga-
tions to be issued in the hope of relieving widespread distress.
Congress was free to reduce gratuities deemed excessive. But
Congress has within power to reduce expenditures by repudi-
ating contractual obligations of the United States. To abrogate con-
tracts in the attempt to lessen Government expenditure, would be
not only a betrayal of them but a bait of repudiation.

Other Spanish-American War Bills—Bills to Repeal Economy Act

On May 2, 1933, during the Seventy-third Congress, I in-
troduced H. R. 5333, the first bill to repeal the entire Eco-

omy Act. When the Seventy-fourth Congress opened on
January 3, 1935, I again introduced the same bill, as H. R.
2825, to repeal the entire Economy Act, and the same day I
introduced H. R. 2828 to repeal that part of the Economy
Act affecting Spanish War veterans and their dependents.
A similar bill, to repeal that part of the Economy Act affecting
Spanish War veterans and their dependents, was introduced by
Congressman Martin F. Smith, of Washington, and be-
came a law on August 13, 1935. This restored the rates of
pensions in effect before the passage of the Economy Act on
March 20, 1933.

Spanish War Veterans Should Be on Same Basis as Civil War Veterans

Spanish-American War veterans are now approaching an
average age of 62. Their number is being reduced at the rate
of 500 per month. They should now be placed on the
same basis as Civil War veterans during the declining years
of their life. With this view in mind, I introduced in the
Seventy-third Congress, and again the opening day of the
present Seventy-fourth Congress, on January 3, 1935, a bill,
H. R. 1404, to place Spanish War veterans on the same
basis as Civil War veterans for pension purposes.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION AFFECTING SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS FROM MARCH 20, 1933, TO AUGUST 13, 1935

Since the passage of the act of August 13, 1933, restoring
pensions, the old pre-Economy Act rates are again effective.
The passage of the Economy Act of March 20, 1933, and
other economy legislation were administered by the Veterans' Administration. From time to time the President and the
Administrar of Veterans' Affairs issued regulations and
orders indicating how these laws were to be enforced. As a
result of legislative orders, the status of Spanish War
veterans pensions, therefore, shifted slightly from time
to time during the period March 20, 1933, until August 13,
1935.

However, during the period of March 1933 to August 13,
1935, Spanish War veterans' pensions passed through five
different major stages:

FIRST STAGE—PRE-ECONOMY ACT

Before the passage of the Economy Act of March 20, 1933,
the old rates of pay were in effect. Until 1930 all Spanish
War veterans who were drawing pensions had established
service connection in accordance with the requirements of
the old so-called general law. On June 5, 1920, the Spanish
War service pension law was passed. Under this law there
was no distinction between service-connected and non-serv-
vice-connected disabilities. Any Spanish War veteran who
applied could receive a pension for varying rates of disability
or for age. The same applies for the laws of May 1, 1925,
and June 2, 1930, which increased the rates of pension until
the maximum of $80 was reached for permanent and total
disability, except in cases where the age and attendance
of another person was required, when a maximum of $72 was
allowed.

Thousands of Spanish War veterans dropped their claims
of service connection under the old general law and applied
for the more liberal pension granted under the later laws
without regard to service connection. Prior to the passage
of the Economy Act, out of about 156,000 Spanish War
veterans on the pension rolls, only 600 were recorded as
service connected. These 600 merely had neglected to apply
for pensions under the new and more liberal law.

Prior to March 20, 1933, the great majority of Spanish
War veterans receiving pensions for 90 days or more of
service were paid on this scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Monthly Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Spanish War veterans, on basis of disability—per month:

90% disability—$90
80% disability—$80
70% disability—$70
60% disability—$60
50% disability—$50
40% disability—$40
30% disability—$30
20% disability—$20
10% disability—$10

For Spanish War veterans, on age alone, regardless of disability—

Age 62—$40
Age 65—$30
Age 72—$30
Age 75—$20

Spanish War widows received $30 per month, with $6 for
each dependent under the age of 16.

SECOND STAGE—ECONOMY ACT, MARCH 20, 1933

Under the Economy Act all Spanish War veterans whose
disabilities were not shown to be service-connected, except
those over the age of 62 and those who could prove perma-

nent and total disability, were scheduled to be dropped from
pension rolls.

The so-called presumptive clause, regulation 12 of the
Executive orders under the Economy Act, recognized that
Spanish War veterans would be at a decided disadvantage
in proving their disabilities to be service connected. This
clause stated that these men shall continue to receive a
pension under the act at the rate being paid them on the
date of enactment of the Economy Act—

It being presumed that the injury or disease causing the dis-
ability was incurred in the line of duty in the active military or
naval service during **the Spanish-American War, in-
cluding the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrec-

The burden of proof was to be on the Veterans' Admin-
istration to show that the disability was not service con-

nected, but in practice, at least in many cases, Spanish War
veterans found the burden of proof on themselves. Little
or no consideration was given to this presumption clause.

Under the Economy Act Spanish War veterans who could
prove service connection were paid at the same rate as World
War veterans whose cases were service connected. The
difficulty for Spanish War veterans was that only a very
small percentage could prove service connection 35 years
after the war, and hundreds of them died before they had a
chance to prove service connection. An amendment offered
to the Independent offices appropriation bill in June 1933 to
prevented reduction of Spanish War pensions more than 25 percent was defeated.

THIRD STAGE—$15 PER MONTH ALLOWED FOR VETERANS IN NEED OVER 55

A slight modification of the Economy Act as it affected Spanish War veterans was made in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act passed in June 1933. This provision stated:

Notwithstanding any of the provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress (the Economy Act), any veteran of the Spanish War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, who served 90 days or more, was honorably discharged from the service, is 55 years of age or over, is 50 percent disabled, and in need as determined by the President, shall be paid a pension of not less than $15 per month.

This meant that Spanish War veterans who were over 55 years of age and 50-percent disabled could be sure of a $15-a-month pension—if they could qualify under a need clause.

FOURTH STAGE—ACT OF MARCH 28, 1934—75 PERCENT RESTORATION

The act of March 28, 1934, provided that Spanish War pensions should be restored to 75 percent of the amount each veteran received prior to the passage of the Economy Act. This was a frank admission that the Economy Act, at least as it affected Spanish War veterans, was a failure. It had brought misery and despair to thousands of Spanish War veterans and their dependents, and public resentment was affected.

The act and all its regulations, as far as they affected Spanish War veterans, were repealed, and the old laws were made the basis for the act of March 28, 1934. This new act was in effect until August 13, 1935.

FIFTH STAGE—ACT OF AUGUST 13, 1935—FULL RESTORATION

The repeal of the Economy Act as it affected Spanish War veterans was completed by the act of August 13, 1935, which was the Smith bill, already mentioned. The Smith bill was a copy of the Lundeen bill, the first bill to repeal the Economy Act as it applied to Spanish War veterans. This act places back on the statute books all the Spanish War pension schedules in effect as of March 19, 1933. Although we can never restore the lives that have been lost or erase the long months of anxiety and destitution thrust upon thousands of our comrades by economy hysteria in 1933, at least we can say the Economy Act as it affects Spanish War veterans is repealed. Those of us who fought against this vicious, cruel, and inhuman act from the first can truly say we have won a great victory.

LUNDEEN BILLS FOR SPANISH WAR VETERANS

In concluding my remarks I wish to say that during the present Congress I have introduced four bills for the benefit of Spanish War veterans:

First. A bill (H. R. 2828) to repeal the Economy Act as it affected Spanish War veterans. A bill similar to this became a law on August 13, 1935.

Second. A bill (H. R. 1404) to place Spanish War veterans on the same basis as Civil War veterans, paying pensions of $75 to $100.

Third. A bill (H. R. 9145) to refund to Spanish War veterans and their dependents the sums taken from them while the Economy Act was in force. This would mean $65,566,171 to Spanish War veterans and $16,317,023.47 to their dependents.

Fourth. A bill (H. R. 12918) to provide an indemnity of $10,000 to dependents of Spanish War veterans whose death resulted from the vicious, cruel, and inhuman Economy Act.

I am a Spanish War veteran, having served in Company B, Twelfth Minnesota Volunteer Infantry. I will continue my efforts on behalf of my comrades as long as I have the honor to represent them in Congress.

TEXT OF LUNDEEN BILLS

Spanish War veterans' indemnity bill:

[Mr. R. 1919, House of Representatives, 74th Cong., 2d sess.]

A bill to provide indemnity benefits to dependents of veterans of the Spanish-American War who died as a result of the enforcement of the so-called Economy Act of March 20, 1934, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $10,000 shall be paid to the dependent of any deceased veteran of the Spanish-American War (including the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion) who was entitled to benefits under the pension laws in force on March 19, 1933, and who died after March 19, 1933, and on or before August 31, 1935, if it appears to the satisfaction of the Indemnity Board, provided for Board, provided for by the act of August 13, 1935, or any act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, was a factor substantially contributing to his death. A dependent may receive the benefits of this act by application claiming the benefits thereof filed with the Indemnity Board.

An application not filed on or before July 1, 1937, shall be void.

(a) The President is authorized to appoint five members for an Indemnity Board, which shall have jurisdiction of applica-

(b) For the purposes of this act such board or any member thereof is authorized to hold hearings, administer oaths, and require the attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of books, papers, documents, or other evidence, and the taking of depositions before any designated individual competent to admin-

(c) Such board may appoint and fix the compensation, subject to the approval of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, of such board.

(d) The board herein provided for shall cease to exist upon the completion of its duties under this act, and upon such completion all records, equipment, and property shall be transferred to the Veterans' Administration.

Sec. 3. (a) Upon final favorable decision upon any application made under this act the Indemnity Board shall certify such deci-

(1) To the widow.

(2) To widow entitled to payment, then to the children, share and share alike.

(3) If no widow or children entitled to payment, then to the

(4) If no widow, children, or mother entitled to payment, then to the father.

(5) No payment under this act shall be made to a widower who has remarried before making and filing application, or if at the time of the death of the veteran the husband was living apart from her by reason of her own lawful act.

(c) Payment under this act shall be made to a child if under 18 years of age at the time of the death of the veteran, or if unmarried or over 60 years of age, or if the father was over 60 years of age, such mother or father, respectively, shall be presumed to have been dependent.

3. As used in this act—

(a) The term "dependent" means a widow, widower, child, father, or mother.

(b) The term "child" includes (1) a legitimate child; (2) a child legally adopted; (3) a child, where father or mother is or has been a member of the veteran's household; (4) an illegitimate child, but, as to the father only, if acknowledged in writing signed by him, or if he has been judicially ordered or decree to contribute to such child's support,
or has been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child;

6. The terms "father" and "mother" include stepfathers and stepmothers, fathers and mothers through adoption, and persons who have, for a period of not less than 1 year, stood in the relation of parent to the veteran at any time prior to the beginning of his service; and

7. The term "widow" includes widower.

Sec. 6. Whoever knowingly makes any false or fraudulent statement of a material fact in any application made under any provision of this act, or under any regulation made under this act, for a pension or burial grant, or for any other benefit under the laws reenacted by such act of August 13, 1935, shall be in full force and effect retroactively as of March 20, 1933. All awards and grants of benefits in force on March 19, 1933, under the laws reenacted by such act, and August 13, 1935, shall be held to be full and complete, and any claim for benefits under such laws, except in cases where the right to payment of such claim by the applicant, and any claim for benefits under the laws reenacted by such act of August 13, 1935, shall be in full force and effect from March 20, 1933, unless hereafter modified or repealed pursuant to such laws, except in cases where the right to payment under such laws or grants of benefits would be affected by the happening of a contingency referred to in such laws. Subject to the same exceptions, benefits accruing under such awards and grants for the period between August 13, 1935, and August 19, 1935, shall be paid without application, after deduction of any like benefits received under pension laws in force during such period.

Sec. 7. No claim in respect of benefits under any of the acts repealed by such act of August 13, 1935, such benefits shall not be reduced or discontinued by reason of the enactment of such act of August 13, 1935.

Sec. 2. Any claim for benefits under the laws reenacted by such act of August 13, 1935, may be considered and determined under such laws without any renewal of such claim by the applicant, and any claim for benefits under any act reenacted by such act of August 13, 1935, pending on August 12, 1935, may be considered and determined as a claim for benefits under the laws reenacted by such act of August 13, 1935. In case of any such claim the applicant shall be afforded an opportunity to present supplementary evidence and to have a new physical examination before his claim is determined, and shall be given notice of such opportunity. Benefits awarded under any such claim shall begin to accrue on the date of filing such claim.

Bill to place Spanish War veterans on same basis as Civil War veterans:

[HR. 1604, House of Representatives, 74th Cong., 1st sess.] A bill granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, or who, having served less than 90 days, were discharged for disease or disability incurred in the service and in line of duty, shall be entitled to, and shall be paid, a pension at the rate of $75 per month: Provided, That any person who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, or who, having served less than 90 days, was discharged for a disease or disability contracted in the service and in line of duty, and who is unable to support himself by reason of age, physical or mental disability, helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind, as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person, shall be entitled to and shall be paid a pension at the rate of $30 per month:

Sec. 2. The widow of any officer or enlisted man who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, or who, having served less than 90 days, was discharged for a disease or disability incurred in the service and in line of duty (such widow having married such soldier, sailor, or marine prior to Sept. 1, 1922), shall, upon due proof of her husband's death, without proving his death to be the result of his service, be placed upon the pension roll at the rate of $30 per month during her widowhood: Provided, That the widow of any officer or enlisted man who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, or who, having served less than 90 days, was discharged for a disease or disability incurred in the service and in line of duty (such widow having remarried either once or more after the death of the soldier, sailor, or marine) if it be shown that such subsequent or successive marriage or marriages has or have been dissolved, either by the death of the husband or husbands or by divorce on any ground except adultery on the part of the wife, and any such former widow shall be entitled to and shall be paid a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

3. The provisions of the foregoing section shall apply to a former widow of any officer or enlisted man, or to her remarried stepmother, father, mother through adoption, and persons who have or have been judicially decreed to be the stepfather, stepmother, or any other relative of the veteran at any time prior to the beginning of his service; and

6. Provided further, That the widow or remarried widow of any soldier, sailor, marine, or nurse, who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, or who, having served less than 90 days, was discharged for disease or disability incurred in the service and in line of duty (such widow having remarried either once or more after the death of the soldier, sailor, or marine) if it be shown that such subsequent or successive marriage or marriages has or have been dissolved, either by the death of the husband or husbands or by divorce on any ground except adultery on the part of the wife, and any such former widow shall be entitled to and shall be paid a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

SEC. 4. The pension or increased rate of pension provided for in this act shall commence from the date of filing application therefor in the Veterans Administration after the approval of this act, in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs provided they are entitled to a pension under the provisions of this act, and the issue of a check in payment of a pension for which the execution and submission of a voucher was not required shall constitute payment in full of the death of the pensioner on or after the last day of the period covered by such check, and it shall not be canceled, but shall become an asset of the estate of the deceased pensioner.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be held to effect or allow the additional pension to those in the roll designated as the "Army and Navy Medal of Honor Roll" in the act of April 27, 1916, but any pension or increase of pension herein prescribed for shall be in addition to this or any former statute: Provided, That when a pension has been granted to an insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless child, or to a child or children under the age of 16 years, who have rendered or rendered services in the line of duty, the same shall continue to such widow or former widow payment of pension to such child or children shall cease, and this proviso shall apply to all claims arising under this or any other act.
Bill to repeal Economy Act as it affected Spanish War veterans:

[H. R. 2835, House of Representatives, 74th Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to restore benefits for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, and for other purposes

"Be it enacted, etc., That so much of title I of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", approved March 20, 1933, as amended, and of all acts or parts of acts amending or supplementing such act, as relates to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, is hereby repealed."

"Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", approved March 20, 1933 (otherwise known as the "Economy Act"), which repeals all public laws granting medical or hospital treatment, domiciliary care, compensation, and other allowances, pensions, or retirement pay to veterans and the dependents of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, which were repealed by section 17 of title I of such act of March 20, 1933, are hereby reenacted to read as such laws read on March 19, 1933, with the same force and effect as such laws had on such date with respect to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection.

"(b) All awards and grants of monetary benefits in force on March 19, 1933, under the laws reenacted by this section, shall be in full force and effect from the effective date of this act until modified or revoked pursuant to such laws, except in cases where the right to payment under such laws has been lost by reason of the happening of a contingency referred to in such laws.

"(c) All claims for benefits under the laws reenacted by this section pending on March 19, 1933, may be considered and determined under such laws without regard to any one of any such claim be in full force and effect from the effective date of this act until modified or revoked pursuant to such laws, except in cases where the right to payment under such laws has been lost by reason of the happening of a contingency referred to in such laws.

"(d) All claims for benefits under the laws reenacted by this section pending on March 19, 1933, may be considered and determined under such laws without regard to any one of any such claim pending on, or filed after, the date of enactment of this act shall begin to accrue on the effective date of this act, or the date of the filing of the claim, whichever is the later date.

Sec. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of the calendar month next following the month during which this act is enacted.

Bill to repeal entire Economy Act:

[H. R. 2835, House of Representatives, 74th Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to repeal Economy Act approved March 20, 1933, and for other purposes

"Be it enacted, etc., That such provisions of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", approved March 20, 1933 (otherwise known as the "Economy Act"), which repeals all public laws granting medical or hospital treatment, domiciliary care, compensation, and other allowances, pensions, disability allowance, or retirement pay to veterans and the dependents of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, and the World War, or to former members of the military or naval service, except as a result of wounds war, shall be in full force and effect from the effective date of this act, or the date of the filing of the claim, whichever is the later date.

Sec. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of the calendar month following the month during which this act is enacted.

DR. TOWNSEND AND THE TOWNSEND MOVEMENT

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, when the Bell resolution to investigate the Board of Rail-pension organization came before the House, I was one of the three who voted against it by a standing vote. I did that for the reason that I did not believe the Congress should spend $50,000 to investigate this poor people's organization, when the Members of Congress were aware of the direct expenditure of funds here in Washington by the people of the country.

I refer to the fact that the power companies last year spent something over $3,000,000 to prevent the passage of the holding-company bill. This sum was not spent in organizing a movement, but for the direct and specific purpose of unlawfully preventing legislation which the people demanded. A committee was set up in the House to investigate this matter, but nothing has been done, and I can confidently predict nothing will be done.

Dr. Townsend and his associates have spent no money to prevent legislation which the people demanded. They have spent a large sum of money in organizing a national movement to secure legislation that millions of people want. The money came from the people, and it is reported in the news items that something like $1,000,000 has been contributed. That seems to be the sin that has been committed by Dr. Townsend—that he collected a million dollars from poor people. The next step, according to the newspaper accounts, is that the people who contributed this money got nothing from Dr. Townsend; therefore, must have gotten the money. Let us see what the facts are.

First, Dr. Townsend and Mr. R. E. Clements founded an idea of old-age pensions. It is immaterial where they got the idea—whether they originated it themselves or whether they borrowed it from somebody else. The fact remains they put out the idea in a way which got the attention of the people.

The one thing about the Townsend plan which gave it such tremendous momentum was the fact that it placed the responsibility for the protection of the aged on the Federal Government, the aged people are not, as said, under the constitutional provisions that the aged in the United States, are eligible to receive benefits. Under any other plan the aged must establish a "legal residence" in some locality. They cannot move—they must remain eligible to receive benefits.

Again, under other plans, and under the Social Security Act, the aged cannot qualify unless they can prove they are paupers and have neither relatives nor friends able to support them.

In other words, the Townsend plan put the plan of old-age security on a high, dignified, and honorable plane and branded it from the standard of a shameful, groveling, and abject begging position.

Second, While at the head of it, Dr. Townsend and his associates built a great organization numbering millions of people in every State of the Union. The building of this organization was of immense value to the aged people and others interested in the welfare of the aged. When it is said that this organization gave the people nothing back for their $1,000,000, I say that statement is absolutely untrue. The fact that this organization exists and has existed for the past 2 years has been of real value to the people fighting for pension bills for the aged.

To unite 5,000,000 people in one movement by the membership method on an expense of $1,000,000 is a most moderate cost. If there are 10,000,000 members, then the cost is still less. In any event, the leaders built the organization at a cost of not to exceed 25 cents per member. I have had experience in organizing the people of a State, and I found it could not be done for 50 cents per member if the organizers were to eat and sleep. Dr. Townsend says he has not over $500 left in money and no property. I believe it. No man living could put over an organization such as the Townsend organization for less than a million dollars. Whatever the people put in the organization spent, and that is what they should have done.

Some say that the Townsend organization as now organized has been of no value to the people who believe in old-age pensions. I desire to dispute that statement forcefully. Is there anyone in this country who can deny that the Townsend organization did not influence the passage of the only law to protect the aged we have on the statute books of the United States? I personally know, as a Member of Congress, that the Townsend movement did influence the passage of the social-security bill. The appeal was made that the social-security bill would prevent the passage of the Townsend plan. That argument was used in my own case. I refused to be swayed by it and voted against the social-security bill. I was sure it would turn out to be nothing but
a starvation dole, and that is just exactly what it has turned out to be in my State. There is no pension about it; it is a relief dole, and before an aged person can get any of the dole he has required to deed his property over to the commissioners in charge of the plan, no matter how little value the property has.

But even though the Social Security Act is a dole, it is better than what we ever had before. We must make the social-security bill more liberal—we must make it possible in time to prevent the aged to receive respectable pensions for the few years they have to live after reaching the age of 60 years. The one organization that will bring about this is not the power lobby, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the Liberty League, or the Democrats, or the Republicans—it will be the Townsend organization.

During both sessions of Congress the McGroarty bill has been before the House. It was sponsored by one of the finest men in public life today, Hon. John Stevens McGroarty, of California. His bill was the official Townsend bill, and I know how hard McGroarty has worked to get this bill before the House for debate. It cannot come up until 218 Members will sign a petition to bring it up.

This Townsend organization is larger now than Townsend ever was—he could not stop it if he wanted to, and he does not want to. Like the leaders in the past, he can be attacked, he can be belittled, he can even be prosecuted, but they can be carried on. The more the Townsend is abused, the more vitality the movement will show. The reason this is true is because the cause he has fostered is right, it is just, and from this movement will finally come a law that will treat the aged of this country as they should be treated by a great Government that has long neglected one of its most important functions.

The money to build this great movement has come from the people—it has not been supplied by some slush-fund contributor who intends to corrupt Members of Congress. It has come from the people, and I am sure the contributors are confident they have been able to give. In return for their sacrifices they have built a great militant organization that has and will continue to build a public opinion so strong in this country in favor of adequate old-age pensions that some Congress in the not far distant future will provide the remedy.

The organization may not have spent all of this money wisely in every particular; someone more versed in business might have done better. The fact remains, however, that they have built in this country the largest organization in our history on the least amount of money of any organization in the United States, for that is the right way to build an endorsement. The endorsement that Townsend can send is that today he has no money, no property. The people never have petitioned Congress to investigate the movement—they are satisfied, so I venture to say that Congress has little right to rush into the fray to determine who put in a dime and what was done with it.

There is one outstanding fact, now well established, and that is none of this $1,000,000 was used unlawfully or corruptly to influence Members of Congress. Can that much be said for the power company? Again, I ask, why drop this power-lobby expenditure of $5,000,000 to corrupt Congress, and start out with guns drawn to chase down the dimes Dr. Townsend used to build public opinion in favor of a just cause.

In my opinion, the sponsors of the present investigation were not as much concerned with the protection of those who contributed their dimes and nickels as they were in trying to prevent those dimes and nickels from being used against their reelection as Members of Congress.

Millions will be raised and poured into the coffers of the Republicans and the Democrats to carry on the coming campaign. Will Congress later appropriate $50,000 to investigate who put in the money, whether it was wisely spent, whether an employee got too much salary, or whether the candidates for the Presidency rode in a new Buick or an old Lincoln automobile? Nothing like it will be undertaken.

Just plain old-fashioned horse sense should dictate that Congress has enough to do to attend to its own business and let the people of this country have an organization of their own, financed by themselves and directed toward a worthy and justifiable end.

Closing this statement, let me say that if Dr. Townsend had not talked a third party, no investigation would have been undertaken. The old parties will stand for almost anything as long as a third party is not suggested. Both old parties know each other. When necessary they can sleep in the same bed and rest comfortably. Just as soon, however, as someone suggests a third party, the permanency of the old parties is put in jeopardy, and they rush at their common enemy with a concerted attack. Their reign has been threatened—their right to rule over the destinies of the American people is questioned. They dread the loss of this power—their very political lives are at stake (so they believe), and their combined attack is savage and desperate.

There is one power, however, that neither of the old parties can withstand. They are powerless before it, and that is the power of public opinion. The Townsend movement is building public opinion and will express itself, no matter who denies or attempts to divest it of its strength.

Finally, that public opinion will be so definitely fixed in this country that Congress will respond to it. When that day comes, 'the people's fight for a just pension system will end, but not until then. How long the Townsend movement will last, that depends. I am sure that long it will take Congress to make up its mind to grant to the aged of this country just, honorable, and adequate security.

Congress is wasting its time and the taxpayers' money in trying to stamp out this movement by investigations. No amount of calumny heaped upon the head of Dr. Townsend will stop the movement—any such procedure would actually increase the people's zeal for the movement.

I may be mistaken in my forecast of the future, but I will venture to guess that the people are about to investigate Congress. If I am correct, then, as Members of Congress, we should remember the Golden Rule: "Do unto others as ye would others should do unto you.'

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been a source of gratification to me that I had the privilege of serving as a member of the committee which undertook so successfully to extend the life of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Its benefits are noteworthy in my State and throughout the Nation. To its responsible head I wish to pay compliment in recognition of his able, effective direction of its activities. My colleagues in the House of Representatives and I with them appreciate the great achievement of the Director of Emergency Conservation Work, Robert Fechner.

In operation more than 3 years, the Civilian Conservation Corps program was created by an act of Congress approved March 31, 1933, and extended by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. The legislation was designed to relieve acute distress by supplying productive employment primarily to young men whose families were on public-relief rolls, to provide for the restoration and protection of our country's natural resources, and to aid in the stimulation of business recovery through supplying a market for large quantities of foodstuffs, clothing, heavy machinery, automotive equipment, and other supplies.

By Executive Order No. 6101, April 3, 1933, President Roosevelt established the office of Emergency Conservation Work and named Mr. Robert Fechner, of Boston, as director. In the order the President directed the War, Interior, Agriculture, and Labor Departments to assist the Director in carrying out the provisions of the act. To make the law effective, a nation-wide chain of work camps was established in the forests, parks, and fields of the country. By July 1, 1933, camps had been established in every State. The camps have been limited to unmarried men between the ages of 17 and 28, to war vet-
erans who may be enrolled regardless of age or marital status, and to a limited number of experienced men living in the vicinity of each camp.

The Director of Emergency Conservation Work has throughout been responsible for the execution of the C. C. C. program. Four Government departments—Labor, War, Interior, and Agriculture—cooperate, and the Director coordinates the functions performed by these departments through an advisory council composed of one representative from each department. These council members act as liaison officers between the Director and the cooperating departments.

Starting the very day that the Civilian Conservation Corps has been functioning more than 1,600,000 persons have been given employment under the program. At present approximately 350,000 men are enrolled in the corps. These men are working out of 2,107 camps.

Enrolled men have benefited greatly in health and morale as a result of outdoor life, good food, regular hours, and steady work, which characterizes the Civilian Conservation Corps program. Care of the health of the C. C. C. enrollees starts at the time of enrollment, as only those men are selected who can stand the work in the forests and who are free from contagious disease. When the enrollees are accepted they are sent to once to camps and are kept under careful medical supervision. Smallpox and typhoid vaccinations are given immediately.

A medical officer is assigned to each camp to look after the health of the young men. Not only does he take care of the sick and the injured, but he is responsible for the sanitation of the camp, the protection of the water supply, seeing that the men get proper food and bathing facilities, providing first-aid Instructions, and giving lectures on personal hygiene and disease prevention.

The men are housed, for the most part, in barracks of either portable or permanent type. Sleeping quarters are carefully heated and ventilated in order to prevent the spread of communicable diseases, especially of the respiratory type. Besides the buildings constructed to shelter the enrollees, the camps have mess halls, recreation halls, and administrative buildings.

Veterinary officers are used to inspect meat and dairy products. These veterinarians inspect slaughterhouses, packing plants, dairy farms, and creameries to see that the food comes from the right kind of places. The food itself is inspected to see that it comes up to specifications and answers sanitary requirements.

The great majority of the enrollees leave the corps better equipped in every way to face the problems of modern life than before their service. Most of them have acquired new skills which open additional job opportunities.

The cash allotments to dependent families have made it possible for many families to be entirely removed from public-relief rolls. Many other families have been materially assisted. The consensus of opinion is that the ultimate results of Emergency Conservation Work will prove of lasting value, not only to the men of the Civilian Conservation Corps but also to the entire Nation.

In my State of New Jersey there are now 36 Civilian Conservation Corps camps engaged in forest protection and improvement, park development, soil-conservation projects, and mosquito-control work. With an average of 152 enrolled men in a camp, a total of approximately 5,832 men will be working this summer on C. C. C. projects in New Jersey. About 4,000 additional New Jersey men will be located on C. C. C. projects in other States.

In the period from April 5, 1933, to April 1, 1936, fully 47,855 New Jersey citizens were given employment by the Civilian Conservation Corps. Of these, 23,608 were New Jersey men. Nonenrolled personnel included those employed in supervisory, technical, clerical, professional, or similar capacities, or who were engaged in the construction and maintenance of camps or other skilled and unskilled labor. As of March 1, 1936, there were 10,176 New Jersey enrollees in the corps.

Total obligations for operations of the C. C. C. in New Jersey through March 20, 1936, approximated $17,443,000. They were incurred for compensation to enrollees and supervisory employees and purchase of materials, supplies, shelter, foodstuffs, clothing equipment, transportation, and the like. Almost every type of industry has benefited through expenditures made by the Civilian Conservation Corps. Of the total amount of money earned by New Jersey enrollees, $4,762,000 was sent home to dependents in the form of allotments. The basic cash allowance of each enrolled man in the corps is $30 a month. All of the young men and many war veterans allotted and still allot from $22 to $25 of their monthly cash allowances to needy dependents. These allotments are mailed directly to the families of the boys by the War Department. Besides receiving cash allowances which permit them to contribute substantially to the support of their families, New Jersey enrollees are housed, fed, clothed, given medical care, and afforded recreational and educational opportunities.

Included in the 36 camps being operated in New Jersey are 12 in State forests, 3 in private forests, 7 on mosquito-control projects, 3 on soil-erosion prevention projects under the supervision of the Soil Conservation Service, 9 on State and National parks, and 2 on conservation projects on military reservations.

In the course of the past 3 years the C. C. C. has accomplished a great deal in the rebuilding of New Jersey's forest resources. Carried on by companies assigned to State and private forests this work has been supervised by the United States Forest Service in cooperation with the State conservation authorities. Large areas of New Jersey were originally covered with good pine forest, but they have been cut over year after year until the growth of pitch pine has become seriously impaired. However, there are still many reproductive trees in the area, and through the labors of the C. C. C., including collection of cones, planting, and extensive preventive measures against fires, the forests are being brought back into productivity. More than 5,600 acres have been planted with trees, and the C. C. C. has put in more than 19,000 man-days on nursery work growing seedlings for further reforestation. More than 7,000 tree seeds have been collected.

To increase the area accessible for fire control the C. C. C. has built a total of 279 miles of truck trails and 61 miles of foot trails. These also serve to provide access to many scenic and historic sites in the forests and parks for the benefit of the people of New Jersey. To further enhance the value of New Jersey's forests, timber-stand improvement work has been completed over an area of 25,922 acres. The C. C. C. has constructed 383 miles of firebreaks. These are lanes cut through forested areas to serve as barriers to halt the spread of spreading fires. Fire hazards have been cleared from 12,568 acres of woodland. Timber estimates have been made over an area of 11,780 acres, and enrollees have spent 10,220 man-days on tree-surgery activities.

New Jersey forests, like other forested areas in the East, are threatened with serious destruction caused by tree-insect pests and tree diseases. The C. C. C. men in New Jersey are conducting an intensive campaign against the ravages of the gypsy moth, the white pine blister rust, and the Dutch elm disease. White-pine blister rust and Dutch elm disease control operations have been carried on over 36,269 acres, and a total of 5,611 acres have been scouted for the eggs of the gypsy moth.

C. C. C. activities also include mosquito-control operations, which involved the digging of 14,360 lineal yards of ditches and the staking of 16,000 yards, carried on over an area of 11,427 acres. The camp at Peterboro, in my district, tilled 3,613 weed-infested acres in its efforts to eradicate the notorious New Jersey mosquito from the meadows of the Hackensack River. As a part of the work, salt and woodland marshes and stagnant, polluted pools are drained by a series of ditches. Such work has not impaired but has increased the value of such areas as wildlife breeding and feeding grounds.
A Civilian Conservation Corps company has been assigned to the development of the Morristown National Historical Park at Morristown. Activities of the C. C. C. in this area have been of wide scope, including work in forestry, archeology, landscaping, and guiding visitors. The park constitutes the site of the encampment of the Continental Army in the Revolutionary War during the winters of 1777-78.

The Wick and Quinch houses, both eighteenth century dwellings associated with the Morristown encampment of the Continental Army, have been restored. Brigade encampment sites of the Continental Army have been suitably marked. Signs, made and erected by C. C. C. enrollees, show positions, composition of the brigades, names of commanding officers, and the time of encampment in the Jockey Hollow area of the park.

Dutch elm disease control has been of prime importance in this area to prevent its spreading throughout the park and to adjacent areas. Removal of dead chestnuts has improved the appearance of the park and furnished material for cabin, fences, and picnic camps.

Twelve C. C. C. camps have been engaged in work on State and local parks at one time or another during the past 3 years. This work is supervised by the National Park Service in cooperation with State and local park and conservation authorities. All of the New Jersey parks serve the metropolitan populations of New York, Philadelphia, or Camden. The work of the C. C. C. in New Jersey parks has consequently been of unusual value in affording greater use of these heretofore unplanned and undeveloped recreational facilities. This has been especially true of the camps in Bergen and Camden Counties.

An average of approximately 400 C. C. C. men have worked in the New Jersey section of the Palisades Interstate Park. In the lower portion of the park, which is a spot of natural beauty, the main work has been on the talus slope, which can be seen from the Hudson River. This slope has in some places been eroded by the elements and by the river tide. The lower area is being preserved for its recreational as well as its scenic value. It is in my congressional district, directly opposite New York City, and attracts a large number of visitors. The work in this park is now being continued by one company of 162 men.

Another 400 men were assigned to the development of High Point State Park, which is under the jurisdiction of the High Point Park Commission. This park covers an area of some 11,000 acres, for the most part a wooded section on the top of a ridge. A point of special interest in this area is the so-called cedar swamps, where grows, among other species, a variety of white cedar not usually seen in that part of the country. Prior to the establishment of the C. C. C. camps only a small area in the immediate vicinity of the points had been used for camping, bathing, and picnicking. This area has been greatly extended by the work of the two companies. About 10 to 12 miles of park roads have been built, and more is contemplated to make accessible other areas for recreation. All these operations are working toward a well-planned program, which not only opens this area to recreation but also preserves its natural character.

The boys have nearly finished one dam which will create a lake of some 40 acres, and another dam is under construction which will provide a lake of some 40 acres. These lakes will not only enhance the scenic value of the park but will serve as reservoirs in time of fire, and their banks will provide sites for camps. Development of picnic areas and special overlook points is also planned.

The company located in Parvin State Park near Vineland, an area of nearly 1,000 acres, is laying out interesting nature trails through the cedar swamps and other woods. In the past this park has been used chiefly for bathing, camping, and picnicking, in the vicinity of Parvin's mill pond. The C. C. C. boys have razed a group of unsightly buildings and have turned the site into a well-planned camping area. Plans are afoot for developing the beach through building a new bathhouse and a group of utility buildings.

A small ravine at one side of the park, called the Thunder-gust, is being developed as a narrow half-mile lake to be utilized for campers and picnickers.

Another C. C. C. company is located in Voorhees State Park at High Bridge. This park, on the edge of the New Jersey highlands, is interesting mainly for its scenic values from park drives and picnic areas. Considerable reforestation has been undertaken here.

An average of 400 men were assigned to the Cooper River and Great Egg Harbor parkways in Camden County during the past 3 years. One company is reclaiming the silt-filled Cooper River, which at one time was navigable as far as Haddonfield. The other company, which was doing similar work in the Great Egg Harbor stream, completed its general development program last summer and was withdrawn. These two parkways are part of a proposed parkway across New Jersey from Camden to Atlantic City.

Twin camps were established in the South Mountain Reservation at Orange to develop this reservation for general recreational use. Improvements under way include the construction of park roads, guard rails, and incidental shelters. Camp company was moved out of this park last month.

A total of 400 men is working in Union County in cooperation with the Union County Park Commission. One company is situated in Watchung Reservation and is doing work similar to that undertaken at South Mountain. The other is working along the Rahway River, reclaiming the silt-filled stream and developing recreational facilities along its course.

The character and location of the camps now in operation in New Jersey and for which my State is the richer in its resources are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp designation</th>
<th>Land ownership (National, State, or private)</th>
<th>County location</th>
<th>Post-office address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-51</td>
<td>State, Branchville</td>
<td>Sussex County</td>
<td>Broncburnville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-52</td>
<td>State, New London</td>
<td>Burlington County</td>
<td>New Lisbon (Woodslle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-53</td>
<td>State, Cape May</td>
<td>Cape May Country</td>
<td>Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-54</td>
<td>State, Atlantic</td>
<td>Atlantic County</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-55</td>
<td>State, Burlington</td>
<td>Burlington County</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-56</td>
<td>State, Warren</td>
<td>Warren County</td>
<td>New Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-57</td>
<td>Private, Morris</td>
<td>Morris County</td>
<td>Morristown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-51</td>
<td>Private, Cape May</td>
<td>Cape May County</td>
<td>Cape May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-52</td>
<td>Private, Atlantic</td>
<td>Atlantic County</td>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-53</td>
<td>Private, Ocean</td>
<td>Ocean County</td>
<td>Ocean City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-54</td>
<td>Private, Bergen</td>
<td>Bergen County</td>
<td>Bergen City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-55</td>
<td>Private, Hunter</td>
<td>Hunterdon County</td>
<td>Hunterdon City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-56</td>
<td>Private, Monmouth</td>
<td>Monmouth County</td>
<td>Monmouth City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-57</td>
<td>Private, Burlington</td>
<td>Burlington County</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-58</td>
<td>Private, Cumberland</td>
<td>Cumberland County</td>
<td>Cumberland City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-51</td>
<td>Private, Morris</td>
<td>Morris County</td>
<td>Morrisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-52</td>
<td>Private, Burlington</td>
<td>Burlington County</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-53</td>
<td>Private, Cape May</td>
<td>Cape May Country</td>
<td>Cape May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-54</td>
<td>Private, Atlantic</td>
<td>Atlantic County</td>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-55</td>
<td>Private, Ocean</td>
<td>Ocean County</td>
<td>Ocean City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-56</td>
<td>Private, Bergen</td>
<td>Bergen County</td>
<td>Bergen City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-57</td>
<td>Private, Hunter</td>
<td>Hunterdon County</td>
<td>Hunterdon City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-58</td>
<td>Private, Monmouth</td>
<td>Monmouth County</td>
<td>Monmouth City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-51</td>
<td>Private, Cape May</td>
<td>Cape May County</td>
<td>Cape May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-52</td>
<td>Private, Atlantic</td>
<td>Atlantic County</td>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-53</td>
<td>Private, Ocean</td>
<td>Ocean County</td>
<td>Ocean City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-54</td>
<td>Private, Bergen</td>
<td>Bergen County</td>
<td>Bergen City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-55</td>
<td>Private, Hunter</td>
<td>Hunterdon County</td>
<td>Hunterdon City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-56</td>
<td>Private, Monmouth</td>
<td>Monmouth County</td>
<td>Monmouth City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-57</td>
<td>Private, Burlington</td>
<td>Burlington County</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-58</td>
<td>Private, Cumberland</td>
<td>Cumberland County</td>
<td>Cumberland City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-51</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Sussex County</td>
<td>Branchburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-52</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Burlington County</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-53</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Cape May Country</td>
<td>Cape May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-54</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Atlantic County</td>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-55</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Ocean County</td>
<td>Ocean City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-56</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Bergen County</td>
<td>Bergen City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-57</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Hunterdon County</td>
<td>Hunterdon City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-58</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Monmouth County</td>
<td>Monmouth City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-51</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Cape May County</td>
<td>Cape May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-52</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Atlantic County</td>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-53</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Ocean County</td>
<td>Ocean City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-54</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Bergen County</td>
<td>Bergen City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-55</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Hunterdon County</td>
<td>Hunterdon City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-56</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Monmouth County</td>
<td>Monmouth City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-57</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Burlington County</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-58</td>
<td>Historical Park</td>
<td>Cumberland County</td>
<td>Cumberland City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camps</th>
<th>State forest</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercer forest</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mosquito control</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soil Conservation Service</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National park</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Symbols | State forest; P, private forest; SCS, Soil Conservation Service; MC, mosquito control; NF, national park; SP, State park. | 56 |
AWARD POSTHUMOUSLY OF THE Distinguished Service Medal TO THE LATE MAJ. GEN. CLARENCE R. EDWARDS

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS, Speaker, from my State came many of the men who served in the Twenty-sixth Division under the leadership of a great general, the late Clarence R. Edwards. They will appreciate the award posthumously of a Distinguished Service Medal to the great leader of that division more so than even a personal award to themselves.

The Gold Star Mothers and the relatives and friends of the men in that division will also consider the passage of this resolution a deserving tribute to the man they learned to know and love in the years following the war. Clarence R. Edwards loved his men in the war and maintained an interest in their welfare after the armistice and up to the time of his death.

To all who came to know him, General Edwards was a great friend, loyal citizen, and trustworthy adviser. From the statements and letters to me of men who knew him on the battlefield or who made his acquaintance since the war, I know the devotion and respect which these men held for him during his lifetime and which has increased since his death

Our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Hon. William P. Connelly, is to be commended for sponsoring House Joint Resolution 570, making this award. The people of the State of Connecticut are proud of the record of the Twenty-sixth Division and its late war leader, whom we are honoring. As a Member at Large from that State, I can only, in my humble fashion, express their thanks for the thoughtfulness and sincerity of Mr. Connelly for introducing and moving the passage of this resolution.

THE FIFTH NATIONAL SCHOOL-SAFETY PATROL PARADE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the city of Washington will witness the fifth national school-safety patrol parade, under the auspices of the American Automobile Association. All of us recognize the important part that school patrols have played in the protection of the lives of the children of America.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should take this opportunity to commend the youth for their work, and it is our duty to encourage them by public recognition. We should commend those who sponsor the school patrol organizations, and an expression is due those who are responsible for the fifth national school safety patrol parade.

During the year 1935, 36,000 persons were killed by automobile accidents and 1,000,000 were injured. It is an appalling death rate, due in large part to negligence and nonenforcement of our motor vehicle laws. By safety education programs, proper law enforcement, and engineering efforts this death rate by automobile accidents can be appreciably reduced.

It is with a great deal of pride that I call attention to the fact that as a result of its educational, engineering, and law-enforcement programs my home town of Evanston, Ill., was recently awarded the 1935 title of "the safest city in the United States." A contest was conducted by the National Safety Council among 801 cities in the United States, and for the third time in 4 successive years the grand prize went to Evanston, which has a population of about 43,000.

Eight hundred and one cities reported to the National Safety Council on their accidents during 1935. Their reports showed that the national average of accidents was 18.1 per 100,000 population. The city of Evanston, however, last year had only 2.3 per 100,000 as an average.

Naturally I am proud of the city. It is the "safest city in the United States." I call attention to its record for safety, not only because of my just pride but because I think it clearly indicates what can be accomplished by civic pride on the part of the people and by a proper educational and law-enforcement program. It is indicative of how fundamentally important the fifth national school-safety patrol parade tomorrow in Washington is as a factor toward a reduction in accidental deaths. It is something in which all of us should take a real interest.

STOP LYNCHING NOW

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H. R. 2776, a bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws and to punish the crime of lynching, I hope the Members of this House give my bill sincere and unbiased consideration. Similar bills have been before Congress many times, but either apathy, prejudice, or a question as to constitutionality has prevented passage.

Surely there is no Member of this House who will defend lynching. All agree that it is a disgrace to this Nation; that it puts to shame our sense of justice, of decency, of humanity. But many argue that efforts to abolish it must be left to the individual States. With this I totally disagree.

Lynching has long disgraced this Nation. The States have had the power to deal with it; to pass drastic laws to insure punishment to all having a part in any lynching, including those public officials who by their remissness, their cowardice, their criminal collusion with the mob, permit lynchings to occur. But nothing has been done. Lynching is unchecked.

On April 28 a Negro farmer by the name of Lin Shaw was shot to death at Colbert, Ga., by a mob of 40 men, 8 hours before he was to go on trial on a charge of attempted criminal assault. This man had been saved from a mob about 2 weeks before at Danielsville, Ga., when Superior Judge Berry I. Mosely single-handedly broke up the mob with a speech from the steps of the jail. The man was then rushed by a National Guard unit to Atlanta for safekeeping. After a week or 10 days he was returned to Danville for trial before the same judge who had saved him from the mob, but when the citizens heard of his presence in the jail they became menacing and he was moved to Royston, Ga., from which jail he was removed by the mob and lynched near Colbert.

Weak efforts had been made to save Shaw by moving him from one jail to another. But when brought back for trial he was taken by a mob from the jail at Royston, Ga., and lynched near Colbert. The State of Georgia proved itself unable to cope with the situation. If H. R. 2776 were made a law, the fear of quick and sure punishment would have prevented the cowardly mob from committing this abominable crime.

On April 29 Willie Kees, 19, was taken from the city marshal of Lepanto, Ark., and shot to death by a masked mob. Kees was said to have attempted an attack on a white woman April 18, but, curiously enough, at that time he was only warned to leave town. He returned on April 27, and the lynching was the result. He was arrested by the city marshal the morning of April 29 and was taken from that officer while the two were on the way to the jail.

On May 3 John Ruskin, a farm hand, was shot to death by a mob of 300 men at Pavo, Ga. He was charged with the slaying of a white man. He was not brought to trial; he was not heard on the charge; he was, instead, murdered by an infuriated mob.

I could recite instance after instance of mob violence. And in every case the facts are the same: The mob either
And no punishment follows. It we are to be estopped from this effort to stamp out lynching of all crimes is to be stamped out. Have had neither the thirteenth, fourteenth, or fifteenth amendment would long ago have become disrupted. Without freely remain unchanged. Without frequent amendments, this Nation from passing measures that may later be declared unconstitutional. The Constitution is a charter of liberties, subject in the constitutional but in refusing to press liberal and enlightened amendment, which means that we would still have slavery. From passing measures that may later be declared unconstitutional. I am accused not only of being a Republican but, this specious outcry. According to the newspapers, you were addressed last month by Mr. P. Frankfurter. Another—and please keep this secret, for, in my opinion, there is evidence that in 1929 there were many economic sections unprosperous in 1929. The New England textile industry was having difficulties even before prevailing taxes were introduced. The bituminous-coal industry was definitely sick. Several millions were unemployed throughout the country in 1929. Even through no one knew or cared how many millions of families, although employed, were existing on incomes far below the amounts believed necessary to yield a decent standard of living. In 1929 several skeptical writers investigated the genuineness of our prosperity. Some of you may recall Stuart Chase’s Prosperity: An Unreality, a popularization of a book by a Prof. Myril. It was warned that prosperity was distinctly an unevenly distributed state, both geographically and by economic groups. There was another significant book written a bit earlier by Miss Clinch. It was called Some Folk’s Won’t Work, the title being a repetition of a comment frequently made by persons when they were informed of the fact several millions were at work. Miss Clinch showed definitely that prosperity did not mean employment for all, and that in most instances unemployment was not a voluntary state, but a form of economic slavery brought about by a chaotic business organization. Workers fairly clear that prosperity, 1929 model, was no economic paradise for millions of our citizens. We were, of course, better off than any other country, but we were no nearer the living to be expected in a country overflowed with the milk of natural resources and the honey of human ingenuity. Prosperity in 1929 had its secrets below the surface. But our 1936 prosperity shows its fundamental weakness so that all may see. Our present joblessness is more acute, more evident, and more hopeless. Until quite recently it was hoped that recovery in production would be accompanied by the absorption of most of the jobless. Yet we have the restored production, and we still have the bulk of our unemployment. Optimists speak glibly of “natural forces” bringing about reemployment and want nothing more than a prolonged “breathing spell.” Realists are concerned lest the breathing spell become a sinking spell, and wonder whether there will ever be substantial reemployment. Mr. Moran. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein an address by the W. P. A. administrator in the State of Maine. The Speaker. Is there objection? There was no objection. Mr. Moran. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include the following address by Albert Abrahamson, Maine works-programs director, addressing the Woodfords Club at Portland, April 24, 1936:

According to the newspapers, you were addressed last month by a college dean who asked you not to blame the colleges of this board of aldermen in the town of Bangor. Mr. Mathes, there were complaints about the lack of efficiency and honesty in public life. There are complaints about Mr. Mathes. I am repeatedly told that he is a Republican. Who am I to take such a complaint over the head of a Republican? If you need any further information, I have been called many other names, which I shall not repeat.
many. It will produce as much in a month as the old-type mill in a year.

"This isn't a move to increase capacity. The industry has been operating at less than 50 percent capacity. It never has operated at full capacity level, so these improvements in installations is not to produce more steel but to use fewer men.

"The National Industrial Conference Board says that if industry would run at the 1920 level operating at a 1929 level, it will absorb only about one-third of the unemployed. So where are we getting?"

All of us can add further illustrations. We know the effects of the steel shut-down, the overwhelming evidence they may have. Two jobs grew before. Industries still flit about New England, bringing together individuals in distress. In the nation, industries also move about without regard for consequence to labor.

It is possible to argue that eventually, and in the long run, such improvements mean lower prices, that lower prices mean greater consumption, and that greater consumption means more jobs. This process cycle is satisfied by intellectual folklore for those who think in terms of the long run. But the worker has to eat every day, and to him the long run may be long enough to result in starvation.

Two. A less important cause of our present situation lies in the perfectly justifiable practice on the part of industry of disposing of its least efficient men first when hard times come. Those that remain produce more abundantly in any case, but they are also driven harder during depressions, and are added to the list of the least efficient. Thus the reservoir of the least efficient is consequently postponed. This aggravates the problem. It is well that a sudden move in production may absorb large numbers, for a doubling of production will necessitate more than a doubling of workers, since the workers added are necessarily less efficient. This is in production, so hope, just around that eternal corner.

Three. A further reason for the swelling of the numbers of the unemployed arises from the fact each year since 1925, 600,000 persons have grown up and become available in the labor market at a time when the demand for labor was falling. Between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 persons have thus been added to the roll taken by technology and depression. These young people present a peculiarly distressing situation. They have neither skill nor experience, special effect to meet their problems through the National Youth Administration, which devotes its $4,800,000,000 Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935.

These factors account in part, I believe, for our present state of Joblessness. There used to be complaints about "profitlessness", but our present situation strikes me as infinitely worse. And this leads us to the next problem: What can be done about it?

2. I envy those simple souls who would leave the unemployed alone and rely upon the functioning of brutal laws of economic survival and upon the hope that private industry will eventually absorb the relatively few worthy unemployed. Most of the unemployed are shifted, it is claimed, and they should be left alone. The proposition of such a policy will never admit that the distress to the point of starvation, that it means the application of economic survival principles long since abandoned by civilized persons in the fields of physical health, and that it means punishing persons who are in trouble through no fault of their own. We are not in a state of nature, at least, we make war with the admittedly imperfect instruments at our command. Is not economic distress fully as worthy of society's attention? We cannot keep the unemployed and then decide for ourselves whether this is the proper policy in an allegedly civilized era.

Many of you probably feel that while a pure laissez-faire attitude is unthinkable, the problem can best be handled through private charity and local governmental aid. However, much this approach may be preferred in normal times, it seems fairly clear that at the present time neither private charity nor local units of government have the resources to perform the task. Certainly the making of a detailed budget of the needs of the communities is that even with Federal aid there are not enough resources to meet the demands. There is hardly a community in the States which does not constantly ask for more and the subject is that this is inevitable; that no matter how much the Federal government does, no matter what its rules and regulations are, no matter how thoroughly a relief load is absorbed, there will always be disgruntled local officials asking for more. And it is quite possible that those let go will complain in the future about the tyranny and stupidity of Federal aid and in the very next sentence ask for more of it.

The proposal for handling relief through what is commonly called the Federal dole. This theory is widely held, and some of my best friends are constantly presenting to me this theory. Cellar admits that this may be true. It admits that society has a responsibility. It doubts that private industry, private charity, and local governments can do much at the present time to absorb the relatively few worthy unemployed. Most of the unemployed are shiftless, it is claimed, and they should be left alone. In support of this theory, those closest to the workers, their friends, are constantly presenting it to me. I suspect that this is inevitable; that no matter how much the Federal government does, no matter what its rules and regulations are, there will always be disgruntled local officials asking for more. And it is quite possible that those let go will complain in the future about the tyranny and stupidity of Federal aid and in the very next sentence ask for more of it.

The War Department appropriation is being devoted to building facilities. The Works Progress Administration (including $2,000,000 for the Rural Rehabilitation Administration) is doing a spectacular job. The W. P. A. has two distinct functions: (1) It has charge of coordinating and planning the activities of all the agencies using funds from the act; (2) It operates projects of its own where other agencies have not absorbed the relief load. In Maine we have one eye on the certified relief load and one on the labor demands of agencies (like Quoddy or the Resettlement Administration) operating under the act. Where there are gaps we devise projects of our own within the limits of our funds.

Thus far approximately $28,000,000 of the $48,000,000 has been allotted to Maine. Of this sum, $4,000,000 went to W. P. A. This left $24,000,000 for the works program proper. The allotments by agencies have been roughly as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>War Department (Quoddy)</td>
<td>37,000,000</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works Progress Administration</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Public Roads</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Conservation Corps</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Administration</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Census, Department of Labor, Soil Erosion, etc.)</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46,000,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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My own concern is naturally with W. P. A. projects. Approxi­mately three-fourths of these are devoted to the construction or improvement of roads not cared for by other programs. The re­mainder of our men and money is being applied to parks, playgrounds, airports. Recognizing the importance of Maine of the importance of the roads, the highway department is putting work on the largest watershed in the world at Gray and a fish ladder at Veazie. For unskilled women our typical project is a sewing room, with the provision of surplus commodities furnished by the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation, in the hands of the State department of health and welfare. Occasionally we are able to build structures like the Community Building in Rockland, now under construction. We are also building a tourist-information building in Portland. Our ability to do this depends on the extent to which materials are con­tributed by the sponsors and the availability of skilled laborers, for with us there is always present the necessity of maximizing employment. If large sums are spent for materials, there is less remaining for wage payments.

The recent flood has given us a new field of usefulness. When the flood came 2,000 W. P. A. workers were engaged in efforts to save life and property and to meet emergency conditions engen­dered by flood. Now we are swinging into permanent repair and replacement of public property damaged by flood. Two million dollars have been allocated for this purpose, and since we have already submitted projects over this sum, another million is being made available. Already 1,400 persons are in employment, and we shall shortly enlarge our activities. In all road and bridge projects we are in close contact with the State highway department.

The flood changed our program radically. Previously our main concern was with the labor supply, and we devised projects to provide employment, a particular problem for us. Now we must do more than just to find the labor; we must find the labor. Because of this, we are empowered, when necessary, to go beyond the relief rolls to obtain the necessary personnel.

Such projects answer in part the problem of the manual la­borer—both skilled and unskilled. But what about the person who is not now engaged in labor or who applies for W. P. A. because he has developed technical skills? It is quite the fashion now to ridicule white-collar projects. Yet to me they are an important development of projects for this class constitutes one of the most gratifying sections of our work. There is great dismay in finding an accountant digging ditches, or that he could not get work if he did not work as an accountant. And there is a genuine satisfaction in trans­ferring such a man to a white-collar project and enabling him to work in his regular field. This incident has actually taken place, and is not isolated. Nor is it confined to men. Trained women have been taken from sewing rooms and put at work more in harmony with their background and training.

The latest figures available show that approximately 1,000 men and women are at work on white-collar projects. Because this work strikes me as extremely important, I should like to tell you what is being done. One hundred and twenty-one trained musicians are giving concerts from time to time throughout the State. Eighty-three persons are engaged in the various projects of them are working in conjunction with the safety campaign now being carried on. One of them is an educational specialist. We have a mural based on Mother Goose at the Children's Hospital in Portland. Another recently completed the painting of a mural also dedicated to Rockland. School boards have engaged also a group of 37 actors, giving performances at G. C. C. camps and other public and quasi-public institutions. All of these per­sons are usually after inspecting various professional groups have put to the test their professional qualifications. They are not amateurs, but qualified persons who normally earn their living at the several callings.

There is also a writers' project of 67 which is engaged in pre­paring part of a national guidebook to be published later. The history and attractions of Maine will be presented in it as a direct result of this project, and there will also be a byproduct of material that will be useful for local and State purposes.

The Maine State Planning Board is enabled to continue its work under our program, and 30 members of its staff are paid from W. P. A. funds. A survey of Federal archives is being conducted and 25 Maine persons are participating. The Bureau of Labor Statistics is employing 28 people to make a study of consumption of goods in Portland. There are 183 persons en­gaged in various projects, including nursery schools, sewing classes, and adult education.

All through the State, finally, approximately 150 persons are at work on W. P. A. projects sponsored locally. These include research into town records, the survey of property, and other works which have been requested by the local officials concerned.

In this field, as in others, we are making every possible effort to use the labor supply, its peculiar skills, and the needs of the State in our projects. The greatest difficulty in our work, as I have already said, is the way we are work. There is present that small fringe that is on the lookout for an opportunity to chisel and cheat. In moments of despair we wonder if we are doing what we should. We are sure that what we are doing is fair and honorable, fully realizing that universal approval

and satisfaction are luxuries reserved for persons other than those who are engaged in the practice of our profession.

I have tried to give you some idea of what we are doing and why we are doing it. In general, the plan and program seem worth the consideration of your Committees, and in the hope that you will deny the reality of the human suffering that is inevitable without some form of Federal aid.

While positive of the need for Federal aid, I am willing to admit that the sort of aid and its amount are open to doubt and discus­sion. As to the type of program, my only feeling is that the sort of thing now being done by W. P. A. is a relatively happy solution. But I can see the validity of the claims, both of those who want direct relief—the dole—and of those who want large, monumenal highway and airport projects. Whether the next President is Mr. Roosevelt, or a Republican, or a Socialist, Federal relief will go on. Republican candidates may talk about Budget balancing, but they will not deny the reality of the human suffering that is inevitable without some form of Federal aid.

ATTORNEY FEES

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting therein a letter from Judge Green, of the United States Court of Claims, concerning attorneys' fees in cases before that court.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, through inadvertence, certain remarks appearing in the

daily Record, at page 7725, concerning the allowance of attorney fees have been attributed to me, although I was not the author of those remarks. It has always been my policy to make certain that the attorney fees granted in any private bill on the calendar should be maintained at a mini­mum, and that no one should be in a better position to assume the burden. I do not believe that the next President can ignore the demands for Federal aid in 1937. Whether the next President is Mr. Roose­velt, or a Republican, or a Socialist, Federal relief will go on. Republican candidates may talk about Budget balancing, but they will not deny the reality of the human suffering that is inevitable without some form of Federal aid.

As to the extent of Federal aid, I expect eventual contradiction, with gradual lightening of the burden to the Federal Govern­ment. I look forward to some relief from the social-security legis­lation, which will probably need modification, and from the great prosperity which will improve the predisposition and their predisposition in the field of relief. But these are not expectations. What actually takes place depends, of course, on answers given to more fundamental questions. Are we going back to laissez-faire, and economic liberty? Or are we to maintain the direction of economic control, political and social activity? Or, more probably, are we to try to combine both? The final answer to these questions is just one more of those sweet mysteries of life.
the cases of all kinds before the court in one in a thousand. I have no recollection of such a provision being made in any except in some Indian cases. Even then nothing over 10 percent is allowed. The chief justice, who has been on the bench 30 years, informs me that he does not know of any case in which more than 10 percent was allowed and that in most of them the amount allowed was less.

Thinking that you would like to know the exact facts in the matter, I am writing this letter.

Very respectfully yours,

WM. R. GREEN.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUCK, for 1 day, on account of official business.

To Mr. DEEN, for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. CUTLEY, for 5 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. DUNN of Mississippi, for 3 weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. DREICOLL, for 2 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WOOD, indefinitely, on account of important business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 925. An act to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William W. Danenhower; and S. 1360. An act for the relief of the estate of Teresa de Provost.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 25, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

851. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a translation of a letter dated March 20, 1936, addressed to The Honorable Congress of the United States of North America, by the Commission of the Mexican Library of Congress, in which the commission requests the cooperation of the Congress of the United States, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 12416. A bill to authorize funds for the prosecution of works for flood control against flood disasters along the Battenkill in New York; with amendment (Rept. No. 2770). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 12416. A bill to authorize funds for the prosecution of works for flood control against flood disasters along the Mettowee River in New York; with amendment (Rept. No. 2738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 12416. A bill to authorize funds for the prosecution of works for flood control against flood disasters along the Black and Moose Rivers and their tributaries in Herkimer, Lewis, Jefferson, Oneida, and Hamilton Counties, N. Y.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2742). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. H. R. 12027; without amendment (Rept. No. 2743). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. B. B. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 12734. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to distribute the commissioned line and engineer officers of the Coast Guard in grades, and for other purposes", approved January 12, 1933; without amendment (Rept. No. 2744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SCHULTZE: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 12355. A bill to authorize wrestling in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 12355. A bill to authorize wrestling in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 12355. A bill to authorize wrestling in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. O'DAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 12762. A bill to extend the definition of an alien veteran, for naturalization purposes only, so as to include certain alien enemies and nationals of Turkey and Bulgaria who rendered active service in United States armed forces with personal record of loyalty to the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2762). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 12362. A bill to authorize the furnishing of steam from the Central Heating Plant to the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. O'DAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 12762. A bill to extend the definition of an alien veteran, for naturalization purposes only, so as to include certain alien enemies and nationals of Turkey and Bulgaria who rendered active service in United States armed forces with personal record of loyalty to the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2762). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 523. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 8442; without amendment (Rept. No. 2752). Referred to the House Calendar.
Mr. DOXEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 5168. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, of Maryland, for park purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2754). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report 2756. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the Post Office Department. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report 2757. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the War Department. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report 2758. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report 2759. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the Treasury Department. Ordered to be printed.


Mr. COLDEN: Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report 2762. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the Department of Commerce. Ordered to be printed.


Mr. COLDEN: Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report 2765. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the Civil Service Commission. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report 2766. Report on the disposition of executive papers in the Department of State. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXIII

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11822. A bill to amend the charter of the National Union Insurance Co. of Washington in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2769). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10876. A bill for the relief of Adele Fowkes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2767). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8418. A bill for the relief of the estate of Catherine Hanks, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 2793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8274. A bill for the relief of Bertha M. Harris; with amendment (Rept. No. 2769). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11869. A bill for the relief of William L. Jenkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 2770). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11850. A bill to provide an additional sum for the reimbursement of certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as a result of the earthquake which occurred at Managua, Nicaragua, on March 31, 1931; without amendment (Rept. No. 2771). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BECKER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11853. A bill for the relief of Clark F. Potts and Charles H. Barker; without amendment (Rept. No. 2772). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BEITER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 10564. A bill for the relief of Booth & Co., Inc., a Delaware corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2773). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BEITER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 12311. A bill for the relief of the P. L. Andrews Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2774). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 12827) to prescribe the effective date of naturalization in certain cases; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12828) to provide a pension of $60 per month for all men and women in the United States and its possessions who have attained the age of 55 years and whose incomes are less than $1,200 per year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 12839) to extend the civil-service merit system by placing the position of postmaster in first-, second-, and third-class offices in the competitive classified service; to provide for promotion within the Postal Service to the position of postmaster as a reward for merit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. GILLETTE: A bill (H. R. 12830) to amend the act of May 17, 1910, entitled "An act to establish a permanent Commission of Fine Arts"; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KOPPLEMANN: A bill (H. R. 12831) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of Hartford, Conn., to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12832) to authorize the distribution of the naval ordnance plant, South Charleston, W. Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 12833) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State, the equal protection of the laws, by discouraging, preventing, and punishing the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLAN: A bill (H. R. 12834) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase the building now used as a post office in Yosemite National Park, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 12835) to provide financial assistance to the States and political subdivisions thereof, to the District of Columbia, or any Territory of the United States for the elimination of slums, for the construction of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings at low rentals for families of low income, and for the reduction of unemployment and the stimulation of business activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts regarding the permission into this country of persons discriminated against in Germany; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts favoring the establishment of a permanent Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 13838) for the relief of Katherine M. Deveny; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 12837) for the relief of Eille Garson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 12838) for the relief of Ida A. Gunderson and her three minor daughters; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

10951. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of citizens of Amherst, N. Y., requesting favorable action on House bill 11609; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10952. By Mr. KENNEY: Resolution adopted by the Truckmen's Store Door Committee of New York, memorializing the President, Members of Congress, Secretary of Labor, Interstate Commerce Commission, and the American Federation of Labor to repeal door-to-door delivery; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10953. Also, resolution of the Eastern Bergen Italo-American Independent Club, Fort Lee, N. J., favoring the adult-education program at their meeting on May 15; to the Committee on Education.

10954. By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: Petition of the City Council of the City of Chicago, favoring the enactment of the United States Housing Act of 1936 (S. 4424 and H. R. 12164); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10955. By Mr. KOPPELMAN: Petition of residents of Hartford County, Conn., asking immediate construction by the Federal Government of the comprehensive system of flood-control dams for the Connecticut Valley, recommended by Army Engineer Corps; Federal Government survey of Connecticut River to determine what measures are to provide for the improvement of the run-off in times of flood and for restoring and raising necessary dikes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

10956. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Central Labor Council of Alameda County, relative to danger to miners from silica dust and urging Federal laws to prevent further disaster as that which occurred at Gauley Bridge, W. Va., etc.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

10957. By Mr. McCORMACK: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States in favor of the permanency of the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Labor.

10958. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of H. B. Williams and 13 others, voicing 100-percent approval of the Townsend pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10959. Also, petition of W. S. Chance and 12 others, voicing 100-percent approval of the Townsend pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10960. Also, by the SPEAKER: Petition of the Bookkeepers', Stenographers', and Accountants' Union, No. 12846, American Federation of Labor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10961. Also, petition of the International Longshoremen's Association, Local No. 231; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10962. Also, petition of the city of Youngstown, Ohio; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10963. Also, petition of the city of Youngstown, Ohio; to the Committee on Education.

10964. Also, petition of the city of Youngstown, Ohio; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 25, 1936

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 12, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 21, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams  Clark  Holt  Overton
Ashurst  Connally  Johnson  Pittman
Austin  Coolidge  Keyes  Pope
Bachman  Copeland  King  Radcliffe
Bailey  Cousins  La Follette  Reed
Bartley  Davis  Lewis  Robinson
Benson  Dsterreich  Long  Russell
Billo  Donohue  Long  Schwellenbach
Black  Duffy  McAdoo  Sheppard
Bone  Ferguson  McGill  Shipstead
Borah  Frasier  McKellar  Smith
Brown  George  McNary  Steiger
Burke  Guffey  Minton  Tydings
Byrd  Hazel  Murray  Vandenberg
Calderon  Harrison  Neely  Van Nuys
Caraway  Hastings  Norris  Walsh
Cary  Hatch  Nye  Wheeler
Chaves  Hayden  O'Mahoney  White

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent because of illness, and that the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. HALITAN, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 3118. An act to provide for the creation of the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument, on Put-in-Bay, South Bass Island, in the State of Ohio, and for other purposes; and

S. 4446. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the issuance of the charter to the city of Lynchburg, Va.

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