By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 7964) for the relief of the estate of T. M. White; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7965) for the relief of Dr. Thomas M. Barnett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEAVY: A bill (H. R. 7966) for the relief of Capt. James L. Alverson; 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:

2985. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of the New York County Lawyers Association, New York City, urging adoption of House bill 4472, introduced by Congressman VOORHIS, making eligible for citizenship persons who had entered this country between June 3, 1921, and July 1, 1924, and who have been residing here continuously since that time; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2986. Also, petition of the State Relief Agency, St. Paul, Minn., endorsing Senate Joint Resolution 85, providing an appropriation of $20,000 to investigate the social and economic needs of laborers migrating across State lines; to the Committee on Labor.

2987. Also, petition of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, regarding air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2988. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of citizens of California, opposing the enactment of new legislation which would nullify the California community property law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2989. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, relative to interest on public-demand deposits, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2990. By Mr. LEAVY: Petition of the Ellisforde Grange, No. 1010, urging the Government to impose an embargo on arms and ammuntion against the Governments of Italy and Germany for their participation in the Spanish rebellion and their unlawful acts of aggression in that conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2991. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Concurrent resolution of the Senate of the State of Michigan, endorsing continuance of the Public Works Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2992. Also, petition of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local 295, Detroit, Mich., endorsing House bill 2691; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2993. Also, House Concurrent Resolution No. 43, of the State of Michigan, providing for granting of consent to the Mackinac Straits Bridge Authority of Michigan to construct a bridge across the Straits of Mackinac; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2994. Also, petition of the Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks, urging the improvement of conditions surrounding employment of substitute post-office clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2995. Also, petition of the Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks, opposing salary reductions or furloughs in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2996. Also, petition of the Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local 295, Detroit, Mich., endorsing the enactment of legislation establishing a system of longevity pay for post-office clerks and other post-office employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2997. Also, petition of the Detroit Federation of Post Office Clerks, Detroit, Mich., endorsing House bill 4647; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2998. Also, petition of the Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local 295, Detroit, Mich., endorsing House bill 3415; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2999. Also, petition of the Michigan State Association of Postal Supervisors, endorsing Senate Joint Resolution 142; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3000. Also, petition of the Michigan State Association of Postal Supervisors, endorsing House bill 6814; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3001. Also, petition of the Michigan State Association of Postal Supervisors, endorsing Senate bill 1306; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3002. Also, petition of the Michigan State Association of Postal Supervisors, endorsing House bill 5852; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3003. Also, petition of the Michigan State Association of Postal Supervisors, endorsing Senate bill 615; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1937

The Reverend Richard A. Cartmell, D. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, the Father of us all, whose love passeth human understanding, whose presence is nearer than the breath of life: Grant to us, we beseech Thee, the nourishment of Thy grace that daily we may grow unto the image of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Even as He, may we, also, seek above all else Thy honor and glory; Thy kingdom of righteousness and peace. Bestow upon us such a measure of His spirit that we may make no compromise with wrong, yet see a vision of Thee in every living soul, so that when we gain our victory, O Lord, it may be Christ's victory of justice and truth, wrought not on the anvil of hate but in the fire of love. And in the end grant that every one of us may come to love Thee with the fullness of our being and our neighbor as ourself. Through the same, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous request, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 20, 1937, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 13, 1937:

S. 557. An act authorizing the naturalization of James Lincoln Hartley, and for other purposes;

S. 727. An act validating homestead entry billings 029004 of Lillian J. Glinn;

S. 767. An act for the relief of the Charles T. Miller Hospital at St. Paul, Minn.; Dr. Edgar T. Herrmann; Ruth Kehoe, nurse; and Catherine Foley, nurse;

S. 1474. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Clyde J. Nesser, a lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, retired; and

S. 2497. An act authorizing John Monroe Johnson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, to accept the decoration tendered him by the Belgian Government.

On July 14, 1937:

S. 171. An act for the relief of George E. Shockley.

On July 15, 1937:

S. 114. An act for the relief of Mildred Moore.

On July 16, 1937:

S. 828. An act for the relief of Ellen Taylor;

S. 885. An act for the relief of H. G. Harmon;

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Alexander E. Kovner;

S. 1188. An act for the relief of J. E. Sammons; and

S. 1934. An act for the relief of Halle D. McCullough.

On July 17, 1937:

S. 630. An act for the relief of the Sheehy Drilling Co.;

S. 1849. An act for the relief of the Goldenberg Furniture Co.; and

S. 2266. An act for the relief of John A. Ensor.

On July 19, 1937:

S. 1257. An act for the relief of James H. Smith.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2086) to authorize the construction of a Federal reclamation project to furnish a water supply for the lands of the Arch Hurley Conservancy District in New Mexico.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 534) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 738. An act for the relief of Asa C. Ketcham;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Guideo Biscaro, Giovanni Polin, Spironello Antonio, Arturo Bettio, Carlo Biscaro, and Antonio Vannin;

H. R. 1025. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Italian Star Line, Inc., against the United States;

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Ellen Kline;

H. R. 1258. An act for the relief of E. G. Briseno and Hector Briseno, a minor;

H. R. 1690. An act for the relief of Ralph Reisler;

H. R. 1858. An act for the relief of Charles E. Names;

H. R. 2093. An act for the relief of Marion Shober Phillips;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of officers and soldiers of the Volunteer Service of the United States mustered into service for the War with Spain and who were held in service in the Philippine Islands after the ratification of the treaty of peace, April 11, 1899;

H. R. 3276. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Delaware Bay Shipbuilding Co., Inc.;

H. R. 3426. An act for the relief of Rose McGirr;

H. R. 4169. An act to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass.;

H. R. 5112. An act for the relief of Frank Lee Borney; and

H. R. 5030. An act granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) authorizing the printing of the report of the Subcommittee on Technology to the National Resources Committee entitled "Technological Trends and National Policy, Including the Social Implications of the New Inventions", as a document, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President.

S. 1762. An act to add certain lands to the Rogue River National Forest in the State of Oregon;

S. 1806. An act to extend the boundaries of the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona;

S. 1972. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell, loan, or give samples of supplies and equipment to prospective manufacturers;

S. 2295. An act to amend the act approved June 7, 1935 (Public, No. 116, 74th Cong., 49 Stat. 332), to provide for an additional number of cadets at the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes;

S. 2587. An act providing for the sale of the two dormitory properties belonging to the Chickasaw Nation or Tribe of Indians, in the vicinity of the Murray State School of Agriculture at Tishomingo, Okla.;

S. 2661. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Maine and New Hampshire for the creation of the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority; and

S. 2662. An act authorizing the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Piscataqua River at or near Portsmouth, State of New Hampshire.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. In order to assure the presence of a quorum, I ask that the roll be called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Pittman
Andrews	Copeland	King	Pope
Ashurst	Davis	La Follette	Radcliffe
Austin	Dieterich	Lee	Reynolds
Bailey	Donahey	Lewis	Russell
Barkley	Duffy	Lodge	Schwartz
Berry	Ellender	Logan	Schwellenbach
Bilbo	Frazier	Lonergan	Sheppard
Black	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bone	Gerry	McAdoo	Smathers
Borah	Gibson	McCarran	Smith
Bridges	Gillette	McGill	Steiwer
Brown, Mich.	Glass	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Brown, N. H.	Green	McNary	Thomas, Utah.
Bulkley	Guffey	Maloney	Townsend
Bulow	Hale	Minton	Truman
Burke	Harrison	Moore	Tydings
Byrd	Hatch	Murray	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Herring	Neely	Van Nuys
Capper	Hitchcock	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Holt	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Chavez	Hughes	Overton	Wheeler
Clark	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	White

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is detained from the Senate because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CONDOLENCES ON DEATH OF SENATOR ROBINSON

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Home Owners' Association of Oklahoma at Tulsa, Okla., and also various other communications from citizens of the United States, expressing regret upon the occasion of the death of Hon. Joseph T. Robinson, late a Senator from the State of Arkansas, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by the Rabbinical Council of America at New York, N. Y., expressing regret upon the occasion of the death of Hon. Joseph T. Robinson, late a Senator from the State of Arkansas, which was ordered to lie on the table.

UNITED STATES GOLDEN GATE INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] as members, on the part of the Senate, of the United States Golden Gate International Exposition Commission, established by Public Resolution No. 52, approved July 9, 1937.

UNITED STATES NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] as members, on the part of the Senate, of the United States New York World's Fair Commission, established by Public Resolution No. 53, approved July 9, 1937.

COMMISSION TO ATTEND DEDICATION OF WORLD WAR MEMORIALS IN EUROPE

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of Public Resolution No. 45, approved June 28, 1937, the Chair appoints the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. DUFFY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] as members, on the part of the Senate, of the Commission to attend the dedication of World War memorials erected in Europe under authority of the act of March 4, 1923.

LAWS OF PUERTO RICO; FOURTH SPECIAL SESSION, 1936; REGULAR SESSION, 1937

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 23 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico, and for other purposes", I transmit herewith certified copies of laws enacted by the Thirteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico during its fourth special session, September 21–22, 1936, and by the Fourteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico during its first regular session, February 8 to April 15, 1937.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 19, 1937.*

LEGISLATION OF THE ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, VIRGIN ISLANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, Virgin Islands, and approved by the Governor of the islands, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

FRANK PASHLEY AND BROWN GARRETT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his report and recommendation to Congress concerning the claims of Frank Pashley and Brown Garrett against the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1936, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BONNEVILLE DAM AND PROTECTION OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER FISHERIES (S. DOC. NO. 87)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Commissioner of Fisheries, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 113, agreed to April 9, 1937, a report on the facilities for the passage of salmon at the Bonneville Dam, Oreg., which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

DELTA AIR CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to section 6 of the Air Mail Act of 1934, as amended, a copy of a decision on the air-mail contract of the Delta Air Corporation, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

CHANGE OF NAME OF CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1284) to change the name of the Chemical Warfare Service, which was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "Chemical", to strike out "Service" and insert "Corps."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ASA J. HUNTER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1067) for the relief of Asa J. Hunter, which were, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$455" and insert "$250"; and on page 1, to strike out lines 8 and 9 and insert "personal injuries sustained by him when his automobile was."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a privileged matter, being a veto message from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the message from the President of the United States, returning without approval, H. R. 6763, entitled "An act to extend for 1 additional year the 3½-percent interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans, to provide a 4-percent interest rate on such loans for the period of July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939, and to provide for a 4-percent interest rate on land-bank commissioner's loans for a period of 2 years."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I dislike to interfere with the reading of the veto message, but it was plainly understood when the Senate adjourned day before yesterday that first we would have today the regular routine morning business, which would be followed by the consideration of the veto message, after which unobjected bills on the calendar would be considered, and then the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] would be recognized. I insist that we go through with that understanding.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is correct. I did not know that the veto message would be laid down for consideration until the morning business had been concluded. If it is necessary to ask unanimous consent that the reading of the veto message be discontinued, I will do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will cease reading the message. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if I am now entitled to the floor, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield until routine morning business shall have been disposed of, and then take my place upon the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is the morning hour, and it is the impression of the Chair that the Senator from New York could take the floor now only by unanimous consent until routine morning business shall have been disposed of.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from New York does not need to make such a request. The routine morning business takes precedence. After that shall have been concluded, and after the unanimous-consent agreement shall have been carried out, then the Senator from New York will be entitled automatically to the floor. That is the rule of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. COPELAND. That being the ruling of the Chair, I will take my seat.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the morning business shall have been concluded, and the other matters under the agreement disposed of, the Senator from New York will be entitled to the floor.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection let me say that it was the understanding when the Senate adjourned day before yesterday that the morning business would be transacted today; that then the veto message of the President would be taken up as a privileged matter; and, following that, I would ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar. I think it would be more orderly to pursue that course, and I now make that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of Clarence R. Bitting of New York, N. Y., praying

for the ratification by the Senate of the so-called international sugar agreement as a means of stabilizing world sugar prices, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of Mrs. C. R. Ertz, of Canon City, Colo., praying for the enactment of House bill 5538, providing Federal pensions to the blind, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of Mrs. Mary E. Cale, of Camden, N. J., praying for the enactment of House bill 2257, providing a Federal pension to every citizen 55 years of age or older, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Texas Bar Association at San Antonio, Tex., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the appointment of official shorthand reporters to the district courts, and also a resolution protesting against the enactment of proposed legislation to reorganize the Federal judiciary, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of Charles Forney, of Princess Anne County, Va., praying for the rejection of legislation to reorganize the Federal judiciary, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Annapolis, Md., praying for the enactment of House bill 2257, providing a Federal pension to every citizen over 55 years of age, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Musical Union, of Baltimore, Md., urging the restoration of certain workers to the rolls of the Works Progress Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Insurance Agents Relief Association, Inc., of Baltimore, Md., favoring the enactment of antilynching legislation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH presented a resolution adopted by the council of the Bar Association of Boston, Mass., protesting against the enactment of legislation to reorganize the Federal judiciary, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Home Loan Defense Association, of Malden, Mass., remonstrating against further home foreclosures on the part of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Central Labor Union of Lawrence, Mass., protesting against the enactment of legislation permitting messenger boys to take noncompetitive examinations for the Postal Service after a certain period of employment, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Belmont-Waverly Post, No. 165, the American Legion, of Belmont, Mass., protesting against the enactment of legislation to reorganize the Federal judiciary, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts praying the abolition of the Federal Reserve System as at present constituted, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented the petition of the Home Loan Defense Association of Malden, Mass., praying the stay of home foreclosures by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation until remedial legislation can be enacted, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Musicians' Protective Association of Boston, Mass., urging that certain persons be restored to the rolls of the Works Progress Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by the Commercial Artists and Designers Union of New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 176, providing for the employment of certain persons by the Works Progress Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Jewish Men's Club of Spring Valley, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 6485, providing for the establishment of adult civic education centers, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Fourth Ward Democratic Club of Mount Vernon, N. Y., protesting against certain reductions in the personnel of the Works Progress Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, State of New York, urging the establishment of Federal relief projects in certain New York communities damaged by floodwaters, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WAGNER presented petitions (transmitted by the Red Hook South Brooklyn (N. Y.) Housing Conference) of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the prompt enactment of the pending low-cost housing bill, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Tremont A. L. P. Club, of the Bronx, N. Y., favoring the prompt enactment of the pending low-cost housing bill, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of several citizens and organizations of Detroit, Mich., praying for the prompt enactment of the pending low-cost housing bill, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Jewish Men's Club of Spring Valley, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 6485, providing for the establishment of adult civic education centers, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Y. W. C. A. Summer Conference at Lake Okoboji, Iowa, favoring the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Van Nuys antilynching bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIARY: PETITIONS

Mr. McADOO. Mr. President, I present numerous petitions signed by some 50,000 Californians in behalf of the President's proposal for court reform. I ask that they may lie on the table where everyone may see them, and also that the body of one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD.

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

The body of one of the petitions presented by Mr. McADOO is as follows:

MONSTER ROLL CALL OF 1,000,000 CALIFORNIA VOTERS BACKING PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT IN HIS PROPOSAL TO REORGANIZE THE SUPREME COURT AND URGING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO SUPPORT HIM—VOLUNTEER COMMITTEE OF 10,000 LOYAL, MILITANT DEMOCRATS TO "CALL THE ROLL"

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States, Washington, D. C.:

In 1932 the people of the United States gave you a mandate to lead them out of economic misery, chaos, and collapse. We did not know you then as we do now. But we looked to you to initiate laws for our economic deliverance.

You did not fail us. And again in 1936, by the most overwhelming majority in our history, we renewed that mandate, trusting to your wise leadership to "make our American democracy succeed" by progressive and constructive legislation adequate to meet the grave social and economic problems confronting us.

You are now leading the battle of democracy up to the next trenches, in your proposal to "reorganize the Supreme Court." Therefore,

We, the undersigned voters of the State of California, herewith answer the "roll call", pledging to you our loyal and wholehearted support. And we herewith urge upon Congress the early passage of the President's proposal, as the only immediate available method to make possible progressive legislation now imperative if democracy is not to fail. "We also," Mr. President, "have just begun to fight."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 117) creating a special committee to investigate and report on matters per-

taining to aquatic life of the United States, its Territories, and waters adjacent thereto, reported it without amendment.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1700) for the relief of William A. Patterson; Albert E. Rust; Louis Pfeiffer; and John L. Nesbitt and Cora B. Geller, as executors under the will of James T. Bentley, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 901) thereon.

Mr. BURKE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1043) for the relief of A. C. Williams, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 902) thereon.

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2707) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of the Mack Copper Co., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 903) thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2427) for the relief of the estates of Al Cochran, Willis Cochran, and Russell Cochran, and for the relief of Shirley Cochran and Matilda Cochran, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 904) thereon.

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 2768. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General to adjust and settle the claim of Leo L. Harrison (Rept. No. 905); and

S. 2769. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General to adjust and settle the claim of Irvin H. Johnson (Rept. No. 906).

Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 363) to authorize an additional appropriation to further the work of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 907) thereon.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3408) to amend the Civil Service Act approved January 16, 1883 (22 Stat. 403), and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 908) thereon.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2598) to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Arthur W. Bass, a lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, retired, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 909) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 2338) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 910) thereon.

Mr. DIETERICH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5969) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 911) thereon.

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6048) to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station in the vicinity of Fort Myers, Fla., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 932) thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 6693. A bill to legalize a dike in the Missouri River 6.9 miles downstream from the South Dakota State highway bridge at Pierre, S. Dak. (Rept. No. 917); and

H. R. 7514. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y. (Rept. No. 914).

Mr. GUFFEY, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 2478) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved June 22, 1936, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 918) thereon.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 2092) to authorize the completion, maintenance, and operation of the Bonneville project for navigation, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 919) thereon.

Mr. COPELAND, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon, as follows:

S. 988. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce a Foreign Commerce Service of the United States, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1927, as amended (Rept. No. 921);

S. 2455. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (Act of June 29, 1936, ch. 858; 49 Stat. 1985) (Rept. No. 912);

H. R. 7051. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 916); and

H. R. 7646. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved June 22, 1936 (Rept. No. 915).

Mr. COPELAND also, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills and joint resolutions, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 2433. A bill to amend section 4450 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of May 27, 1936 (49 U. S. Stat. 1380, 1383; title 46, U. S. C., sec. 239) (Rept. No. 922);

S. 2575. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast Guard (Rept. No. 913);

S. 2578. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to continue the existing system of classification and pay of positions of lighthouse keepers (Rept. No. 923);

S. 2638. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved June 22, 1936 (Rept. No. 924);

S. 2729. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer the two unused lighthouse sites in Kahului Townsite, island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, in exchange for two plots of land located in the same townsite and now occupied for lighthouse purposes under permission from the respective owners, the Kahului Railroad Co. and the Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Ltd. (Rept. No. 925);

S. 2786. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to exchange with the people of Puerto Rico the Guanica Lighthouse Reservation for two adjacent plots of insular forest land under the jurisdiction of the commissioner, department of agriculture and commerce, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 926);

H. R. 4642. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the county of Beaufort, S. C., of the Hunting Island Lighthouse Reservation (Rept. No. 928);

H. R. 6045. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of Commerce to transfer to the Government of Puerto Rico a portion of land within the Catano Range Rear Lighthouse Reservation, P. R., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 929);

H. R. 6976. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Alabama at or near Dauphin Island, Ala. (Rept. No. 930);

H. R. 7823. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to exchange with the people of Puerto Rico the Guanica Lighthouse Reservation for two adjacent plots of insular forest land under the jurisdiction of the commissioner, department of agriculture and commerce, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 931);

S. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of certain bequests of James Reuel Smith, late of the city of Yonkers, State of New York (Rept. No. 920); and

H. J. Res. 413. Joint resolution to permit the transportation of passengers by Canadian passenger vessels between ports or places in the United States on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River (Rept. No. 927).

MEMBERSHIP OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT AND RELIEF PROBLEMS

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably, with an amendment, the resolution (S. Res. 145) increasing the membership of the Special Committee on Investigation of Unemployment and Relief Problems, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 145) submitted by Mr. HATCH on June 15, 1937. The amendment of the committee was, on page 1, at the end of line 6, to insert a comma and the words "and the committee is authorized to call upon the executive departments for clerical and other assistants", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the membership of the special committee of the Senate to study, survey, and investigate the problems of unemployment and relief, created under Senate Resolution No. 36, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, agreed to June 10, 1937, is hereby increased by two Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and the committee is authorized to call upon the executive departments for clerical and other assistants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

VIOLATIONS OF FREE SPEECH AND RIGHTS OF LABOR—CHICAGO MEMORIAL DAY INCIDENT (PT. 2, REPT. NO. 46)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. From the Committee on Education and Labor I submit an interim report on the activities of the subcommittee appointed pursuant to Senate Resolution 266 (74th Cong.) to investigate violations of the right of free speech and assembly and interference with the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed with the illustrations.

VIOLATIONS OF FREE SPEECH AND RIGHTS OF LABOR—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. By authority of the full Committee on Education and Labor, for the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and myself, I report from that committee a resolution, which I ask may be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the resolution referred as indicated by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The resolution (S. Res. 154) was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, agreed to June 6, 1936, and under Senate Resolution 70, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, agreed to February 19, 1937, to investigate violations of the right of free speech and assembly and interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively, is hereby increased by $50,000.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HITCHCOCK:

A bill (S. 2790) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2791) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, by including hops as a commodity to which orders under such act are applicable; and

A bill (S. 2792) to authorize the withdrawal of national-forest lands for the protection of watersheds from which water is obtained for municipalities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By MR. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 2793) to amend section 4 of the United States Grain Standards Act of 1916 as relating to the use of the official grain standards of the United States on grain moved in interstate commerce from shipping points to destination points without official grade determination; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 2794) to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 2795) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Great Falls Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Great Falls", approved April 21, 1928; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GIBSON:

A bill (S. 2796) to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide for widows' annuities; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BLACK (for Mr. HAYDEN):

A bill (S. 2797) for the relief of Mrs. Miriam Thornber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2798) for the relief of Edith Jennings (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HATCH:

A bill (S. 2799) for the relief of George Marsh; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEE:

A bill (S. 2800) to pay the burial expenses of Clancey O. Gilham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE:

A bill (S. 2801) to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of the State of New Jersey", approved May 15, 1936; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 2802) for the relief of the parents of Carl Orr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 2803) granting a pension to George M. Fisher; and

A bill (S. 2804) granting a pension to Mrs. Clyde Fyfe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEIWER:

A bill (S. 2805) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Rule (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2806) for the relief of Indian war veterans who were discharged from the Army because of minority or misrepresentation of age; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

A bill (S. 2807) granting a pension to Henrietta V. W. Owen; and

A bill (S. 2808) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Promie (alias Eugene Promis); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 2809) to provide for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Navy for the value of personal effects lost while engaged in emergency relief expeditions during the Ohio Valley flood in February 1937; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 2810) for the relief of Joseph Bradley Murphy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2811) to amend the Judicial Code by adding thereto a new section to be numbered 659 (1) relating to the certification, authentication, and use in evidence of docu-

ments of record or on file in public offices in the State of Vatican City; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

A bill (S. 2812) to renew and extend certain letters patent to Irvine K. Roby; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 2813) for the relief of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co.;

A bill (S. 2814) for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.;

A bill (S. 2815) for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.; and

A bill (S. 2816) for the relief of Thermal Syndicate, Ltd.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2817) providing for the purchase by the United States of air navigation facilities established, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, by air-mail contractors on their contract routes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE:

A bill (S. 2818) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act (pt. II); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 2819) to create a committee on purchases of blind-made products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 2820) to provide for studies and plans for the development of a reclamation project on the Cimarron River in Cimarron County, Okla.; and

A bill (S. 2821) to provide for studies and plans for the development of reclamation projects on the Cimarron River in Cimarron County, Okla.; the Washita River in Oklahoma, and the North Canadian River in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BLACK:

A bill (S. 2822) granting a pension to Grizelda Hull Hobson; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2823) to quiet title and possession to certain islands in the Tennessee River in the counties of Colbert and Lauderdale, Ala.; and

A bill (S. 2824) to establish the Coosa National Park in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. BERRY) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 180, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 181) providing for participation by the United States in the exposition and celebration to be held in Oklahoma City in 1939; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 182) to make available to the Federal Government the facilities of the Council of State Governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma introduced Senate Joint Resolution 183, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining and appears under a separate heading.)

CONSERVATION AND PRESERVATION OF IRON ORE AND STEEL SCRAP

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BERRY] and myself I introduce a joint resolution pertaining to an investigation of the steel and iron-scrap situation of the country. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

For the record I will say that a similar joint resolution is being introduced in the other House today. This is a subject with reference to which Congress does not have the facts and it is deserving of investigation and attention.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be referred as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 180) to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Conservation and Preservation of Iron Ore and Steel and Iron Scrap, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 738. An act for the relief of Asa C. Ketcham;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Guideo Biscaro, Giovanni Polin, Spironello Antonio, Arturo Bettio, Carlo Biscaro, and Antonio Vannin;

H. R. 1025. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Italian Star Line, Inc., against the United States;

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Ellen Kline;

H. R. 1258. An act for the relief of E. G. Briseno and Hector Briseno, a minor;

H. R. 1690. An act for the relief of Ralph Reisler;

H. R. 1858. An act for the relief of Charles E. Names;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of officers and soldiers of the volunteer service of the United States mustered into service for the War with Spain and who were held in service in the Philippine Islands after the ratification of the treaty of peace April 11, 1899;

H. R. 3276. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Delaware Bay Shipbuilding Co., Inc.;

H. R. 3426. An act for the relief of Rose McGirr;

H. R. 4169. An act to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass.; and

H. R. 5112. An act for the relief of Frank Lee Borney; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5030. An act granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) was referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Report of the Subcommittee on Technology, submitted to the National Resources Committee, entitled "Technological Trends and National Policy, Including the Social Implications of the New Inventions", be printed as a House document; and that 10,000 additional copies shall be printed, of which 2,900 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 7,100 copies shall be for the use of the House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. BLACK. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 701) to aid the several States in making certain toll bridges on the system of Federal-aid highways free bridges, and for other purposes, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

I will say in explanation that I have taken the matter up with the chairman of the Committee on Commerce and also with the chairman of the subcommittee who handles bills of this type. I have also discussed it with the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. This bill relates to Federal-aid highways in connection with bridges, and therefore is more properly a subject for the consideration of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

LOW-COST HOUSING—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WALSH submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1685, the so-called low-cost housing bill, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TAXES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7472) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and

for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

IMPROVEMENT OF RIVERS AND HARBORS: AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUGHES submitted an amendment, Mr. TYDINGS submitted two amendments, and Mr. SHEPPARD submitted six amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 7051) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HAWAII

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Hawaii, which shall be composed of not to exceed 12 Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and not to exceed 12 Members of the House of Representatives, and the Delegate from Hawaii, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members. The committee shall cease to exist upon making its report to Congress pursuant to this resolution.

SEC. 2. The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of the subject of Statehood and of other subjects relating to the welfare of the Territory of Hawaii. The committee shall report to the Senate and to the House of Representatives not later than January 15, 1938, the results of its investigation and study, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems necessary or desirable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to sit and act, as a whole or by subcommittee, at such times and places as it deems advisable, to hold such hearings, to administer such oaths and affirmations, to take such testimony, and to have such printing and binding done as it deems necessary.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS ON THE INVESTIGATION OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS

Mr. TRUMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 155), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of part 1, and each subsequent part, of the hearings held before a subcommittee appointed by the chairman of said committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-fourth Congress, "To investigate interstate railroads, holding companies, and affiliated companies."

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR ROBINSON

Mrs. CARAWAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 156), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Joseph T. Robinson, late a Senator from the State of Arkansas, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

STABILIZATION OF SUGAR PRODUCTION AND PRICES

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, during the last few weeks there has been negotiated what is known as the International Sugar Treaty. There has also been reported to the other House a bill practically the same as the original Jones-Costigan Act. The matter has not been acted upon as yet, but there is considerable propaganda to the effect that the treaty should be permitted to take the place of legislation. Upon that subject I ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Clarence R. Bitting, of New York, and my reply to Mr. Bitting's letter. I ask that these may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 17, 1937.*

HON. WILLIAM E. BORAH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BORAH: The sugar-producing industry of the world, for many years in an almost chronic state of distress, should, through the terms of the International Sugar Agreement, now before the Senate for ratification, to be placed upon a sound economic base. Much of the credit for this accomplishment is undeniably due to President Roosevelt and Secretaries Hull and Wallace.

The causes underlying the failure of the Chadbourne plan, which preceded, and because of its failure made necessary, at least in part, the Jones-Costigan Act, have been rectified in this new agreement and should, therefore, result in sugar prices, throughout the world, fair to both producer and consumer. Fair sugar prices elsewhere in the world will automatically establish fair prices in the United States.

It would seem only fair to give the International Sugar Agreement an opportunity to function free of supplemental legislation in this country and it is therefore respectfully suggested that no sugar legislation be enacted by Congress until the international agreement has been in operation for at least 1 full year and thus its effect on the American market fully disclosed.

Respectfully,

CLARENCE R. BITTING.

[Telegram]

JULY 20, 1937.

CLARENCE R. BITTING,
New York City:

I am in receipt of your letter urging that there be no sugar legislation at this session and that we await the ratification and the results thereunder of the International Sugar Agreement.

May I be permitted to say that this discloses either a great want of information as to the interests of the beet-sugar growers or a great indifference to their welfare.

In the first place, the treaty can never take the place of local legislation, and to postpone legislation to watch the results of the treaty would be to destroy in a large measure the beet-sugar industry. There is nothing in the treaty and never can be anything in the treaty providing for the disposition of the proceeds between the processors, the growers, and the laborers, one of the most vital things in connection with the sugar-beet industry. Furthermore, the treaty itself should have some changes, and it will take at least 2 years or 3 years to know its results.

The beet-sugar growers have not behind them a vast corporation to carry them over such 3 years.

The beet growers frankly want and need the legislation. If the quotas are abandoned and the tariff of 1.5 percent again become effective, they see nothing but distress and disaster ahead.

The President, in his message of March 1, 1937, declared "The Jones-Costigan Act has been useful and effective and it is my belief that its priciples should again be made effective. I therefore recommend to the Congress the enactment of the sugar-quota system and its necessary complements which will restore the operation of the principles on which the Jones-Costigan Act was based." Eighty thousand beet farmers of the Nation who took the Presidential message at its face value, planted beets in the expectation that the quota system would be continued. They must not be sacrificed to the conflicting claims of industrial groups. This year the cost of producing beets will be higher than in many years past because the growers have generally granted substantially higher wages to their workers who number more than 100,000. Wage rates in factories affecting tens of thousands of men have also been increased.

Enactment of pending legislation would merely recognize the principle of protection which is extended to industry as a whole. It would not increase the price of sugar and it would not give any unusual margin of profit. It would continue the insular areas in their present position and permit Cuba to maintain the preferred and prosperous status which she now enjoys. The bill should be enacted and its enactment should not be blocked by the demands of the insular producers that legislation be passed which gives them the opportunity for tremendous expansion of their refining capacity and for further enrichment of their large corporate farming enterprises.

Farmers of the irrigated West who know from 40 years' experience the value of the beet in a particular kind of agriculture want to continue in the production of that crop. Eighty thousand farmers growing beets depend on the crop for a large portion of their cash income—in some cases their entire income. For the small farmer it is the best and most dependable crop that can be grown.

The quota system of the Jones-Costigan Act proposed and sponsored by the administration comes to an end December 31, 1937. Recently the House Committee on Agriculture unanimously reported a bill which in every significant detail follows the Presidential wishes. Beet growers of the United States asked nothing in the legislation that was not given to them in the Jones-Costigan Act—as a matter of fact, they were given a substantially smaller quota.

The only point in controversy is an issue not raised by the beet growers. It deals with the right of the insular producers benefiting from low labor costs and corporate agriculture to refine their entire quotas in the insular areas. To grant that privilege (which is not granted in the Jones-Costigan Act) would mean a tremendous reduction in the volume of continental cane refiners with losses in employment and forced liquidation of capital as a consequence.

WILLIAM E. BORAH.

J. R. COLLIE AND ELEANOR Y. COLLIE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 455) for the relief of J. R. Collie and Eleanor Y. Collie, having met,

after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$1,000" contained in said amendment, insert "$2,500"; and the House agree to the same.

J. W. BAILEY,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,
ELMER J. RYAN,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

FRAZIER-DAVIS CONSTRUCTION CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1144) for the relief of the Frazier-Davis Construction Co., which were, on page 1, line 6, after "Company", to insert a comma and "of St. Louis, Mo."; and on the same page 1, line 7, after "company", to insert "against the United States".

Mr. CLARK. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

G. L. TARLTON

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1143) for the relief of G. L. Tarlton, which were, on page 1, line 5, after "Tarlton", to insert a comma and "of St. Louis, Mo."; and on the same page, line 6, after "claim", to insert "against the United States."

Mr. CLARK. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ASSIGNMENT OF LINE OFFICERS OF MARINE CORPS TO STAFF DUTY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2521) to authorize the assignment of officers of the line of the Marine Corps to staff duty only as assistant quartermasters and assistant paymasters, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, lines 6 and 7, after "to", to strike out "staff duty only as assistant quartermasters and assistant paymasters" and insert in lieu thereof "assistant quartermaster and assistant paymaster duty only"; on page 2, line 2, after "for", to insert "other"; on page 2, line 5, after "to", to strike out "staff duty only" and insert "such duty"; on page 2, line 8, after "to", to strike out "staff" and insert "assistant quartermaster and assistant paymaster"; on page 2, line 11, after "officers", to strike out "assigned to staff duty only" and insert "so assigned"; and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the assignment of officers of the line of the Marine Corps to assistant quartermaster and assistant paymaster duty only, and for other purposes."

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

REORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIARY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GEORGE

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator GEORGE July 19, 1937, on the proposal to reorganize the Federal Judiciary, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAGES AND HOURS OF LABOR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BLACK

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the wages and hours of labor bill, delivered by Senator BLACK at Charlottesville, Va., July 15, 1937, which appears in the Appendix.]

GERMAN-AMERICANS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DUFFY

[Mr. SCHWELLENBACH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Splendid Contribution of German-Americans to America and Wisconsin" delivered by Senator DUFFY in Milwaukee, Wis., June 27, 1937, which appears in the Appendix.]

YOUTH'S SEARCH FOR SECURITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. BLACK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator PEPPER on Friday, July 9, 1937, to the National Youth Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL CUMMINGS AT BOY SCOUT NATIONAL JAMBOREE

[Mr. MCADOO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address of welcome delivered by Hon. Homer Cummings, Attorney General of the United States, at the opening session of the national jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America June 30, 1937; which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO CAPT. JEREMIAH O'BRIEN—ADDRESS BY JOSEPH F. O'CONNELL

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by former Representative Joseph F. O'Connell at the unveiling of a tablet to Capt. Jeremiah O'Brien in Boston, June 12, 1937, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR TINGLEY, OF NEW MEXICO, TO CONVENTION OF YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Clyde Tingley, Governor of New Mexico, before the convention of Young Democratic Clubs of Missouri, July 17, 1937, which appears in the Appendix.]

IRRIGATION PROJECT CROPS—STATEMENT BY INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

[Mr. POPE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the Department of the Interior with reference to crop production under irrigation projects, which appears in the Appendix.]

BLUE SHIRT REPUBLICANS—EDITORIAL FROM RUTLAND (VT.) HERALD

[Mr. GIBSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Blue Shirt Republicans", which was published in the Rutland (Vt.) Herald of May 7, 1937, which appears in the Appendix.]

DESTROYING THE PRESIDENT—EDITORIAL FROM NEW BEDFORD STANDARD-TIMES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Destroying the President". which appeared in the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., July 9, 1937, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON SENATOR COPELAND'S SPEECH ON REORGANIZATION OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Boston American, written by Prof. Robert E. Rogers, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, with reference to a speech by Senator COPELAND on the proposal to reorganize the Federal judiciary, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REDUCED INTEREST RATE ON FEDERAL LAND-BANK LOANS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed. Under the agreement the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the veto message.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma and Mr. MCNARY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to state that the Senate would complete morning business; that the veto message of the President should then be laid before the Senate, and after its disposal the Senate would proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asked if there was objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky for unanimous consent to such an agreement, and, there being no objection, the Chair stated the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The veto message will be read.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the veto message, which entire is as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 6763, entitled "An act to extend for 1 additional year the 3½-percent interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans, to provide a 4-percent interest rate on such loans for the period July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939, and to provide for a 4-percent interest rate on Land Bank Commissioner's loans for a period of 2 years."

Section 1 of the bill extends for 2 additional years the policy originally adopted as an emergency measure in 1933 under which borrowers from the Federal land banks are allowed to pay interest on their loans at rates lower than those provided in their mortgage contracts.

Section 2 of the bill broadens the field of loans on which interest reductions are granted by providing that for a period of 2 years interest may be paid at the reduced rate of 4 percent on loans made by the Land Bank Commissioner.

SECTION 1. FEDERAL LAND-BANK LOANS

At present, through the sale of bonds to the investing public, new loans are being made by Federal land banks at the lowest rate that has ever been made available to farmers generally in this country, namely, 4 percent per annum. A decrease in farm-mortgage interest rates has been brought about through the refinancing operations of the Federal land banks and the Land Bank Commissioner. The average rate of interest on the private loans refinanced by the Federal land banks in 1933 and subsequent years has been 6.3 percent. Consequently those farmers who refinanced their private loans in 1933 and 1934 by converting them into 5-percent Federal land-bank loans cut their annual interest charges more than 20 percent, while those who have refinanced at the present 4-percent rate have obtained a permanent reduction in excess of 40 percent. I believe, therefore, that there is no justification for continued Government subsidy of Federal land-bank interest rates below the unprecedentedly low rate these banks are now offering farmer-borrowers on a business basis.

Furthermore, the ability of farmers to pay interest at the rates provided for in their mortgages with the Federal land banks has been very substantially improved, due to an increase of more than 100 percent in the level of farm prices since the emergency period of 1932–33. In December 1936 the index of farm prices as reported by the Department of Agriculture stood at 126, as compared with 55 for the month of March 1933 and an average of 100 for the pre-war period August 1909 to July 1914. The gross farm income as estimated by the Department of Agriculture also rose from $5,337,000,000 in 1932 to $9,530,000,000 in 1936.

As an illustration of the lightening of the interest burden during the past 4 years through improvements in farm prices and the refinancing of farm debt, the following instance may be cited: The quantity of farm products required to meet the annual interest charge on a 6.3-percent private loan refinanced as a 5-percent Federal land-bank loan in 1933 is now only 63 percent of the quantity required during the 5 pre-war years 1910 to 1914. The greatly increased debt-paying capacity indicated in the foregoing figures is borne out by the record of actual payments on Federal land-bank loans. Approximately 85 percent of all loans of the Federal land banks were in good standing at the end of 1936, as opposed to approximately 50 percent delinquency when the emergency legislation was first passed.

The reduction of the rates of interest on Federal land-bank loans to 3½ percent for the fiscal year 1938, and to 4 percent for the fiscal year 1939, as required by the bill for loans made through national farm loan associations would, it is estimated, necessitate payments from the Treasury in the amount of approximately $31,700,000 for the former year and $21,200,000 for the latter, a total of $52,900,000. The effect of such an arrangement is that part of the individual borrower's interest is paid for him by the United States. In other words, it constitutes a gift to individual borrowers from the Federal Treasury.

As indicated by me in my letter of June 8, 1937, addressed to the committees of Congress then considering this legislation, the whole question involves the rate of interest charged by Government agencies and relates not only to farm loans, but also to moneys lent by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Public Works Administration, and other agencies.

The foregoing considerations have led me to the conclusion that further reductions in the interest rates payable on Federal land-bank loans are not justified.

SECTION 2. LAND BANK COMMISSIONER LOANS

The farm loans made by the Land Bank Commissioner on behalf of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation bear an interest rate of 5 percent per annum. In view of the circumstances under which these loans are made, it cannot reasonably be said that a 5-percent rate of interest is excessive. Comparison with Federal land-bank loans may serve to illustrate this point. A majority of the loans made by the Land Bank Commissioner are secured by second mortgages. Federal land-bank loans may only be granted on first-mortgage security. A Land Bank Commissioner loan may be made for an amount which, taking into account any prior liens, equals 75 percent of the value of the property, including both land and buildings. A Federal land-bank loan is restricted by law to a sum not exceeding 50 percent of the value of the land and 20 percent of the value of the improvements. Land Bank Commissioner loans are frequently granted upon farms which because of some physical or economic hazard would not qualify as security for a Federal land-bank loan. Finally, Land Bank Commissioner loans lack the element of cooperative responsibility through stock ownership by borrowers of their national farm-loan associations upon which the Federal land-bank system is built. In view of the added factors of risk present in the average Land Bank Commissioner loan, I feel that the 5-percent interest rate charged on these loans compares favorably with the present 4-percent rate of the Federal land banks. I have been unable to find any system in which second-mortgage loans have been made available to farmers generally on a basis as low as the present 5-percent Land Bank Commissioner loan rate.

The contemplated reduction in interest rates on Commissioner loans from 5 to 4 percent under the bill would reduce the annual income of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, which owns those loans, by an amount of approximately $8,350,000. No provision is made for a corresponding reimbursement of this sum by the Treasury to the Corporation. Losses suffered by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation ultimately fall upon the United States as the sole holder of the Corporation's capital stock. More than this, the payment of principal and interest on all bonds issued by the Corporation is guaranteed by the United States.

Any reduction in the interest rate on Commissioner loans will place the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation in such a position that there is a definite possibility that it may not be able to meet its obligations from its own income.

The passage of this bill was not contemplated in the preparation of the Budget for the fiscal year 1938. As the Congress is well aware, I am definitely seeking the balancing of that Budget. To this end I have called upon the heads of all Government departments, establishments, and agencies to set up reserves of not less than 10 percent of all funds available for the fiscal year 1938, except such funds as are not susceptible to such treatment. Approval by me of the bill under consideration, involving as it does an additional draft upon the Treasury in excess of $30,000,000 during the fiscal

year 1938, would be totally inconsistent with my purpose to bring about a balancing of the Budget for that year.

For all these reasons I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill H. R. 6763.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 9, 1937.*

[H. R. 6763—Seventy-fifth Congress of the United States of America; at the first session, begun and held at the city of Washington on Tuesday, the 5th day of January 1937]

An act to extend for 1 additional year the 3½-percent interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans, to provide a 4-percent interest rate on such loans for the period July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939, and to provide for a 4-percent interest rate on Land Bank Commissioner's loans for a period of 2 years

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) effective July 1, 1935, the first sentence of paragraph "Twelfth" of section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (relating to reduction in interest rates on certain Federal land-bank loans), is amended by striking out the following: "occurring within a period of 2 years commencing July 1, 1935" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "occurring within a period of 3 years commencing July 1, 1935, and shall not exceed 4 percent per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring within a period of 1 year commencing July 1, 1938."

(b) The fourth sentence of such paragraph "Twelfth" (relating to the time limit on payments made by the United States to land banks on account of such interest reduction) is amended to read as follows: "No payments shall be made to a bank with respect to any period after June 30, 1939."

SEC. 2. Section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act, as amended (relating to loans by the Land Bank Commissioner), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the rate of interest on loans made under this section outstanding when this amendatory paragraph takes effect or made on or after such date shall not exceed 4 percent per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring within a period of 2 years commencing on the date when this amendatory paragraph takes effect."

W. B. BANKHEAD,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

KEY PITTMAN,
President of the Senate pro tempore.

[Endorsement on back of bill:] I certify that this act originated in the House of Representatives.

SOUTH TRIMBLE, *Clerk.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the veto message, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 13, 1937.

The House of Representatives having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 6763) entitled "An act to extend for 1 additional year the 3½-percent interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans, to provide a 4-percent interest rate on such loans for the period July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939, and to provide for a 4-percent interest rate on land-bank commissioner's loans for a period of 2 years", returned by the President of the United States, with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement with reference to this matter, not at all argumentative, but simply stating the situation as I understand it.

When this bill was originally before the Senate, being in charge of it as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I stated that the passage of the bill extending for 1 year the 3½-percent rate on land-bank loans and extending for an additional year the rate at 4 percent, and the inclusion of commissioner's loans in a 2-year 4-percent rate, involved an annual expenditure of approximately $40,000,000 from the Treasury. That was the statement made by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. It was the statement made in the President's letter to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House. In that letter and in the President's message also he has reiterated what we may well consider in determining our votes upon this veto message.

Of course, no one can predict whether at the end of the 2-year period efforts will be made to obtain a further extension. If we could feel some assurance that no further effort would be made to extend this rate, which is costing the Treasury $40,000,000 annually, it might be easier to reconcile ourselves to it; but, as the President has stated, if this is to continue as the policy of the Government with respect to farm loans made either through the land banks or through the land-bank commissioner, it will be difficult to resist the same request when the borrowers through the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and other agencies of the Government come and ask that the same treatment be accorded to them.

If we should yield to that request when it comes, if it should come, it would undoubtedly involve an annual burden on the Treasury by reason of the reimbursement of these agencies for the difference between the rates collected from the borrower and the rate borne by the land-bank bonds or other bonds through which the Treasury obtains the money. I think it not unreasonable to predict that the amount of this reimbursement would ultimately be somewhere in the neighborhood of two or three hundred million dollars a year. So, Mr. President, without attempting to influence the vote of any Member of the Senate, and having myself, when the bill passed the Senate originally, voted in favor of it, in view of the additional reasons given by the President in his message and the situation which we know may arise, I feel that, notwithstanding my former attitude and position on the matter. I am justified in voting to sustain the veto of the President.

This, in substance, is the situation which confronts us; and I think it offers sufficient ground for us to give serious consideration to the matter, regardless of our attitude on the previous vote.

PROTEST AGAINST DECREE VIOLATING THE BALFOUR DECLARATION AS TO AMERICAN JEWS

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I beseech the Senate to indulge me for one or two moments on a subject that is apart from the one which is at present under consideration. I bring to the attention of the Senate what I feel has been a neglect of American citizens and something of a wrong done the property of these who are citizens of this Republic.

We are informed, sir, by international communication, that at Palestine there has come forth a decree by a friendly government in which it is sought to make an allotment of the property of the Jews who are assembled to establish themselves in their ancient and ancestral home at Jerusalem.

Mr. President, my relations to this subject justify me in imposing on the Senate. I remind them that I, as Senator for Illinois, was in a small way one of the voices of the Wilson administration in the matter of conference and consultation with Sir Herbert Samuels and Sir Alfred Mond—the latter now known as Lord Melchett. This proceeding was as to what we speak of as the Balfour declaration. I see some reference being made to certain "American protests" by one of those who sat on that Commission. I am that one. I protested against the declaration, as I construed it, embodying the American Jews as subjects of Great Britain. I contended that those who were citizens of the United States and from America should be allowed to choose for themselves to what country they desired allegiance. I urged that, until the American Jew chose British citizenship by his declaration, he must be treated as an American citizen.

Sir, I do not know whether or not my protest was the one which availed. I must inform the Senate merely of the proceeding; but, by virtue of that relationship, I am not unacquainted with the situation as coming forth in what we speak of as the Balfour declaration.

This declaration more particularly interests us in that it provided the privilege of occupation of these lands on the part of those who have gone to them and settled under the privileges of the declaration. The agreement that was then existing gave to the American Jew the equal privileges accorded all other Jews settling in that domain of Jerusalem or Holy Land.

Now, Mr. President, it is asserted, and generally published as the admited fact, that a general division of these properties has been made, and that these people who are called Jews settling in Palestine and the Holy Land have been distributed by the new decree to different sections than formerly obtaining. What I beg to call to the attention of the Senate is the situation of the American Jew who has settled in portions of that country in compliance with the charitable and generous opportunity given by his own people. In that connection, recall that our American Jews have expended millions of American money in the Holy Land for the settlers. The settler has taken his place in that country of the Holy Land in some form or other. This American has cultivated his lands and developed his property. I deny the right of any land or any nation to have removed this American without consideration of America or representatives of the American Jew. If such be done by consent of American Jews, that, of course, becomes justified. Yet, to transfer these people from Palestine and remove them to Trans-Jordania or to any other portion of the country that takes them from the land upon which they settled, and to which we have contributed large sums of money to establish them—using the word "we" as meaning America—I regard as an unfair act, though it be not so intended by the English authorities, nor in anywise an intended injustice. Here I respectfully bring to the attention of this honorable body that now, since it has been printed that there is to be some revision or some reconsideration of this subject by England and the Arab government, I suggest that as to the American Jew there should be an American representation in the new commission of adjustment on behalf of these American Jews. These should serve in conjunction with the others who may serve on this body.

We have heard in the open from this honorable body the declaration that two distinguished Senators—the able senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], who is eminent not only as a physician but as a humanitarian, and the able constitutional lawyer from Vermont, the senior Senator [Mr. AUSTIN]—as Senators have both lately had occasion to visit the scenes to which we allude. These Senators examined the subject and became acquainted with its details. I take the liberty to suggest that these two, among others, particularly these two, could most fittingly sit as American representatives on the commission.

I rose at this time to make protest against the American Jews as Americans and their property being disposed of without opportunity of American representation. I respectfully insist that we recognize the sacred history and the sacred established fact that as to Jerusalem the Jews have had so long a claim and so long a rightful privilege that we recognize it as sacred. Today we may turn to the sacred law and repeat the claim of the children of Abraham that this home should belong to Jews, as should the well, because their father had digged the well and set the landmarks of the sacred habitation.

I respectfully give notice that at an appropriate time I shall ask the Committee on Foreign Relations and this honorable body to give this matter consideration, upon the first occasion when appropriate in conjunction with what is now proceeding under the orders of the British Government.

I thank the Senate for indulging me to intrude this subject at this time.

EXTENSION OF REDUCED INTEREST RATE ON FEDERAL LAND-BANK LOANS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the veto message on the bill (H. R. 6763) to extend for 1 year the interest rates on certain Federal land-bank notes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CONNALLY in the chair). The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I do not think any Member of this body is more anxious than am I to have economy put into practical operation, and, if possible, at some time in the future to have our expenditures provided for by our income. But I admit I was utterly astounded, in view of all the protestations about the lowly condition of the man on the farm, that the President of the United States should veto a bill which extended to the farmer only a partial remittance of the interest due on his land mortgage. I was astounded that our efforts at economy should start by denying to that class of our society some relief from the intolerable burdens they have to bear.

I was very much gratified that in the body at the other end of the Capitol the action was so spontaneous and overwhelming, showing that in the terrible condition which confronts the country, if the reports of the humanitarians and economists are correct, we should not only reduce the interest rate but, if necessary, eliminate the payment of interest for a period.

How many of us realize the condition in which and under which those who feed us and produce the raw material out of which we are shod and clothed have to work? Only last year the potato crop, which is one of our standard crops, brought a splendid price. There is what is known as the Surplus Commodities Corporation, an organization supposed to absorb and distribute any surplus that affects the price of a given commodity. This year there has been a total failure so far as the price of potatoes is concerned. In addition to that, telegrams were received only this morning from the South stating that the market for the watermelon crop has absolutely collapsed. That is due partially to the abundance of the crop and partially to the inability of the people to absorb it. The same condition exists with respect to the whole citrus-fruit industry.

Mr. President, it is not necessary for me to stand before this body and compare the conditions under which farmers have to get what income they receive with the condition of those who fabricate manufactured goods. At what rate of interest are they enabled to borrow money, and at what rate of interest does our Government borrow money? We hear talk about 4 and 5 percent under modern conditions. No business of ordinary earning capacity can stand any rate above 3½ or 4 percent.

We must take into consideration the fact that the farmer pays every expense incident to getting his commodity ready for market. In the case of cotton there is deducted 30 percent of the weight for tare. In the case of his truck the price of all hampers is deducted from the price paid him for the contents thereof. The price is fixed by the buyer. Not a farmer in all America has ever sold at his own price a bushel of wheat or a pound of cotton or a steer. He takes his commodities to market and asks the other man what he will give for them. Every expense incident to the sale is deducted.

But when the farmer buys a shirt or a woolen jacket he pays for the cotton and the wrapping which go around it and the freight on the raw wool to the market and back. Of course, the farmers are not organized, and therefore the farmer is the Chinese of American society. He is the mark for the exploitation of every man who sees fit to exploit him. Even under our present administration he is not extended a reduction in interest rate in this hour of his need.

Mr. President, I understand there are those who are so anxious to keep faith with bond buyers, so anxious to see that nothing shall happen to curtail the rate of interest the bondholders enjoy, that they at once start to increase the burden where all the burden is borne—namely, with the unorganized farmers of this country.

The mere fact that land-bank bonds run into the billions of dollars is prima-facie evidence that the owner of the land could not meet the current expense, and had to involve

his investment in order to live. He is eating his principal now. Thousands of farmers throughout the country, hundreds in my State, have had to yield up their land, although their debts were to be amortized over a period of years, which, to an ordinary, thrifty business, would have made it easy to meet the debts, 4 and 5 percent covering amortization and interest. Even under those conditions the farmer could not meet the payments.

The economy practiced by the American farmer is the most cruel economy in all of our organized society. Go into the average farm home, and how many frigidaires do you see, how many bathtubs of modern pattern, how many electric lights? How many of the things that you and I consider necessities are to him unattainable luxuries? We get exceedingly fond of him at about election time and make all kinds of promises to him, and then we come here, and the first lick along the line of economy is made at his devoted head.

Mr. President, how can we be so inconsistent? We shed crocodile tears and vote $1,500,000,000 for the unemployed, and farmers in my section now cannot get hands to work their crops. A farmer in one of the lower counties in my State, having had his farm drained by one of the relief agencies under a project operated by W. P. A. or P. W. A., and so forth, went, as I understand, to the manager of the relief organization and said, "I stand to lose my crop. I simply cannot get it worked." The manager said, "Well, what do you want?" The farmer said, "I want some hands." The manager asked him, "How many?" The farmer told him how many he needed. The manager said, "All right; you can get them; but before you take them away you must agree to work them under the same conditions as we are working them." The farmer asked, "What are those conditions?" The manager said, "Eight hours a day and 40 cents an hour and guarantee to give them the same living conditions." I shall not quote what the farmer said, but he very emphatically refused and wrote me about it. I wrote and told him that under the circumstances I doubted his sanity. Rather than go and get those hands, why did he not get a job at 40 cents an hour for working 8 hours a day, I asked him. And then I said, "That is a blame sight more than you would make on your farm."

Mr. President, on the one hand we take the public money and pay it out to men for working a certain number of hours, when any practical farmer in America would be bankrupted if he were limited to working that number of hours on his farm. If the farmer were limited to 8 hours a day, he would find that crabgrass and weeds would be the crop with which to settle his bills if he could find a market for them.

Mr. President, we are laboring under natural laws. The manufacturer labors under artificial laws. He produces under laws which he makes and which he controls. Neither winter, summer, spring, nor fall interrupts his operations. The man out in the field must subscribe to the exigencies of natural laws. He can neither produce in quantity nor in quality according to his own will. Yet now we are asked to put the farmer in the category of an industrialist.

Mr. President, I am utterly amazed at this veto message under the circumstances. Here is the record of the bill as it passed: The RECORD shows that the new leader of this body was one of the foremost protagonists of this relief to the beleaguered agriculturists; and, Mr. President, I have been of the opinion that it would take more than $30,000,000 to balance the Budget.

I hope that every friend of the farmer—the man in the field, the man who has had to mortgage his property in order to hold onto a semblance of his old farm—I hope every man in this body will grant him at least this surcease from the obligations he must meet. Taxes are exorbitant. Living expenses are mounting. If I could sell a steer at the same price per pound that I would have to pay for a steak here, I wonder how much a real, good, fat steer would bring? Thirty-five dollars per hundred pounds is what I could get if I were paid at the rate of 35 cents a pound. That would be $350 a thousand pounds. I see my friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. McGILL] in his chair. He comes from the cattle-raising section. How many steers did he sell for approximately $350 per head in his part of the country? The cost of living is mounting, yet the price of farm products remains static.

Mr. President, I hope we shall override this veto in the interest of those who are voiceless here, and yet upon whom we all depend. I hope this veto will be overridden by as great a percentage as that by which the bill was passed in the first place.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the Senator from South Carolina takes his seat I wish to ask him to yield in order that I may ask him a question.

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from South Carolina to the fact that the Congress has just passed, and the President has just approved, the farm-tenancy bill, which proposes to make 40-year loans on the basis of 3-percent interest, I believe; and yet the interest rate on Federal land-bank loans for 1 year is reduced to 3½ percent and for a second year to 4 percent, and the rate of interest on commissioner's loans is reduced to 4 percent. All the loans under the Farm Tenancy Act, however, will be carried for a long period of time—40 to 45 years—at an interest rate of about 3 percent.

Mr. SMITH. I indicated while I was speaking that I did not understand the inconsistencies which are so glaring in this respect. Here are those who own the land begging for some means of holding on to it, and we pass a bill under the terms of which we invite others to come in and buy land and offer them a lower rate of interest than it is proposed in this bill shall be paid by farmers who already own their land.

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

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That may be for the purpose of giving those who have lost their land an opportunity to buy the farms of those who are now paying high rates and who will be obliged to go bankrupt.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; that may be so. It may be that those who now own the lands should be dispossessed of them and that those who do not own them should come into possession of them by the extraordinary method of this new loan.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. At 3 percent.

Mr. SMITH. At 3 percent.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to call attention to the refinancing which has occurred with respect to railroad corporations. The Great Northern Railroad, with a mortgage of $100,000,000, was refinanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3½ percent.

I think there is a great deal in what the Senator from South Carolina has said. It seems to me the loan policy is inconsistent, and that the natural result will be that when the interest rate is restored to the high figure which, according to the contract, has been paid by those who now own the land, they will lose the land and others will come in and buy it with money borrowed at an interest rate of 3½ percent.

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

I cannot understand why there is such a weeping and wailing and so much brotherly love expressed for the man who does not own the land, while when the man who owns it, and who has been doing his everlasting best to make a living, finally is obliged to throw up his hands in despair, we step in and say to one who has never shown the thrift and enterprise necessary to acquire a farm, "We will make you a present of what this other poor devil lost."

Mr. President, the position is so obviously inconsistent, in the face of our protestation of love and devotion to the farmer, that I hope there will hardly be a dissenting vote in overriding the President's veto.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, a statement was made by our distinguished leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], which brings me to my feet. He spoke about the relationship of the pending matter to the possibility of similar relief in the case of loans made by the

Home Owners' Loan Corporation. It is because I believe that should be the effect of our action on the veto, if it shall be overridden, that I say what I do.

Mr. President, it is a terrible thing to think that in this country at the present time 31,000 homes have already been lost through foreclosure under loans made by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation up to the 1st of April this year. That is the latest date for which I have reliable figures. Besides that, on the same date, 84,385 homes were authorized for foreclosure. In an Ohio newspaper of recent date I saw the statement that in the city of Youngstown alone, between 600 and 700 properties are being foreclosed.

Then, besides all that, there is the estimate of a high official of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation that for 1938 more than 200,000 of the million-odd homes in that one State on which these mortgages have been placed, will be lost to the present owners by foreclosure.

It does not stop there, Mr. President. Many of these homes are taken over under foreclosure at a ridiculously low figure, and then deficiency judgments are asked for and obtained. Thus the people who have lost their homes may also be under the further obligation, if they have anything else in the world to lose, to confront the application of deficiency judgments. So the statement of my leader as to conditions under the Home Owners' Loan Corporation excites me to say what I have.

I never go along a country road and see a row of maples or elms at the roadside in front of an old homstead without experiencing a thrill of emotion. To me those trees tell the story of a homesick bride, a young couple, coming into a pioneer country, taking up land, and attempting to carve out a home and a living. The bride is homesick, and the husband says, "Keep a stiff upper lip, my dear; I will go out in the swamps and dig up some soft maples to plant in our dooryard. We will make this place bloom like the rose." That place has been a home, perhaps, for two or three generations; babies have been born there; they have grown up to adult life; and now, because of economic stress, these homes are to be lost.

Ah, Mr. President, I do not want everybody to think that he can come to Washington and get money. We are giving away money, billions of dollars of money; the national debt is increasing day by day; but, Mr. President, it is not expected that by this generous treatment we shall lose the money of the Government. There is ample security for these loans, both in the case of farms and in the case of homes in the villages and in the cities. The Government will be no worse off, if foreclosure comes ultimately, whether that foreclosure takes place now or next year.

So, Mr. President, because of my interest in the Home Owners' Loan Corporation victims, I have a like feeling of sympathy for the farmers who are likely to lose their homes. Therefore I think it is only an act of justice on the part of the Senate of the United States that it shall make possible the reduction of the interest rate on the loans, and, if possible, to have retained in present ownership those places which have been called home—than which there is no dearer place on earth.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I listened to the statement of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] in answer to the question of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] as to the different interest rates charged borrowers under the credit system of the Federal land banks and tenant farmers under the tenant bill. That was dwelt upon as a discrimination that could not be justified under our policy. But, of course, we make such discriminations in the loan of other Government funds. Under the Disaster Loan Corporation, set up by Congress to meet the flood situation, if one were a victim of the flood and his property were washed away and he had not the wherewithal to meet the situation and could not put up the collateral, he might borrow from the Disaster Loan Corporation at 3 percent; but if he could put up the collateral, if he had the security to give, he had to go to a bank and pay the usual rate. So we have discrimination in the lending of Federal funds in other agencies. But it is not a discrimination, it seems to me, that we should loan money at 3 percent to the submerged group, farm tenants, whom we are trying to reach under the farm tenant bill, and who, as everybody knows, constitute the lowest strata in this country. If we should loan them money at 3 percent, when they have not a thing to give except what they may buy with the money in the way of security, it seems to me that we are only reaching down our hand to help people who cannot help themselves at all; and if we ask the man who has a farm, who has some of this world's goods, who has some of the wherewithal to help himself, to pay a little more, we are not doing anything that we have not been doing in the case of other agencies of the Government engaged in the lending of funds.

So, as the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] has pointed out, if we are going to make this adjustment for these men on the farm and give them some Federal money to the tune of $50,000,000 a year or $150,000,000 a year, or whatever it may be, I know of no reason why we should not turn around and give $150,000,000 or $200,000,000 a year to the home owners in this country who mortgaged their little homes to the Government and pay 5-percent interest on their notes. If we do that, then where are the Budget balancers going to be who did not want to spend any money in this session of Congress to take care of people who do not have enough to keep the wolf from their door?

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

Mr. MINTON. I yield.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact, too, that the Government, extending relief in 1933 or 1934 to home owners who were paying, many of them, from 6 to 8 percent, assumed their burdens and responsibilities at 5 percent?

Mr. MINTON. Exactly so.

Mr. KING. So they were the beneficiaries of the generosity of the Government?

Mr. MINTON. Exactly so, and so were the farmers. The farmers were paying sometimes, just as were the home owners, 6 and 7 and even 8 percent, and, in some cases, 10 and 12 percent. The Government came to their aid and loaned them money at a lower rate of interest. Now it is desired again to reduce the interest rate to the farmer, but not to reduce it to the home owner who finds himself in identically the same situation. So if we are going to give $150,000,000 to the farmers by way of a reduction of interest, let us do the same thing for the home owners; and if we cannot afford it for the home owners, we cannot afford it for the farmers.

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

Mr. MINTON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator approve charging an interest rate to the railroads less than is charged to the farmers?

Mr. MINTON. No; I do not. I think that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has loaned money on a basis that nobody who is not a banker or engaged in high finance in some way or other can quite understand.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has loaned hundreds of millions of dollars to the railroads at 4-percent interest; that it has loaned hundreds of millions of dollars to the banks at 3 percent; that it has loaned further hundreds of millions of dollars to mortgage loan corporations at 3½-percent interest, and to insurance companies at 3½-percent interest?

Mr. MINTON. I never heard the Senator from Virginia object to any such loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He has always been in favor of them, so far as I have heard.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is entirely mistaken. Upon what authority does he make that statement?

Mr. MINTON. I have never heard the Senator object to any loan made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator knows that on the floor of the Senate I charged that the Reconstruction Finance Corpora-

tion was deliberately misleading the people of this country with respect to its statement as to the assets of the Corporation.

Mr. MINTON. That may be true, but still the Senator never objected to lending money to the railroads at 4 percent.

Mr. BYRD. I voted against the appropriations made for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. MINTON. That may be true, but still the Senator never objected to making 4 percent loans to the railroads.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator is trying to evade my question. Does he favor lending money to the farmers at a higher rate of interest than to the railroads?

Mr. MINTON. The answer to that is no. So the Senator cannot get away from the proposition that, if we want to balance the Budget, we cannot do it by giving $50,000,000 or $150,000,000 to some class which it is desired to favor and denying it to another class which is just as worthy.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak on the veto message, and am challenged to do so by the statement of the Senator from Indiana as to balancing the Budget. That seems to be the theory upon which the President bases his veto. I am not in accord with the Senator from Indiana that the President ought to try to balance the Budget by taking it out of the farmer who has a mortgage on his farm. I have not previously heard the Senator from Indiana talk about balancing the Budget. He seems to be inspired in that direction now because the effort is aimed against the poor man who cannot meet his mortgage rate of interest. I think it is rather unusual that the President of the United States——

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. McNARY. I will yield in just a moment when I finish the sentence. I think it is rather unusual that the President of the United States, without ever making any substantial effort to balance the Budget, should wait until this unfortunate time to take $40,000,000 out of the pockets of the farmers who cannot pay the interest on their mortgages. I now yield.

Mr. MINTON. Will the Senator from Oregon support a measure to reduce the interest rate to the home owners of this country?

Mr. McNARY. O Mr. President, I would reconstruct the whole credit system as applied to mortgages to home owners and to those who have mortgages on their farms. I made myself rather definite a few days ago when the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] had the tenancy bill before the Senate. I said at that time that I thought it was unfair tc loan money for the acquisition of farms to tenants who heretofore had never shown a disposition to assume responsibility or a desire to own a farm, and at the same time charge nearly twice that rate of interest to farmers who had made a success as farmers and had built up the agriculture of our country.

I stand in that position today. It is not alone my desire to help the needy farmer, as I have heretofore pointed out, but it is a desire to help particularly the farmer who has made an effort to acquire property. In that direction we should give at least a low rate of interest to the farmer who has made an effort to hold his farm, maintain his home, educate his children, and become a prominent citizen, the kind of citizen who has made the Commonwealths of this country great, including that of Indiana.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I did not get the answer to my question.

Mr. McNARY. In direct answer, I will say, yes. I will go further and take up the whole scheme of loaning money to the farmers and home owners to aid them without any profit to any private individual firm or corporation.

Mr. President, I recall most graphically that in 1920 the Senate had under consideration a bill which, I believe, was called the Shipping Act of 1920, permitting the lending of money to shipowners who wanted to build new ships. We agreed to loan them 75 percent of the cost of building the ships, and to loan them that money at the rate which the Government borrowed the money in the respective Federal districts, which was not often more than 3 percent. Years went by. Fortunately or unfortunately, it fell to my fate to handle the Farm Marketing Act when Mr. Hoover was President of the United States. At that time I attached the same amendment to the act creating the Federal Farm Board. Money was loaned to farm cooperatives on that basis.

I think the $40,000,000 this program would cost the Government is a small item compared with the great expenditures and waste incurred by this administration in the last 4 years. Therefore I shall take the opportunity to express myself by voting to override the President's veto.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the bill which the President has vetoed simply proposes to reduce to 3½ percent the interest rate on the mortgages held by the Federal land banks for the year beginning July 1, 1936, and for the subsequent year to 4 percent, and proposes also to reduce the interest rate on the land commissioner's loans to 4 percent for 2 years.

In the President's veto message it is stated, and it is a fact, that on the volume of farm mortgages carried by the Federal land banks the loss to the Treasury will amount to $31,700,000 for the first year; for the second year, of course, less than that because the interest rate is advanced to 4 percent. The loss on the land commissioner's loans is estimated by the Treasury to approximate a little more than $8,000,000 for each of the 2 years. The land commissioner's loans are made, of course, to a corporation, all the stock of which is owned by the Treasury, so there is a loss of profits or prospective profits to the Treasury so far as the land commissioner's loans are concerned.

In the veto message it is pointed out that the land commissioner's loans are made generally upon what we know as second mortgages, where the margin of security is not as great. I desire to invite attention to an important fact, a very important fact to the farm owners of America who have been compelled to borrow upon their land. Through all the years we have paid high interest rates, and we have paid unnecessarily high interest rates because the lender always figured a percentage of loss and made the thrifty farmer make up the loss on the loans that could not be collected.

It is pointed out in the veto message that the land commissioner's loans are made upon second mortgages, and the security is not very ample, or at least the margin is not very great and therefore the possibility of loss is greater; hence the interest rate should remain at 5 percent.

Mr. President, I favored this proposal when it was before the Senate——

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. Did the Senator state the commissioner's loans are on second mortgages?

Mr. GEORGE. The commissioner's loans are generally on second mortgages.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it not a fact that a great many of the commissioner's loans are not on second mortgages?

Mr. GEORGE. That is true.

Mr. HUGHES. A great many of them are on first mortgages, are they not?

Mr. GEORGE. It is true that a great many loans are on first mortgages, but a great many are on second mortgages. The first mortgage generally is held by the Federal land bank.

I favored the bill because I favor a reduction to 3-percent interest rate on the fixed indebtedness against American farms. I am ready to vote for any measure that will give us a rate not exceeding 3 percent upon the fixed mortgage farm indebtedness in this country.

Through the Federal land-bank system and the commissioner's loans, approximately 37½ percent, I believe, of the farm mortgages of the country are now carried. In other words, the Federal land bank and the land commissioner have absorbed almost 37½ percent of the outstanding mortgages upon American farms. The greatest relief that can be given to the American farmer is to give him a rate of interest which his business will sustain.

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

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Are the percentages stated by the Senator in number of mortgages or in the aggregate amount of the mortgages?

Mr. GEORGE. In the volume of fixed farm indebtedness. I may not have the figures accurately, but I think I have stated them substantially.

Mr. BARKLEY. The information given the committee when this measure was before it was to the effect that out of more than 6,000,000 farmers in the United States, about one-half of whom own farms free from mortgage of any sort, approximately 800,000 were borrowers through the land bank or land commissioner; that of the 6,500,000 farmers approximately a little more than 600,000 are borrowers through the land bank, which is about one-tenth in number; that the number of land commissioner's loans amount to a little more than $500,000, but there are many duplications which would make the net number of individual borrowers through the two sources a little more than 800,000. Of course, that has no relationship to the amount. I am speaking of the proportion of farmers who are borrowers through the land bank or land commissioner. The Senator may be correct as to the aggregate amount. I am not in a position to dispute that statement.

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

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator, of course, is familiar with the fact that at this session of Congress $440,000,000 was appropriated under the Soil Conservation Act. While it carried the title of "soil conservation" the underlying purpose was to provide some cash benefits to the farmer who did certain things.

It seems to me from the standpoint of economy that a lower rate of interest would put the farmer in a position where he would require less, if he required anything, in the way of a direct grant from the Federal Treasury. In other words, the higher the interest rate the more need there is for Federal help in other forms. The lower the interest rate the less need there is on the part of the farmer for direct grants.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is undoubtedly correct.

Mr. President, what I was undertaking to say is that, taken on the average, the farms in the South will not and cannot sustain an interest rate on farm mortgages of more than 3 percent; and that accounts for the fact that we have a great many farm tenants in the South. Not all the farm tenants of the South have been tenants throughout their lives or from choice. Many of them formerly were home owners. Many of them have been foreclosed out of their homes; and the carrying charge upon the fixed indebtedness against the farm in the form of a farm mortgage has been one of the primary causes of farm tenancy in the South. It not only prevented the thrifty and industrious young man who desired to own a farm from becoming a purchaser of a farm, but during the past few years it actually foreclosed out of farm homes thousands and even hundreds of thousands of former landowners who could not pay the excessive interest charges.

Mr. President, I presume that in fixing the rates of loans to the railroads the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been governed by what it believed to be sound economy. That is, the officers of that agency undertook to fix rates of interest which the business could bear, and which would permit it to remain solvent as a going part of our transportation system. I suppose that is the reason why we have made loans to foster and to build or rebuild our merchant marine at lower rates of interest than 3 percent, and I suppose that is why we now have authorized the making of loans to tenants to enable them to become farm home owners at 3 percent over a long period of 40 or 45 years. I am not complaining about that, Mr. President, because I repeat that there will be no genuine, permanent, lasting, dependable farm aid until the Government has seen to it that an interest rate of not exceeding 3 percent is possible to all the farm owners in this country.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator the rate of interest which farmers now are required to pay when they seek loans from banks, or from loan agencies, or from some of the farm organizations which are not under the patronage of the Federal Government. Is it not a fact that they have to pay 5 and 6 and 7 percent?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is a fact; but I do not see the relevancy of the question, nor the relevancy of the fact. The fact is that the average farm will not bear and cannot pay an interest rate of 6 or 7 or 8 or 10 percent, and that is why so many American farmers have become impoverished. I repeat, if we want to give real farm relief, let us reduce this interest rate to not exceeding 3 percent.

The objection is raised that the home owners will want the same reduction. Suppose they do. That is another question. It has no relevancy at all to this question. But suppose they do, Mr. President. It is a very natural thing for them to do when we have already embarked on a housing program, and we are already building homes for the American people which they are permitted to occupy at less than 3-percent interest upon the investment. We are subsidizing tenants in many of our housing projects at this moment, and we are proposing to expand the housing program. The home owners have nothing to do with this matter. They ought to be judged on their own merits.

Mr. President, there can be no logic in making farm tenants by permitting the foreclosure of honest farmers who, through all the lean years, have stood up under the burden of debt and have gone on trying to make good, and then turning around and saying, "When we make a tenant out of you we are going to enable you to buy back perhaps your own farm or the farm that you formerly owned and pay not exceeding 3-percent interest over a long period of time."

The distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON] reminded us that some of us were "Budget balancers", as he described us. One of the few times when the Senator from Indiana has become a Budget balancer is today, when he does not want the farmer to have money for the next 2 years at 3½ percent for 1 year, and 4 percent for the next year. The only other time was when the President vetoed the simple bill enabling the American soldier to carry his insurance for another period of 5 years. No, Mr. President; I am not that kind of a Budget balancer. I have no desire to balance the Budget by taking the necessary amount out of either the soldier or the farmer; but I am defending my vote on this veto upon the proposition I have already stated, that if we expect to relieve the American farmer and give him dependable, steady, constant, real relief, we shall have to do it through reducing the interest rate on farm mortgages in this country, and that rate ought not to be as high as 3½ percent. It ought not to exceed 3 percent.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. GEORGE. I was about to yield the floor, Mr. President; but I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUGHES. Does not the Senator from Georgia think that the question which we have been considering here for some little while is largely governed, so far as our views are concerned, by our local knowledge, or the needs of particular localities?

Let me illustrate. In the State of Delaware, which I have the honor in part to represent, a large number but not an unusually large number of loans were made by the Federal land bank and also by the Federal land-bank commissioner. It may be that our conditions are different from those of the

State which the Senator in part represents; but those loans have been very materially reduced. It is a rare thing that a mortgage held by either the Federal land bank or the land-bank commissioner has been foreclosed. There are very few cases in which that has been done. The payments have been met because, perhaps, our farmers have been able to meet them.

Looking at this question from the standpoint of the information which I have been able to obtain in my State, and the views which the farmers of my State hold as I understand them, we have no need for a reduction of the rate of interest. We are probably more interested in having the indebtedness of the Government reduced, and not taking a loss of thirty or forty million dollars a year.

I was a member of the committee when this matter came up, and I heard Governor Myers discuss it before the committee; and the impression I received was that at this time farm conditions have so greatly improved that there is not need for a reduced rate of interest.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, of course, conditions may be better in some sections than in others, and the farm indebtedness may not be so heavy in the State of Delaware as it is elsewhere, and I hope it is not. I repeat, however, that on the average the American farmer who now has a fixed mortgage indebtedness against his farm can never liquidate it if he has to pay more than 3-percent interest, and I think the Senator will find that the same thing is true in Delaware. The farmer may liquidate by selling; he may have other, outside resources; but the cotton farmer, the farmer of the Southeast, cannot possibly liquidate his farm debt if he is required to pay more than 3-percent interest. The Senator from South Carolina and other Senators around me who have spent their days on the farm, and are familiar with farm conditions, know that precisely what I am stating is true.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, to me for the legislative branch to vote on the question of passing a measure notwithstanding a veto of the executive branch is a serious matter. I think the majority leader, in calling attention to the need for study and deep concern, did a very proper thing.

When the legislative authority was vested in the Congress, this limitation of requiring Executive approval was put on it, and the Constitution provided that if the Executive approval were not forthcoming there must be certain definite procedure and certain definite action to pass the legislation. To my mind that puts every one of us on notice, in considering a matter like this, to consider it on a little different basis from that on which we considered the measure originally. I know that is my feeling.

For some years I have had a small part in helping enact the type of legislation that is now before us, but when there is a Presidential veto I believe there should be careful reconsideration and review of reasons which might have been compelling at the time of the original presentation of the bill. I have tried to give that reconsideration to the pending measure, and I have reached the conclusion that there is every reason why there should not be a vote cast in this Chamber to sustain the veto of the President.

Because some of my associates here in private discussion have called attention to some matters which I believe are erroneous conclusions, I think it would not be a waste of time to refer briefly to the proposed legislation and its purpose. It is legislation proposed to assist the farmer. Those who have been Members of this body for many years will recall that the Farm Loan Act of 1916 was enacted for the purpose of bringing the farm borrower in touch with the sources of credit. It was for the purpose of setting up a farmer-controlled and a farmer-owned organization, and of continuing a reservoir of credit which the farmer could tap without paying unreasonable rates of interest.

The Government subscribed practically all the original capital stock. There was provision for borrowers to take 5 percent of the stock in local associations, and by 1924 the original capital which the Government contributed was all paid off under the provision requiring that 25 percent of the payments should be set aside for that purpose. In 1924 the farmers owned and controlled the organization, but because of the increased business, because of the change of conditions, it became necessary again for the Government to authorize a subscription to the capital stock and a contribution toward surplus. In January 1932 Congress passed an act authorizing the subscription of $125,000,000 to the stock, and, with a very small reduction, we still have that amount of stock at the present time.

However, that was found not to be sufficient. Because of the conditions during the depression years, the land banks could not secure the funds with which to make the necessary loans; it was absolutely impossible. Private sources of credit had disappeared. As was called to our attention in the debate today by one of the speakers, many of the farmers had incurred mortgage indebtedness on the basis of an income-producing power that did not exist, and they were compelled to pay fixed charges in taxes and interest on the fictitious-value loans. They could not refinance their loans locally; commercial credit, as I have said, was completely dried up. It became evident to the Members of Congress that it was necessary to provide the only credit that was available in this country at that time, namely, Government credit.

There was some discussion as to the best way to go about that. Some suggested that we set up an entirely new governmental organization and lend Government money to these needy people in the various lines, especially to farm borrowers. Others counseled that we could best lend aid to the Federal land banks in the way of making it possible for them to get funds with which to carry on. As an argument for that position, it was said they had the organization ready to go without additional expense. At that time, namely, May 1, 1933, 60 percent of the Federal land-bank borrowers were in default in principal and interest.

We passed the Farm Credit Act of 1933, and it did three particular things it was designed to do. The first was to bring about a reduction in interest. Bear this in mind, that the land-bank mortgages which had been negotiated were carried on a contractual basis. The interest rates ran all the way from 4½ percent to 6½ percent. Over 50 percent of the loans bore greater than 5 percent, and the borrowers are paying that today, and have been since the 1st day of July of this year. That is what we have to bear in mind in considering this question; they are paying that percentage. It is not a matter of only half a percent. It reverted to the contractual rate.

The Farm Credit Act of 1935 first provided for a reduction to 4½ percent, and later, through the efforts of some on the other side and some on this side of the Congress, the rate was reduced for 1 year to 3½ percent, and then again reduced to 3½ percent; but that extension expired on the 1st day of July of this year. We provided that the Government should pay from the Treasury into the Federal land bank the difference between what they were losing under the contract rate of the mortgage and the interest rate we were providing. We provided that this loss should be paid from the Treasury.

I am constrained to believe, from some of the statements made in the veto message, that the President has been misled.

I do not believe there is any possibility of a charge this year on the Treasury of up to $40,000,000 in the way of a bonus—call it a bonus if you care to—as contemplated and suggested either in the testimony of Governor Myers before the subcommittee on the veto message of the President.

I have here the consolidated report of the Federal land bank dated January 1 last year, and it shows that the entire charge paid by the Treasury because of interest reduction in 4 years was $61,000,000. I have here their report, in which they listed as necessary to be paid for reductions last year $12,000,000. We are not asking merely for the extension of one-half percent interest rate. If that is all the gentlemen have in mind, I might say that there are about $2,000,000,000

in Federal land-bank mortgages. One-half of 1 percent would amount to $10,000,000. There are $800,000,000 in commissioner's loans. One percent on that is $8,000,000.

The total would be $18,000,000 instead of $40,000,000.

Let me digress just a moment on that. When we made provision that we would pay this reduction of the interest, the Federal land bank, because of the limitations, could not refinance any of the farmers who were losing their farms. Because of the limitation of 50-percent appraisal on the land value, plus 20 percent of the insurable building valuation, they could not reach this mortage indebtedness which has been created on a fictitious valuation. We made available from the Treasury a new fund, $200,000,000, United States Treasury money, and we provided that if under the limitation as to appraisal they could not refinance a farm, there would be available up to $7,500 to a man, of this commissioner's money, this Federal Treasury money, at the rate of 5 percent, up to 75 percent of the appraisal, and that it could be loaned secured by second mortgage on real-estate or on chattel security, and by supplementing in that way we might enable a large number of the men to refinance their mortgages, which could not be refinanced under the limitation.

To take care of additional losses, we provided that they should pay into the land banks contributions to surplus and additional contributions for taxes and delinquencies. We set up a Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, which is dealing in the bonds right now. It is the market for the greater share of the Federal land-bank bonds.

Incidentally, I have their report up to January 1 of this year. Last year the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation had a profit of over $20,000,000 before they had set aside anything in reserves, and after setting the reserves aside they show a profit of $11,000,000 for 1936.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator from Iowa has made a study of the Federal land bank. I wish to ask a question for information. This afternoon the Senator from Georgia stated that every share of stock of the Federal land bank belonged to the Federal Governemnt. My understanding was that there was some private ownership in the Federal land-bank stock, and I merely ask the Senator from Iowa if he will state the actual situation.

Mr. GILLETTE. I think the Senator from Colorado is correct in his statement. As I attempted to state a moment ago, in 1924 the original stock had all been retired by the contributions of 5 percent by the borrower, but because of the necessity for contributions we bought $125,000,000 worth of stock later as authorized in January 1932. We owned on January 1 last—that is, the Government owned—$124,000,000 of the stock, but the Federal land bank is not a governmental institution, nor are we guaranteeing their bonds. We are guaranteeing the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation bonds.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take time on this matter, but there are two things which are uppermost in my mind. First, I do not believe there is the necessity for a subsidy, judging from the conclusions drawn in the debate. I may say that last year the President of the United States was one of the finest allies the farmer had in the consideration of this question. In the interest of reducing the rate last year we went to the President. Governor Myers was there, and the President took the lead in asking for this reduction for the 1 year, the reduction which expired the 1st day of July.

I believe the facts will justify me in the statement that there will not be the charge on the Treasury which is feared. Eventually, of course, if the United States reimburses the Federal land bank for losses, there may be some charge. But granted, Mr. President, that there is such a charge, it seems to me there is every justification for it, as was so forcefully presented by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and other Senators this afternoon. We thought nothing of contributing $160,000,000 by way of bonus to build up the merchant marine. I have no fault to find with our action in that respect. We thought nothing of appropriating $61,000,000 to build a battleship, and I voted for that appropriation. I have no fault to find with that action. But why in the name of all that is fair, when farmers are in such a bad situation as they now find themselves, should we not grant them relief?

A friend asked me why one-half of 1 percent could make any difference to our farmers. One-half a percent is the difference between profit and loss; it is the difference between financial life and financial death. It is the difference between the continuance of a home and a producing agency at a profit, and its destruction.

Mr. President, we do not have a fixed income on the farm. The Senator did me honor over much when he said a moment ago that I had made a study of this matter. My study was largely made as a debtor. I am a farmer. The farmer's income is so very small. Do Senators know there are thousands of farmers in the State of Iowa who in the last years in actual cash income did not receive over $150 to $200 per annum? And with that they had to meet fixed charges, interest charges, insurance charges, and taxes. They had enough to eat. They could go out and kill a chicken, and there was a vegetable garden, so they had enough to eat, and they had some clothing, but when they have to get the dollars they cannot get them.

Mr. President, we have been helping the farmers. They cannot understand why we now are asked to take the action resulting from this veto with respect to them. And here is another thing they cannot understand. In the district which I formerly had the opportunity to represent, within the last 2 months one of the ctiies issued municipal bonds, bearing interest at the rate of 2½ percent, which were oversubscribed. The farmer cannot see why he should be required to return to a contractual rate of from 5 to 6½ percent. He was not responsible for his condition. Seven hundred and thirty-five thousand farmers lost their farms within the last 4 years. The National Grange is my authority for that statement. Why should we compel them to pay as high as 5½ to 6½ percent? That is how the farmer argues when he sees and knows that subscriptions to municipal bond issues are available at lower rates than he has to pay on what he borrows. The farmer cannot understand that procedure, and he ought not to be expected to have to understand any such thing.

Mr. President, I apologize to the Senate for using so much of its time. As I said, it is a serious matter for me to vote to override the action of a coordinate branch of this Government. I would not take such a position unless I were thoroughly convinced in my own mind that it is justified, and I did not take that position today until I had reviewed the facts as I saw them and the conditions as carefully as I was able to do so. I do not believe there ought to be a vote cast to sustain that veto.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] that some of the statements which came from the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration were at least misleading, and I think the President did not quite understand the situation when he wrote his veto message.

As the Senator from Iowa said, the farmers who are making loans through the land banks are paying a contract rate; and he is correct in his statement that the interest rate runs from 4 percent to 6½ percent. The land-bank law provides that no rate shall be above 6 percent; but there are, according to the figures of the Farm Credit Administration, 157 loans now outstanding on which there is paid a contract rate of 6½ percent. Those are some special loans, as I understand, in the case of which the borrowers do not have farm-loan associations set up, and it costs the land bank a little more to make the loans. Some of the loans are in some of our island possessions. At any rate, on some

of the loans the borrowers are paying 6½ percent. Eighty-six percent of the contract loans are made at the rate of 5 percent or over.

The average rate of interest on the land-bank bonds that are outstanding is a little better than 3½ percent—to be exact, 3.5659 percent. The average contract rate of interest on the land-bank loans is 5.0529 percent, a difference of 1.487 percent. There is a provision in the land-bank law that the land bank shall not charge more than 1 percent above the rate of interest carried by the last issue of bonds sold; but the fact remains that there is a difference of 1.487 percent, almost 1½ percent difference

Mr. President, besides that, a large amount of the old outstanding bonds have been refunded by the land banks at the rate of 3 percent, cutting down the expense of the land bank in paying that interest; but the farmers have not received the benefit of that reduction. They are still paying their contract rate. This bill would give the farmers another year of 3½-percent rate of interest on their regular farm land-bank loans and 4 percent on the commissioner's loans.

Mr. President, the bill originated in the House of Representatives. It was considered by the Committee on Agriculture in the House and was passed by the House. It came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. A subcommittee was appointed, of which the eminent leader of the majority side was the chairman. A hearing was held. Governor Myers and some others came before the subcommittee, and after hearing the evidence the subcommittee voted to report favorably to the full committee the bill as passed by the House. When the bill came before the full Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate an amendment was offered to strike out the provision which provided for 4-percent interest on the Commissioner's loans, and the majority of the committee present at the meeting voted for the amendment. The bill was reported to the calendar and came to the Senate with the committee amendment. After a little discussion on the floor of the Senate the committee amendment was rejected by a majority on the floor of the Senate, and the bill was passed as it passed the House.

I was sorry indeed to see the President veto the bill; but as the Senator from Iowa has so well said, the Constitution provides how bills which are vetoed by the President shall be acted upon.

Mr. President, it seems to me there is need for this legislation. Governor Myers stated that conditions among the farmers are now better; that their ability to pay is better. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the farmers are still being foreclosed upon.

The Senator from Iowa gave the figure of 735,000 farmers being foreclosed upon during the past 4 years in respect to all loans. According to the figures of the Farm Credit Administration, however, on farm loans made through the land banks from June 1933 to June 1937, during the past 4 years 37,396 loans made by the Federal land banks were foreclosed upon by those banks. So, even though conditions are getting a little better, farmers are still continuing to lose their farms by foreclosure because they cannot pay the interest.

On June 30 of this year there were pending before the land banks of the Nation 4,189 foreclosure cases, making for the period of 4 years a total of 41,585 loans foreclosed and those cases which were pending at the end of the 4-year period. So, Mr. President, the fact that these loans are being foreclosed by the land banks at the rate of better than 10,000 per year for the past 4 years indicates that the rate of interest still is higher than the farmers can pay, and they are losing out.

The land banks have been of great benefit to the farmer. There is no doubt that they have had the effect of reducing the rate of interest. Not only have they caused reduction in rate to the farmers who borrowed through the land banks, but they have also caused reduction in the rates to the farmers who borrowed from insurance companies, or local banks, or from other private interests. The average rate of interest on farm loans has been reduced because of the land-bank law.

By reason of the figures which I have stated here and those which have been given by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and others, we feel that the rate is still too high, and that at least for another year we should keep the rate on land-bank loans down to 3½ percent, and keep down the rate on commissioner's loans to 4 percent.

The money for the commissioner's loans, as has been stated, is raised out of the Treasury of the United States by the sale of low-rate interest bonds. So there is really no loss in money on the commissioner's loans even at the reduced rate of 4 percent. Of course there is a loss between the amount the Government would get if the rate were 5 percent and what it would get if the rate were only 4 percent. There is that difference, of course; but it comes out of the farmer, and there is no actual loss on the commissioner's loans so far as the Government is concerned by the reduction of 1 percent.

So far as Federal land-bank loans of 3½ percent are concerned, as the Senator from Iowa has so well stated, there is no question that the figures of the land bank's report have proven beyond a doubt that there will not be a $31,000,000 loss if the 3½-percent rate is continued for another year.

So I hope, Mr. President, that the farmers may be given this little recognition and assistance in paying off their debt and continuing to own their property.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly on the pending question. The understanding generally is that all that is involved in this matter is merely the difference in interest between 3½ percent and 4 percent. My understanding is—and, of course, there can be no doubt about it, because it is in accordance with the facts—that if the bill should not pass, the farmer would be under obligation to pay 5 percent or 5½ percent and, in some instances, 6 percent. It is that very great inequity, it seems to me, that has not been properly considered either by Governor Myers or the President in his message; in fact, I think one reading the President's message must come to the conclusion that he was guided with reference to his facts and figures entirely by the statements that have been made by the Governor of the Federal land bank. It is not a question of calling upon the farmers to pay 4 percent; it is a question of whether we desire to call upon them to pay 5 percent or 5½ percent or 6 percent.

There is no trouble in this country about securing money for almost any kind of business at 3 percent, 3½ percent, or 4 percent. I have the figures here, for instance, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. That institution is making many loans to banks and trust companies at 3 percent, to insurance companies at 3½ percent, to railroads at 4 percent, to mortgage-loan companies at 3½ percent, and preferred-stock loans at an interest rate of 3 percent. There can be no justification in calling upon the farmer, under present conditions, to pay as high as he will be compelled to pay if this bill does not pass. When money is plentiful for 2½ percent, 3 percent, and 4 percent, does the Senate want to go on record to the effect that the farmer shall pay 4 percent, 5 percent, 5½ percent, or some 6 percent?

One cannot properly appreciate the situation with reference to agricultural conditions without going back over the years during which time the accumulation of indebtedness and other burdens has been going on. The chart of the Agricultural Department shows that from 1915 to 1921 the farm was making money; but there has never been a year since 1921 when the farm has paid in the United States. So the important question is not that the farmer is in a better condition than he was last year, but is he in a situation financially, in view of the accumulated burdens of 10 years, to carry on and pay a rate of 5, 5½, or 6 percent?

Something has been said here about the fact that the passage of the bill will establish a precedent which we cannot ignore when we come to consider the question of home owners' loans. I think that is correct; in all probability we

will have to consider it; but I do not hesitate to say that there are two things which the Government must do in this emergency: It must keep the farmer on the farm and it must keep the family in the home, if it is possible to do so. I am quite favorable to any program which will reasonably tend to accomplish those two ends. I do not believe that there is any kind of farm relief that can be so immediate, direct, and beneficial in its effects as giving the farmer a rate of interest which he can actually meet and remain on the farm. We will deal with the home owners' loan matter when it reaches us.

My contention is that, as a matter of fact, 3 percent or 3½ percent is all the farmer can possibly pay in the way of interest. It is not in the business to pay more at any time. And it is worth something to keep him on the farm, even at the expense of the Treasury, until unfavorable conditions shall have passed.

I do not minimize what is involved when it comes to overriding a Presidential veto, but I am sure that the passage of this bill will be of tremendous benefit to a great many farmers, and that, if they are not to remain on their farms, the amount which the Government will ultimately pay in trying to get them back on the farm will be very much greater than the amount which we are supposed to contribute for the purpose of keeping them on the farm. There may be more glamor in pushing a man off the farm and then devising some ambitious scheme to take him from tenancy and put him back on the farm, but the real beneficial effect of any program is, in the first instance, to keep him there, if it is possible to do so. In my opinion, the passage of the bill will serve the cause of farm relief as immediately, effectively, and substantially as any possible legislation which may be passed at the present session.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement on the question now pending before the Senate. I intend to vote to override the veto of the President, and I should like to offer a few reasons why I think it is wise to afford to the farmers the lowest interest rate on loans made by the land banks and land-bank commissioner.

Mr. President, there is one thing that is indispensable to the farmer—that is credit. Unlike all other things which are produced, it takes many, many months to produce a farm crop.

Take wheat, for example, which is planted in the fall and usually reaped 8 or 9 months later. In order to plant a wheat crop the farmer has to buy the fertilizer nearly a year ahead; he has to buy the seed a year ahead; and then put his crop of wheat in the ground a year ahead. So that, after he has made all these expenditures, it is necessary for him to wait 9 months in order to harvest his crop. He cannot produce something, like a manufacturer can, in a day. It takes him 9 months to produce a crop of wheat. In addition to that, he is subject to all the hazards of the weather, to disease, to drought, and so on. He needs his extra labor at the very time the crop is ready for harvest.

Quite often to plant his crop he has to go to a local bank and borrow money to finance him over the 9 months' period for fertilizer, seed, and so forth, and when he does reap his crop the bank knows it. He usually borrows from a local institution and the bank wants the note paid off at the time he reaps his harvest. Often many farmers are in the same situation; the need for paying off these obligations is pressing at harvest time, so that such farmers dump their products upon the market at almost the identical time, which causes the price to fall to a very low figure. The only way the farmer can hold his products and "feed" them out in a more orderly way in the market and realize the maximum amount of return from his 9 months of waiting is to have sufficient credit to enable him to do it. If the credit is at 6 percent, the increase in the price he secures by holding the product several months after harvesting is partly or entirely offset by the high interest the farmer has to pay to get his loan. Therefore, in the interest of orderly marketing and a fairer price return, it is the farmer's need to have sufficient credit at a low interest rate to permit him to "feed" his commodities into the market at such time as he can get an adequate return from them.

There is a second reason I wish to offer in support of the low interest rate. What is the logic of saying that the farmer needs help and of giving the farmer benefits in the form of soil conservation, on the one hand, and charging him a high interest rate for the money he borrows from the Government on the other hand? Certainly, if he needs help out of the Federal Treasury in the form of a gratuity, as under the Soil Conservation Act, it is maintained he does need help, then I think it is likewise of greater importance that we reduce the interest rate, give him easier credit, and thereby make the need for other help less pressing. Certainly, as between the two, it would pay us to finance the farmer through loans at a low interest rate where his own work and his own property give security for the loan, and where it will be eventually returned to the Treasury at a low rate, say, of 3 or 3½ percent interest, than it would be to charge him, say, 6 percent and make it necessary for the Congress to appropriate a huge sum of money in other forms of assistance.

I cannot see any logic in the policy of saying agriculture needs help, and taking money out of the Federal Treasury and giving it to the farmer on the one hand, and in the next breath insisting that he pay 5 percent to the land banks or land-bank commissioner for money that is only loaned to him to assist him in running his farm and that loan on good security. What the farmer needs is credit. He needs it because in his particular business he cannot stop the operation of producing crops once he has planted them in the soil. If there is a surplus or a shortage of the crop, he needs credit, because his industry is a long-time industry, taking many months to bring it to harvest; and when he does bring it to the point of harvest, every other farmer has done the same thing, and all the produce is placed upon the market at the same time unless credit is at hand enabling the farmer to hold out for better prices.

Therefore if it is possible—and it is possible—for the Government to make a loan to the farmer at an interest rate which in reality costs the Government nothing, because it is borrowing money at a lower interest rate than it is now lending it to the farmer, it seems to me that it is good business to continue a larger and more equitable policy of credit than it is to enter the field of increased gratuities.

For that reason I shall vote to override the President's veto, believing that it is in the interest of agriculture as well as the Treasury of the United States to give the farmer low interest rates—ample credit, if you please. And if he has this at a small cost in interest, he will not need the other assistance so much. But without credit at low interest we may look for agricultural relief measures which would not come before us if the farmer could borrow without high interest eating into his returns.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if any note is taken here of the individual record of Senators, I may fairly assume that most of my colleagues know very well that I have consistently opposed the entrance of the Federal Government into the business affairs of the country. I have always contended that the differences in equities between the agricultural interests and the industrial interests of the country should be adjusted by abating the enormous privileges of the industrial interests in behalf of the agricultural interests, so that the farmer might buy at a reasonable rate what he is compelled to buy rather than at the privileged rate of the industrialist.

That until recently has always been the attitude of the party to which I belong. It has always demanded that that be done. But when the party had an opportunity to do it, it has never written a sentence into a statute to accomplish that purpose.

It will also be recalled that effort after effort has been made here toward economy, toward balancing the Budget. Almost the last extended speech of the late lamented leader of the majority was made in behalf of that issue of economy.

However, in every single instance and upon every item every effort at economy has been successfully resisted.

Today I am not willing to support this effort to begin with the farmer in the matter of economy. It does not directly affect my State. I imagine—in fact, I know—that the farm-mortgage record of Virginia is a particularly happy one. It does not affect me politically, because the probability is that I shall be dead when my term shall have expired here in the Senate. But as a matter of fairness to the farmers in contrast with what has been done here, I intend to vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am glad to associate myself with our beloved friend, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], in the views expressed in the early part of his remarks. I am sure we were benefited and profited by the same. I do not, however, agree with the concluding statements of the Senator with respect to the veto message of the President. I intend to support the position of the President as presented in the veto message which has just been read.

In my opinion, the veto message should be sustained, and I regret that it is not receiving the support to which it is entitled in view of its merit and the sound basis upon which it rests.

The Senator from Virginia indicated that there have been departures from the basic principles upon which the Democratic Party was founded, and I inferred from his remarks that unwise policies had been adopted by the Federal Government which tended to weaken the authority of the States and to concentrate in the Federal Government power in excess of that which had been delegated to it. In my opinion there have been tragic and dangerous departures from the faith of the fathers and from the principles upon which genuine democratic government rests. Throughout the world forces are operating calculated to weaken, if not to destroy, local self-government and restrict the rights and liberties of individuals. Governments are usurping authority and impinging upon the rights of individuals. The Democratic Party has demanded equal rights for all and has denounced special privileges, contributions, and subsidies in favor of groups and various industries. It attempted to preserve the Republic, not only its form but its spirit, and to maintain constitutional government and the rights of the States.

There is unmistakable evidence that many of our citizens are forgetting or ignoring the principles upon which constitutional government rests, and particularly the duties and responsibilities which rest upon them as individuals and upon the States and local communities. There has been a growing insistence that the Federal Government take over the duties and responsibilities of the States, and also a subsidence of that fine spirit of individualism so essential to the maintenance of genuine democratic government. This is apparent in the demands which are made for grants and subsidies and special privileges from the Federal Government. The Democratic Party for years opposed bounties, and special privileges, and grants, and subsidies, and movements, and policies looking toward the creation of an omnipotent Federal Government. Democrats protested against a powerful central government—against what they denominated as the philosophy of Hamilton; but, unfortunately, for the best interests of our country, not only now but in the future, there is unmistakable evidence of a desire upon the part of many of our citizens to have the Federal Government enlarge its authority and engage in activities beyond its constitutional power.

I fear that these centripetal forces are drawing within their powerful grasp not only individuals but local communities and States, and are developing a false philosophy, which will, if unchecked, culminate in the aggrandizement of the Federal Government and the devitalization of the States.

I fear that many Democrats have forgotten the teachings of the founders of the party and the platforms which have been promulgated during many decades. I wonder if we have forgotten the teachings of Jefferson, Madison, and Jackson, and those great apostles of democracy who made important contributions to the development of this Republic. Apparently there are many Democrats who seem as eager for subsidies and bounties and special privileges at the hands of the Federal Government as have been persons belonging to other political parties, and whose policies and conduct Democrats severely criticized.

During the depression policies were adopted which it was thought were justified by the situation, but which under normal conditions could find no justification. It is quite likely that improvident appropriations were made, and many communities and individuals conceived the view that the Federal Government should continue its Nation-wide activities and enormous expenditures. The time has now come when there must be material reductions in Federal expenditures and the withdrawal of the Government from activities which appertain exclusively to individuals and to local communities.

The veto message now before us should receive our support. It is justified by economic conditions and by the condition of the Federal Treasury. Moreover, it is an admonition that the Federal Government cannot continue indefinitely to carry the heavy burdens placed upon it and meet the increasing demands made by the people.

In passing may I say that I have supported, as I recall, every veto submitted by the President upon which a vote in the Senate has been taken. I sustained the President in his veto of the bonus bill. In my opinion, the first bonus veto message was a strong and impressive state paper. I was glad to support the President's position. I likewise supported his second veto of the so-called bonus bill. It gave me pleasure to support the President in his recommendation that the United States should become a member of the World Court; and, for that matter, I have supported most of the measures brought to the attention of the Senate during the past 4½ years. I have acted upon the conviction that the functions of the Executive and the legislative branch of the Government were different, and that it was the duty of Senators to oppose measures which they did not believe to be constitutional or just or for the best interests of the country.

My recollection is that a number of distinguished Democratic Senators, who have been very critical of some of their Democratic colleagues because they felt constrained to oppose the so-called court bill—which has been before the Senate for a number of months—failed to support the President in the veto messages to which I have referred and in his patriotic and statesmanlike position with respect to the World Court. I assume from the unmistakable attitude of Senators upon the floor that some of the Democratic Senators who have been, as I say, critical of myself and others who have opposed the so-called court bill, will, within a few moments, when the vote is taken, refuse to follow the President, and will vote to override his veto. I hope that I shall be pardoned for saying that tolerance is a virtue not only in matters of public concern but in all the relations of life.

It is fortunate that we cannot all agree; indeed, progress has often been measured by differences of opinion. We do not want standardization in the realm of thought or in the policies pursued by individuals, communities, and nations. Herbert Spencer speaks of heterogeneity and the differentiation that contributes to material, moral, and spiritual development.

I am glad now to support my President in the position which he has taken with respect to the measure under consideration. I believe the President to be right, and though I may be with a very small minority, I shall have the approval of my conscience. I shall, therefore, vote against the motion to override the veto. I believe the President's message presents valid reasons justifying his position. One not acquainted with the conditions of the Treasury, or of the fact that the Government has no funds except those obtained from taxation or by borrowings, would assume from some of the observations made during the debate that the Government should gladly reduce the interest rates, if not cancel obligations due it. The fact is that the Government is required to borrow not millions but hundreds of millions of dollars to meet its expenditures.

Through the sale of bonds to the investing public loans are being made by the Federal land banks at the lowest rate that has ever been made available to farmers generally in the United States.

The fact is that as a result of the efforts of the Government, through the Federal loan banks and the loan-bank commissioner, the farmers have saved in interest charges from 20 to 40 percent of the amount previously paid for interest on their loans. That there has been an improved condition in agriculture during the past 2 or 3 years is conceded by all, and in view of the benefits which have been derived by the farmers as a result of credit extended by the Government, it would seem that there ought not to be a demand that the Government borrow $30,000,000 more in order to reduce the interest charges upon loans made to farmers. My understanding is that the cost to the Treasury of the United States for the next 2 years, if the President's position shall not be sustained, will amount to approximately $53,000,000; and, of course, it will follow that other debtors of the Government will demand that their obligations shall be reduced.

When the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was speaking a moment ago, I asked him if it were not true that farmers obtaining loans from banks or loan companies were not now paying interest in excess of that which they are paying to the Government. His answer, of course, was in the affirmative. It is conceded that the farmers who obtained loans from the Government discharged their obligations secured by liens upon their farms, and that such obligations bore a much higher rate of interest than they are now paying to the Government.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the veto message of the President has not been successfully met. I regard it as sound and justified under all the circumstances. I shall, therefore, as I have stated, vote to sustain his message.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think we should have a quorum. Therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	King	Radcliffe
Andrews	Copeland	La Follette	Reynolds
Ashurst	Davis	Lee	Russell
Austin	Dieterich	Lewis	Schwartz
Bailey	Donahey	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Duffy	Logan	Sheppard
Berry	Ellender	Lonergan	Shipstead
Bilbo	Frazier	Lundeen	Smathers
Black	George	McAdoo	Smith
Bone	Gerry	McCarran	Steiwer
Borah	Gibson	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Gillette	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Brown, Mich.	Glass	McNary	Townsend
Brown, N. H.	Green	Maloney	Truman
Bulkley	Guffey	Minton	Tydings
Bulow	Hale	Moore	Vandenberg
Burke	Harrison	Murray	Van Nuys
Byrd	Hatch	Neely	Wagner
Byrnes	Herring	Nye	Walsh
Capper	Hitchcock	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Caraway	Holt	Overton	White
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	
Clark	Johnson, Colo.	Pope	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I wish to read an extract from a short article I wrote for the New York Times on July 9, 1936:

If it be true that Congress loves the people or their votes, it is likewise true that Congress loves President Roosevelt for his vetoes.

President Roosevelt has vetoed more bills than any other Chief Executive except Mr. Cleveland. In Congress bravery is not required to vote for a bill, but when a Member of Congress votes against a bill he exhibits fortitude.

I have just completed a thorough examination of the various bills vetoed by President Roosevelt, and although I do not agree with his veto on the bonus bill or with his veto of the bill which proposed to restore the expense allowance of district and circuit judges to the sum of $10 per diem when holding court away from the place of their official residence, candid men must declare that the Franklin Roosevelt vetoes are courageous and in the interest of economy and retrenchment.

Regarding many, if not most, of the vetoed bills, had President Roosevelt approved them, he would have laid incalculable burdens upon the people; and in not a few instances he would have injected vitality into stale claims of doubtful merit against the Government; indeed, in some cases the bills as to which he withheld approval were not only wholly lacking in merit but called for enormous and wrongful drains upon the Treasury.

President Roosevelt should receive praise and approbation for the superb service to the people he has quietly rendered in protecting the public revenues by his vetoes.

HENRY F. ASHURST,
Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? On a question of this kind the Constitution requires that the vote be taken by yeas and nays. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, which resulted—yeas 71, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—71

Andrews	Davis	Lee	Russell
Austin	Dieterich	Lodge	Schwartz
Bailey	Donahey	Logan	Schwellenbach
Berry	Duffy	Lonergan	Sheppard
Bilbo	Ellender	Lundeen	Shipstead
Black	Frazier	McAdoo	Smathers
Bone	George	McCarran	Smith
Borah	Gibson	McGill	Steiwer
Bridges	Gillette	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Brown, N. H.	Glass	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	Hale	Moore	Townsend
Bulow	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Byrd	Herring	Neely	Tydings
Capper	Hitchcock	Nye	Van Nuys
Caraway	Holt	Overton	Wagner
Clark	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Wheeler
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Pope	White
Copeland	La Follette	Reynolds	

NAYS—19

Adams	Byrnes	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ashurst	Chavez	King	Radcliffe
Barkley	Gerry	Lewis	Vandenberg
Brown, Mich.	Green	Maloney	Walsh
Burke	Guffey	Minton	

NOT VOTING—5

Bankhead	Hughes	Norris	Pittman
Hayden			

The PRESIDING OFFICER. More than two-thirds of the Senators having voted in the affirmative, the bill is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I am advised that there is on the Vice President's desk a message from the President. I ask unanimous consent that it may be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate at this time is to proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar; but, of course, that unanimous-consent agreement may be superseded by another.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if the matter is to take any time, of course I shall withdraw the request; but I think it is of sufficient importance to justify its consideration for a moment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair will lay before the Senate the message from the President relating to an oil compact between certain States. The message will be read.

The legislative clerk read the message, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report of the Secretary of State enclosing a certified copy of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas, executed on May 10, 1937, by the Governors of the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, New Mexico, and Colorado, which has been deposited in the Department of State of the United States in accordance with the provision contained therein. The compact refers to the Inter-

state Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas executed at Dallas, Tex., on February 16, 1935, which received the consent of the Congress in Public Resolution No. 64, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 27, 1935. As the above-mentioned compact will expire on September 1, 1937, the present compact provides that the original compact shall continue in force for 2 years from that date. In a letter from the Secretary of the Interior dated July 8, 1937, enclosed with the report of the Secretary of State, the opinion is expressed that some good may be accomplished by this compact.

Accordingly, I hope that Congress will enact appropriate legislation giving its consent to this interstate compact as required by Article I, Section 10, of the Constitution of the United States.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 19, 1937.*

[Enclosure: Report of the Secretary of State, dated July 14, 1937, with enclosures.]

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, under the Constitution two or more States have the right to make a compact, and when they enter into a compact the document must be sent to the office of the Secretary of State and thereafter transmitted to the Congress by the President for the consideration of the Congress, because the compact has no validity until approved by the Congress.

Some 2 years ago, I think, five States entered into a compact for the conservation and protection of oil. The compact was transmitted to the Congress in the regular channels and the Congress promptly approved it. The States concerned have been operating under the compact for 2 years.

Early last spring the same States, through their representatives, met at New Orleans and voted to extend the compact under which they have been operating for 2 years. The compart was not changed. Now, there is a request that the Congress consent to a continuation of the same compact for 2 years more from the date of the termination of the present compact. There is no change proposed in the compact. The States merely desire to have it extended for 2 more years, beginning September 1, 1937.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, it appears that the States among and between which the compact was negotiated and now exists were Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, New Mexico, and Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct. Five States altogether have joined in the compact.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask the able Senator are the two Senators from each of the States agreeable to the extension?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have not checked with the Senators, but the Governors and the legislatures of the five States are agreeable to the extension.

Mr. ASHURST. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. All that is asked is an extension or a continuation of the compact which is now in operation for another 2 years beginning at the date of the termination of the present compact, which will be September 1, 1937.

Out of order I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution proposing to give the consent of the Congress to an extension of the existing compact for 2 years from September 1, 1937.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator does not request action at this time, does he?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, of course the request is out of order at this time, but I do not intend to raise that question. I will ask that the joint resolution be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate in order that Senators may have an opportunity to become conversant with the purposes of the measure.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have not asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. I have merely asked unanimous consent to be permitted to introduce it.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to that. I should object to immediate consideration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Just one further word, if permission is granted for the introduction of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator is permitted to introduce a joint resolution, and it will be properly referred.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, 2 years ago a message came to the respective Houses of Congress, and in the other body of the Congress a joint resolution was introduced promptly granting the consent of that body, as a part of the Congress, to the ratification of the proposed compact. A joint resolution was introduced in this body very shortly after the message was received, and at that time there was no objection. But in view of the statement made by the Senator from Oregon, I have no intention of pressing for immediate consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 183) consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

REORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIARY

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1392) to reorganize the judicial branch of the Government.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I rise to ask unanimous consent to make a motion to recommit to the Committee on the Judiciary Senate bill 1392, to reorganize the judicial branch of the Government, with all amendments thereto.

I might say by way of explanation that, after a very full and free hearing this morning, the Committee on the Judiciary directed me to make this request, with the understanding that it would be instructed to report a bill for the reform of the judiciary within 10 days, if the motion should prevail. I ask unanimous consent that I may be authorized to make the motion at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the pending business before the Senate, Senate bill 1392, to reorganize the judicial branch of the Government, be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report within 10 days. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the request of the Senator from Kentucky was that he be permitted now to make the motion. It was not, as I understood it, a motion to recommit with instructions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was merely attempting to facilitate the matter by getting unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think probably the request for permission to make the motion should be submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator desires to ask unanimous consent that the bill be recommitted with instructions, the Chair could not see why that could not be done.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I usually try to follow the Chair, but that cannot be done now. I am willing to grant unanimous consent that the motion may be made, but not that the bill may go back to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky that he may make a motion to recommit the pending business to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to return the bill within 10 days? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, pursuant to the instructions of the Committee on the Judiciary, as it imposed the duty upon me this morning, I move that Senate bill 1392, to reorganize the judicial branch of the Government, with all

amendments thereto, be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to that committee to report a bill for the reform of the judiciary within 10 days from this date.

Mr. President, some days ago I prepared a speech to deliver on the bill itself in an effort to make my position clear. I have never had an opportunity to deliver it. I now ask unanimous consent that that speech be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MCNARY. Just a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky to have his contemplated speech printed in the RECORD as a part of his remarks? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The speech prepared by Mr. LOGAN is as follows:

It is true, as has been stated in the Senate during this debate, that a place of justice is a hallowed place. No one can well take issue with that statement. A court is a place where justice should be administered, and it is, therefore, not inappropriate to refer to a court as a holy place. I disagree with neither the statement nor the conclusions which have been reached during the course of this debate as to the respect which should be shown to the courts of our country or as to the honor which should be accorded them, but a court should not be worshiped as a fetish.

Courts are made up of men, and the men constituting any court do not lose their ideas of the problems of life or their theories of government, because they happen to become members of a court. When interpretations are to be made of constitutional or statutory provisions, it is impossible for a judge to wholly rid himself of the ideas which have become a part of him, and where there is latitude for reasonable grounds of disagreement as to a proper interpretation, he will naturally follow his own ideas. We know this is true, and because of this truth we have varying interpretations by the same court at different periods of the same constitutional and statutory provisions.

There is no book that has caused as much controversy in the world as the Holy Bible; there has been great diversity among learned men over the proper interpretation of nearly every important statement in that book. The good faith of those who disagree should not be questioned. It is human to err, and oftentimes the truth is found midway between the extremes.

If for any reason a court becomes the citadel of the privileged and not a reservoir for the good of all, he is unfaithful to his trust, who has the power to correct the evil and fails to exercise that power. If it is found that a court of justice, though it should be a holy place, is more partial in its decisions to the protection of the few than to the promotion of the happiness and general welfare of the many, the fountain of justice has become polluted, and he who has the power to purify the fountain and fails to do so, is not faithful to the trust which has been placed in him.

It is not necessary to question the integrity of any member of a court in order to reach the conclusion thus expressed. Many of the ancient philosophers surprised the world with their wisdom; they became so great among men that their names live even to this day. It is known now that much of their philosophy was shallow or untrue, but no one questions their honesty or the integrity of their purpose.

If it be true that through a mistaken interpretation of our Constitution or a tortured construction of its provisions, millions of toiling men and women on farm and in factory have been denied the good things of life, it is not the part of wisdom to advance the idea that nothing should be done, because the court sits in a holy place. It is entirely beside the question to say that the members of the court are men of wisdom and integrity. That may well be conceded, but if they bring to the world through their decisions sorrow and tears, when they should have brought joy and happiness, no one can well say, so it seems to me, that the court should be allowed to persist in an erroneous interpretation of our fundamental law.

In heated extemporaneous debates we make statements that were better left unsaid. In my opinion, it is unwise to charge that any court willfully misinterprets the Constitution. It is unwise for one to question the good faith and integrity of those who may hold different views in the Congress.

While I have severely criticized the report of the Judiciary Committee on the pending legislation, and I still believe that much criticism is justified because the report plainly shows the emotional side of the members who wrote it, even to the extent of the use of exclamation points to emphasize some of their expressions. I regard it as a paper calculated to arouse prejudice and hate, and as the same end could have been accomplished without doing so, with the same result accomplished, I think the violence of the language is without justification.

I believe in the political party to which I belong, and I know that the report of the committee has aided those who oppose the party, and for that reason, it aroused my resentment. It is generally regarded throughout the country as an attack upon the President and his policies, and, in my opinion, there is no justification for that belief, but I accept the word of those who write it that they did not so intend it.

We sometimes speak without mature deliberation, and often when we do so, we make statements that are unfair. Much feeling has been aroused over the discussion of the important proposal before us, and when we pause to consider that this feeling has often been aroused in the history of our Nation, there are no just grounds for criticising those who are on one side or the other.

It is my earnest and sincere wish that the Members of the United States Senate will calmly and judicially consider the matter in the light of the best reasoning which can be advanced on both sides, so that when the debate has developed every point that may be developed, there may be a vote. If I should be on the losing side when that vote is cast, I will be satisfied to know that I have done the best I could, seeking the light to the best of my ability. On the other hand, if my vote should be cast on the winning side, I will feel no cause for gloating. I do not believe there will be a filibuster, as I recognize the intelligence, the patriotism, and the good faith of those who hold views opposite to the views which I entertain. I shall regard those who vote opposite to my views on this side of the Chamber as my friends and fellow Democrats, the same as I regard them now. I believe there is no one who takes an opposite view to mine who has not played an important part in forming the great legislation that has been enacted during the past few years. Instead of believing that the Democratic Party should seek reprisals, it is my personal view that we will need the help of all of them in the solution of many other great questions, so I express the hope that I may have the privilege of serving many years with them in the Senate of the United States.

It has been said often that there is something wrong with the decisions of the Supreme Court. If that statement should have been made only by those friendly to the proposed legislation, there might be reasons to doubt the statement, but let us look to the leaders of the opposition and see what we find. The distinguished senior Senator from Montana believes that the decisions of the Supreme Court at times have been against the best interest of the great body of the people of the Nation, and I am quite sure that he believes that there are many things wrong with the decisions of the Supreme Court on many important questions. He believes that the Constitution should be so amended as to require a form of indirect recall of judicial opinions on constitutional questions. He believes in a modified form of the doctrine advocated by Theodore Roosevelt when he was last a candidate for President. He makes no concealment of his views, because he has proposed an amendment to the Constitution, carrying into effect his ideas.

The distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska must hold the opinion that the Supreme Court needs attention, as he has proposed a constitutional amendment providing that the Justices of the Supreme Court shall be retired automatically at the age of 75.

The distinguished junior Senator from Nevada proposed an amendment to the original bill increasing the number of Justices of the Supreme Court by two; and there is the able senior Senator from Wyoming, who believes that it should require more than a majority of the Supreme Court to declare an act of the Congress unconstitutional, and he has expressed that belief through a proposed constitutional amendment.

I believe that the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho has in the past held similar views, as shown by amendments proposed by him. Both the senior Senator from Montana and the senior Senator from California have been candidates for Vice President on platforms advocating the recall of judicial decisions by the people.

I listened with pleasure to learned men and women who appeared at the hearings held by the Judiciary Committee, and in the majority they stated readily that there was something wrong with the decisions of the Supreme Court. I doubt whether there are more than 3 members of the Judiciary Committee out of the 18 who fully believe that the Supreme Court should be left alone exactly as it is without any limitation upon its powers or any regulation as to its actions.

With such a diversity of views, is it any wonder that thinking men disagree, and is it not well that someone point out, if he can, what is wrong with the Supreme Court or its decisions? In the history of the Court and the Nation there should be found evidence which would lead one to an intelligent conclusion as to what is wrong with the Court. I propose to express my views and to point out, if I can, what has brought to us all of our difficulties.

As clearly indicated in a statement recently given to the press by former Justice Van Devanter, the Supreme Court has had many storms in its history. Some of them have been very violent and have threatened the very existence of the Court. Others have been less violent, but in the most stormy periods of our national life the Supreme Court has usually been the very center of the storm. Why is it that the troubled waters cannot be calmed? Why is it that for nearly 150 years passions and prejudices have been aroused by the action of the Supreme Court? There must be a reason.

The shades of Marshall and Madison still fight on. At one time one of these shades rides the whirlwind and beckons the Court to follow, and the Court does follow. At other times the other shade is found in the midst of the whirlwind, beckoning the Court to follow, and the Court does follow. Thus the warfare of the shades

of Marshall and Madison, aided at times by the shades of Jefferson and Hamilton, trouble the waters and bring uncertainty to the Nation.

I used to think of the Constitution as the same in the past, the present, and the future; that the same language should mean the same thing, regardless of the membership of the Court or the conditions that prevail throughout the country. I have been willing always to recognize implied powers, but I thought the provisions should not, by implication, mean one thing in one age and another thing in another age. I have liked to think of a constitution in which a court found the same meaning at all times and under all circumstances. I once thought that when a question was once settled by a court, and that the principles announced were adhered to until they became fixed rules, that the doctrine of stare decisis should apply. I say that if I had been at liberty to interpret the Constitution as a court in the beginning, I perhaps should have thought about it differently from what I think today. It may have been my conclusion that if any change in the interpretation of the Constitution was to be brought about, it must be done through amendments to the Constitution. I believe there is at least one member of the Judiciary Committee, a valuable member, who actually adheres to these views now. If such had been the interpretation of the Constitution in the beginning and down to now, the controversy raging today would be as mild as a perfumed zephyr at early dawn from a garden of roses in the month of June. So, as this controversy, carried on with more heat than light, is one that divides men and arouses passions, the cause must be looked for, and perchance it will be found in the bosom of the Court itself.

There is no disrespect to the Court in my saying this. I expect to prove it. I want my children and my children's children for many generations to know that I had reasons for the position taken by me, and that I had right on my side in this controversy, and I am willing to play for the judgment of the future. I know how difficult it is amid the passions and the prejudices that have been aroused to make myself heard. I know that the whirlwind rages, and that the turmoil is great, but, once and for all, I want to show, if I can, that it is not the Congress, that it is not the Constitution, and that it is not the people of the Nation, great or small, that have unloosed the whirlwind. It is the Supreme Court. I do not mean the present members alone. I refer, of course, to the Court from its establishment by the Congress, pursuant to the Constitution, down to and including the present members of the Court.

Before pursuing that thought allow me to again repeat that I respect the judgment of those who disagree with me. I ask only that he who disagrees shall answer the argument which I hope to advance. "Mouse tracking" will be no answer. Bombast will constitute no argument. Impassioned eloquence will not do the trick. I want an answer, a calm, deliberate answer, pointing out the error in my premise, if there be error, disproving my reasoning, if it can be disproved, and showing the fallacy of my conclusion, if such may be done.

The one strange thing that strikes me is that while there is disagreement among the Democratic Members of the Senate, there is no disagreement among Republican Members. They are all on one side. It is strange that a subject dividing men the one from another in their reasoning processes has no effect upon our Republican brethren in the Senate. They will be here to be counted when the vote shall be taken, and they will constitute a solid block in opposition to the enactment of the legislation. My invitation to answer such argument as I may advance extends to them, however. If I am wrong, I want to know it before the vote is cast. If I have been unconsciously influenced in any way, I want some Member of the Senate to point out in what respect. Of course, I know that I have reached my conclusions through processes of my own reasoning. I know I have no desire to further my own ambition, as I have no further ambition. I know that benefits coming to my State have had no influence on me. I am conscious only that I am desirous of doing that which is right under the guidance of God, in whom I believe, and I am not ashamed of it.

Allowing to other men that which I claim for myself, I have given, and shall give, the reasons that impel me to the position which I have taken. I am deeply grieved because many of my lifelong friends in my own State are disappointed in me. They cannot understand my position, yet they are my friends, and I respect their opinions. I believe that nearly everyone of them, placed in my position, who should forget everything except his desire to do that which is right, and who had the same information that I have, would act as I expect to act. It is no pleasure, therefore, for one to have charges hurled at him day after day when he knows the charges are untrue. It is not pleasant to be the recipient of threats of death and destruction or to have the President of the United States held up as the greatest criminal of the age. These things grieve us all, and I for one, shall do the best I can to satisfy myself, and I hope that I may satisfy at least some of my friends as to my honesty of purpose and my desire to serve my country.

To find out what is wrong with the Supreme Court it is necessary to travel backward through the years and to find the very origin of the trouble. It is necessary to find out, if we can, why it is in this great Nation that we have a supreme judicial tribunal that apparently wanders in a wilderness without blazed trails when it comes to decisions on many important questions. I do not believe it is hard to find the cause of our troubles. I believe they are found in the records of the Court itself. It is necessary, therefore, as briefly as the matter may be encompassed, to point out the origin of that course of conduct which has led our Court into a wilderness, from which there is apparently no outlet.

Before Marshall the Supreme Court was of minor importance in the affairs of Government. It had not been called upon often, if at all, to interpret any provision of the Constitution. Few cases had come before it. A position on the Supreme Court was not esteemed very highly. It was not supposed to interfere seriously with the vocation or avocation of justice. Whether our Government was made up of a compact of States or whether it was an indestructible union was of no great consequence at the time. With the ascent of Marshall to the Chief Justiceship a great change took place. Political parties took form. The Constitution was the subject of more careful scrutiny. National power was sought, not only for the immediate future, but for the long years to come. The Court was confronted with the important question of whether the Constitution should be subject to interpretation that would meet changing conditions, or whether it should be subject to an interpretation which would remain the same throughout the years. Was it to be an elastic instrument, pulled this way and that, so it would cover new political and economical conditions as they should arise, or should it be defined as an instrument that meant what it said and no more? Marshall was called upon to answer that question, and he answered contrary I think to the way in which I may have answered it if I had been in Marshall's place but he answered it nevertheless, and what was his answer?

In McCulloch against Maryland, Marshall thus expressed his views the broad interpretation of the Constitution:

"This provision is made in a Constitution intended to endure for ages to come, and, consequently, to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs. To have prescribed the means by which government should in all future times execute its powers would have been to change entirely the character of the instrument and to give it the properties of a legal code. It would have been an unwise attempt to provide by immutable rules for exigencies, which, if foreseen at all, must have been seen dimly and can best be provided for as they occur."

Marshall undoubtedly had in view the English Constitution, which was not written at the time he wrote that famous paragraph. The Constitution, so he said, was to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs. He expressed as his opinion that it would have been unwise to attempt to provide by unchangeable rules for every crisis which might arise in the future. That was the latitudinarian construction.

The Constitution of England has been a matter of growth and development. The Parliament may modify it so that it may meet the exigencies of every condition which may arise. I need cite but a few paragraphs from expressions from the Supreme Court to show how completely the ideas of Marshall developed national power through the interpretation of the Constitution. The Court, speaking through Justice Story in 1816, used this language:

"The instrument was not intended to provide merely for the exigencies of a few years but was to endure through a long lapse of ages, the events of which were locked up in the inscrutable purposes of Providence. It could not be foreseen that new changes and modifications of power might be indispensable to effectuate the general objects of the charter; the restrictions and specifications which, at the present, might seem salutary, might in the end prove the overthrow of the system itself. Hence its powers are expressed in general terms, leaving to the Legislature from time to time to adopt its own means to effectuate legitimate objects and to mold and model the exercise of its powers as its own wisdom and the public interests should require."

Having molded the Constitution into an instrument of national power, a consideration of the opinions of Marshall and those who agreed with him establishes that he developed these particular important powers: The right of the Supreme Court to review both State and Federal legislation, as well as decisions of State courts; broadened the jurisdiction of the Federal Government by expanding, as far as possible, the interpretation of the powers vested in it, and by calling into existence the doctrine of implied powers; and whittled away the reserved powers of the States. We find the same ideas expressed in many opinions of the Supreme Court. In recent years they have generally been expressed in the dissenting opinions of the Court on important questions where national power had been invoked.

Let me say that the statement that the Nation has grown great without its having been necessary to interfere with the Supreme Court in any manner is not true without explanation. When the doctrines of Marshall have prevailed, with a broad construction of the Constitution as written, or the development of the doctrine of implied powers, the Nation has prospered, but, almost without an exception, calamity has followed the attempt to depart from the Marshallian construction. At the time of his death in 1835 Marshall, the expounder of the Constitution, had by interpretation so enlarged national power that every crisis had been met up to that time, and the authority was firmly established for meeting crises in the future.

Let us fix firmly in our minds that Marshall well established the principle that the Constitution should grow and expand as national problems should arise; that the interpretation should be broadened as occasions might arise. This, as I have said, was the approval of the common-law doctrine which we brought from England. If the Supreme Court had consistently adhered to the theories of Marshall, as it has generally done, we would be in no difficulties today, but trouble came in each instance when the Court departed from the principles of Marshall, who was looking

toward the future and believing that the Constitution was an elastic instrument. It was because of Marshall's interpretation that the doctrine of stare decisis has been given little consideration by the Supreme Court. Its own opinions are not binding on it. The opinions of one age that meant a solution of new problems have never been adhered to in another age when different problems have arisen.

In the establishment of this doctrine Marshall was careful never to claim that the Supreme Court should bear the same relationship to the Constitution of the United States that the Parliament bears to the Constitution of England. The usurpation of legislative powers by the Supreme Court was a process of growth, and it was not until recent years that the Court assumed the functions that the Parliament of England has over the English Constitution. Insofar as the Supreme Court has assumed that power over the Constitution—that is, to expand and develop it without legislative sanction—it has usurped the powers of the Congress. I shall return to this point later.

If there is any Member of the Senate that desires to challenge this statement, I will overwhelm him with the proof taken from the opinions of the Court itself.

In the very essence of parliamentary sovereignty it does not differentiate between the law-making and the Constitution-making process, and ordinary legislation and the Constitution meet with equal sanction. Strictly speaking, therefore, there is no English Constitution, but when it had been established by the Supreme Court that the Constitution of the United States is a growing instrument, it largely destroyed the distinction between the Constitution and legislative pronouncements when such legislative pronouncements were made by the Supreme Court itself. In other words, if the Constitution is what the judges say it is, the judges have the power, as the Parliament of England has the power, to change the Constitution at will.

It is true there are very few provisions of the Constitution where there is latitude left to the Supreme Court to exercise its legislative functions, but it so happens that these few provisions are important in the life of the Nation. To mention only two of them—the commerce clause and the due-process clause—it may be well said that we have no written Constitution as to these two clauses. The meaning of these clauses depends upon the opinions of the Supreme Court, and that may mean one thing for a time and something entirely different at another time. What is known as the Bill of Rights in the Constitution may not be subject to modification, because the Court has no latitude to modify any of the provisions. Such is true of nearly all of the provisions.

Dean Alfange has recently had published a great book, the Supreme Court and the National Will. It won the Theodore Roosevelt memorial award. The judges making the award were Dr. Harold Willis Dodds, president of Princeton University; Dr. Harold Glenn Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution; Dr. Henry Seidel Canby, of the Saturday Review of Literature; Prof. Roscoe Pound, dean emeritus of Harvard Law School; and Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr. The action of this committee of judges insures one that he will be well repaid for his time if he reads this book. I quote from this work, beginning on page 25, as follows:

"Had the Constitution depended for its development only on formal amendments, the contention would be warranted that its framers drew up a rigid, almost a static instrument for the governance of the most dynamic society of modern times. Such a charge, however, cannot be justifiably made. It is true that the American Constitution is both written and 'rigid'; that it emanates 'from an authority superior to that of the legislature'; and that, therefore, it cannot be 'bent or twisted by the action of the legislature but stands stiff and solid, opposing a stubborn resistance to any majority who may desire to transgress or evade its provisions.' It is also true that revision by formal amendment has been surprisingly infrequent. But this is not entirely due to the cumbersomeness and complexity of the amending process; for, as the repeal of the eighteenth amendment has shown, that process can be greatly accelerated by strong popular sentiment. As a matter of fact, despite the relative infrequency of formal revision, the Constitution has proved an exceptionally flexible instrument of government due to a continue process of amendment by political usage and judicial interpretation."

Again I quote, from page 28, as follows:

"Moreover, the American Constitution has not developed only by means of formal amendments, or the accretions and modifications wrought by usage. More potent than either of these processes has been the method of amendment by judicial interpretation which is peculiar to the American system and implicit in the Constitution itself. The negative aspect of this method is the power of the courts to declare statutes void on grounds of unconstitutionality. Yet despite the importance it rapidly assumed, the question of judicial review was barely touched upon by the Philadelphia Convention, and this power, which has often been hotly contested and is today perhaps the most explosive issue before the American people, is nowhere expressly granted in the Constitution."

It was no lesser person than Abraham Lincoln who warned the people that when questions were irrevocably solved by the Supreme Court, "the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal."

At one time Justice Sutherland seemed to have great respect for Marshall's interpretation of the Constitution, when in his opinion of the Adkins case he held that the liberty of individuals must frequently yield to the common good and said that "any attempt to fix a rigid boundary would be unwise, as well as futile."

Endless quotations could be made from the opinions of the Court throughout its history, establishing more firmly the views of interpretation first announced by Marshall. Those who agree with Marshall's interpretation rest their position on a solid rock. The present Democratic administration, as I understand it, stands firmly on the interpretation of the Constitution as established by Marshall, that is, the expansion of national power as the exigencies of the occasion may arise, so that every crisis may be fully met. It is the position taken by those who favor the legislation now before us, it is my position, arrived at after the most serious consideration, that I have ever given any question.

I have prided myself that I was a Jeffersonian Democrat, without giving much consideration to the divergent views running through many of the opinions of the Supreme Court on the proper interpretation of the Constitution. But for Marshall and those who have agreed with him in the interpretation of the Supreme Court, I am well convinced that our Nation would have perished long ago.

In answer to those who say we are trying to destroy the Constitution, we say that we are trying to save the Constitution. In answer to those who say that the present legislation would have the effect of invading the jurisdiction of the judiciary by the executive and legislative branches of the Government, we answer that we have no such purpose. We seek only to make the Constitution the supreme law of the land and to return to that interpretation which has allowed our Nation to expand, until it is now perhaps the greatest nation on earth.

So let those who oppose us answer, if they can. We have just cause to complain when it is heralded over the country that we are seeking to destroy the Constitution.

Our distinguished opponents cannot and will not dispute that the position taken by the President of the United States as to the proper interpretation of the Constitution is that which has generally prevailed throughout the history of the Nation, and that the glorious past was made glorious, because the great statesmen who manned the ship of state in the dangerous waters of the beginning contended for the same interpretation of the Constitution for which we now contend. The present Supreme Court departed from the Constitution and the settled construction which made it a living, expanding instrument which afforded protection to the rights of the humblest, as well as the greatest. This, in brief, is one side of the question dividing the Congress today. What is the other side?

It has been expressed often to the effect that the Constitution means exactly what it says and nothing more, that it may not be expanded by interpretation, that if there are any implied powers at all, they are very few, that the rules written into it are immutable, that the Constitution is a strait jacket, and that all laws enacted by the Congress must be found in harmony with the strict language of the Constitution itself.

While Jefferson and Madison adopted this narrow view of the interpretation of the Constitution, and their followers were known as strict constructionists at that time, everyone familiar with the history of that era must well understand that national power continued to expand under Jefferson and his immediate successors in office. It has been suggested in the debate on the floor of the Senate that Jefferson made no effort to control the Court through the enlargement of its membership or otherwise. Jefferson had no cause to quarrel with the decisions of the Supreme Court, as his views were undergoing a change, and the Court was with him in the expansion of national power. Jefferson was troubled about it but finally he agreed to the expansions of power as did Madison, Monroe, and John Quincy Adams. They were not so much concerned with the expansion of national power as they were in protecting the reserved powers of the States. Marshall did not have an easy time in expanding national power. At times he almost wrecked the Union, but he persisted, and he did not quit, as some of the Members of the Congress insist that we should do. He fought on for the establishment of a great Nation under a Constitution, as we should fight, and within the Constitution, as we are fighting within the Constitution. Those, however, who hold to the views of Jefferson are not deserving of censure. They have 150 years of history behind them where outstanding men, great statesmen of their time, took the position which they are now assuming, along with some of the members of the Supreme Court, who refuse to adhere to the doctrines of the expansion of national power.

The Federalists had control of the Supreme Court from its organization until the death of Marshall in 1835. After 1800, there was no President of the same political faith as the Supreme Court until the death of Marshall, but through increasing the number of Justices, deaths, and resignations, Jackson and Van Buren had an opportunity to make over the Court. The Chief Justice and five new Justices were appointed, and such men as Daniel Webster and other great statesmen said when Taney became Chief Justice that the Constitution was "gone." They used the same language that our opponents are using today, but nothing in particular happened.

Some of the opinions previously rendered by Marshall were modified, but national power was not seriously interfered with until the Dred Scott decision. We find at that time that the Court went over to the opposite side and attempted to limit national power, exactly as some of the Justices of the Supreme Court desire to limit it today. Our opponents, therefore, have

the Dred Scott decision on their side, and they may make the most of it. The narrow constructionist won a great victory, but the Nation paid dearly for it. The Dred Scott case almost destroyed the Nation, and I am one who believes that if increasing the number of Justices of the Supreme Court at that time to prevent the decision had been resorted to it may have been justified, because it would have prevented the most disastrous internecine strife that the world has ever seen. We in this day can hardly picture the horrors that covered our Nation as a result of the Dred Scott decision, caused by departure from the interpretation of the Constitution in a liberal manner so as to enlarge national power.

All of you who are familiar with history will know that the sainted Abraham Lincoln took the position that the Justices to be appointed during that dark period in our history should be such as would uphold what had been done to carry on the war; but, strange as it may seem, the Court departed from the Marshallian interpretation of the Constitution and went over to the strict constructionists. Grant tried to prevent it, but the Court was too speedy for him. He had two vacancies to fill, one caused by the enlargement of the Court by Congress and the other to fill a vacancy otherwise created. He sent the names in to the Senate. One was rejected, and the other died within less than a week after confirmation. Before he could get two more names to the Senate, or, rather, on the same day that he did so, the Supreme Court declared that the Legal Tender Acts were unconstitutional; and the consequences of that decision, if it had stood, would have been the utter bankruptcy of the Nation.

Departing from the broad construction of the Constitution brought on the War between the States, and departing from it a few years later in the Legal Tender case would have destroyed the Nation, but for the fact that President Grant succeeded in securing the confirmation of two Justices who held political and economical views such as his own. The first decision, therefore, strictly construing the Constitution was withdrawn, and in the second opinion the Court went back to the doctrine of Marshall, holding that enough could be found in the Constitution to meet any crisis which might arise.

As I have said, I used to think that emergencies should have no influence on the interpretation of the Constitution, but that was before I understood fully the history of the Supreme Court and its decisions. I quote from the case of Knox against Lee, in which the Legal Tender Acts were upheld, as follows:

"It would be difficult to overestimate the consequences which must follow our decision. They will affect the entire business of the country and take hold of the possible continued existence of the Government. If it be held by this Court that Congress has no constitutional power, under any circumstances, or in any emergency, to make Treasury notes a legal tender for the payment of all debts (a power confessedly possessed by every independent sovereignty other than the United States), the Government is without those means of self-preservation which, all must admit, may in certain contingencies become indispensable, even if they were not when the acts of Congress now called in question were enacted. It is also clear that if we hold the acts invalid as applicable to debts incurred, or transactions which have taken place since their enactment, our decision must cause throughout the country great business derangement, widespread distress, and the rankest injustice. * * * Men have bought and sold, borrowed and lent, and assumed every variety of obligations contemplating that payment might be made with such notes. Indeed, legal-tender Treasury notes have become the universal measure of values. If now, by our decision, it be established that these debts and obligations can be discharged only by gold coin; if contrary to the expectation of all parties to these contracts, legal-tender notes are rendered unavailable, the Government has become an instrument of the grossest injustice; all debtors are loaded with an obligation it was never contemplated they should assume; a large percentage is added to every debt, and such must become the demand for gold to satisfy contracts that ruinous sacrifices, general distress, and bankruptcy may be expected. These consequences are too obvious to admit of question."

The Supreme Court and its opinions for several years followed rather haltingly a liberal interpretation of the Constitution. It had during this period fairly well gone back to the interpretation of Marshall, but its opinions were not uniform. In the early seventies the question arose as to whether the Supreme Court should, by its own interpretation, expand the Constitution without legislative enactment, or whether Congress should be the judge of the facts and of what was necessary for the common good.

It may not be the first case, but it will do as well as any to illustrate my point. The State of Illinois had enacted a statute in 1871 for the regulation of grain elevators and had attempted to fix monopoly prices by legislation. The legislature had determined that the particular business was impressed with a public interest, and upon that theory proceeded to fix the rates which an elevator could charge.

When the matter reached the Supreme Court it had three important questions before it. One was whether the State legislature may fix prices to be charged by business in the nature of a monopoly. Another was whether such prices must be reasonable; and if so, whether the legislature or the Court should be the judge of their reasonableness. It was held specifically by the Supreme Court that the statutes simply extended the law to meet any developments of commercial progress, that it was within the power of the legislature to determine rates and prices, and that the Court was without such power. It was said in the course of the opinion, "For protection against abuses by legislatures, the people must resort to the polls, not to the courts."

Again, in the case of *Mugler* v. *Kansas*, the Court was called upon to determine whether it was a legislative or a judicial question when the State of Kansas had failed to compensate liquor manufacturers for the depreciation in the value of their property. The Court upheld the statute upon the ground that it was a matter within the power of the legislature. The Court said:

"If, therefore, a State deems absolute prohibition * * * to be necessary to the peace and security of society, the courts cannot, without usurping legislative functions, override the will of the people as thus expressed by their chosen representatives. They have nothing to do with the mere policy or legislation * * * it is not for the courts, upon their views as to what is best and safest for the community, to disregard the legislative determination of that question * * *. This conclusion is unavoidable, unless the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution takes from the States of the Union those powers of police that were reserved at the time the original Constitution was adopted. But this Court has declared, upon full consideration, that the fourteenth amendment had no such effect * * *. A prohibition simply upon the use of property for purposes that are declared by valid legislation to be injurious to the health, morals, or safety of the community cannot in any just sense be deemed a taking or an appropriation of property for the public benefit."

Economical forces brought about a change later in the opinions of the Court. The Minnesota rate case came on a few years later, when the Supreme Court departed from previous opinions, and, in effect, held that the Court itself and not the legislature must determine whether regulations were reasonable. That doctrine has been enlarged, until the Court does not leave it to the Congress to determine facts upon which legislation may be based, or what is for the general welfare, or what is interstate commerce. The Court without evidence has assumed that it has the power to determine as a court what is just or right in rate making, taxation, regulation of utilities, transportation, interstate commerce, and many other things.

The Supreme Court, in questions relating to certain important provisions of the Constitution, had finally come to the point where it agreed with Marshall that the Constitution could be expanded by judicial interpretation, and that the expansion required no assistance from legislative bodies; that the Court had become the parliament to determine when the common law should be changed.

The Court returned again to strict construction in the income-tax legislation. When the statute was invalidated, it brought confusion, and for many years the Government was greatly handicapped in adopting a fair system of taxation.

Instance after instance could be cited to show that the Supreme Court has brought upon the country many ills through its frequent departures from a broad interpretation of the Constitution, resulting in the enlargement of national power. The disagreement among the members of the Court as to whether the Marshallian or Madisonian interpretation is correct has become so acute that neither legislatures nor the Congress can intelligently make laws necessary to meet crises as they arise. Within the last few years at least four of the members of the Supreme Court have been implacable in their opinions against a broad and liberal interpretation of the Constitution for the expansion of national power. Sometimes a Justice may be convinced that a particular case fits on one side or the other of the line of interpretation. He is the fair-minded, unbiased judge, but when the Supreme Court reaches the point where, because of age or predilection, or for any other reason, some of the members refuse to be unbiased and national power suffers thereby to the common detriment of all of the people, something should be done, if any branch of the Government has the power to do it.

We cannot stand still. Society must move forward. National power must be expanded to meet the exigencies of all occasions, and if the Nation has a Supreme Court that will not allow this, then the Nation must begin to wither and die. We who favor this legislation have no purpose other than to preserve the Nation and to maintain the happiness of its people. We want to see justice flow down as the waters, and justice cannot flow from a court when some of the members deliberately refuse to be unbiased. They cannot be impeached, and although they may have passed the retirement age, they were appointed for life, and no one may compel them to retire.

So in such a crisis, what does the Constitution provide may be done? What was the meaning of the provisions of the Constitution relating to the Supreme Court? These things we will now examine.

I believe that no one is so simple as to believe that the Constitutional Convention intended when it provided for the establishment of a Supreme Court that it should be superior to the Congress and the Chief Executive. I do not believe that the Convention took such great pains to throw restrictions and limitations around the legislative and executive branches of the Government and left the Supreme Court without any check upon it at all except its own self-restraint. It is contrary to the spirit of the time, and it would require evidence which I am quite sure cannot be produced to convince me that the members of the Convention intended to vest absolute power in either branch of the Government. One will look in vain to the Constitution for even an intimation that the Supreme Court should have absolute control over Congress and the Chief Executive.

One will be impressed when he reads the Constitution with the particularity of the language used in defining the powers and duties

of the legislative branch as well as the executive branch of the Government. It was decided by the Convention that the executive head should be one person, who should be denominated the President of the United States. He was required to be a native-born citizen, and his age and residence were defined and his duties named with particularity.

All these things are true as to the legislative branch. The number of Senators from each State was fixed and the number of Members of the House of Representatives was determined and the rule established whereby Congresses in the future should determine the membership of that body. The President was required to keep the Congress informed as to the state of the Nation and the Congress was expected to meet the problems which should arise through legislative enactment. When Congress should agree upon the form of legislation it had to be sent to the President, and he was given the power to veto it. His veto, however, need not be final, as two-thirds of the membership of each House of Congress was given the authority to pass the legislation over his veto. One was a check upon the other. The great check, however, against the acts of the Executive was that he could only hold his office for 4 years, and at the end of his term the voters were given the opportunity to refuse to continue him in office or to refuse to continue his policies.

The Members of the House of Representatives had to go to the people every 2 years and the Members of the Senate every 6 years. A barricade against absolute power was erected so far as the executive and legislative branches are concerned. They were not only answerable to each other but they were answerable to the people.

Perhaps the Convention did not believe that the Supreme Court had the power to declare acts of the Congress unconstitutional. Whether that be true or not, it is now conceded that the Court has such power, and that is proper, but when we concede that it is proper, we further concede that the Constitution may be distorted or its meaning perverted by the Court, and there is no check upon its acts by the people or by either of the other branches of the Government, if the contention of those who oppose us is true. If that contention be true, the Czar of Russia in the old days had no more power than the Supreme Court. If there is no remedy, it may completely change our form of Government through the interpretation of the Constitution, and the people are helpless, as the Supreme Court cannot be reached by the people.

It is unthinkable to me that such power may be vested in any branch of a government in a republic. If that be true, the Council of Ten in Venice had no more power than the nine who compose the membership of our Supreme Court. It is foolish to say that members of the Court may be impeached because of decisions rendered. No one can explore the mind of any Justice to determine whether his actions were sincere or otherwise. It is fortunate that many of the provisions of the Constitution are so clear that the provisions cannot be distorted, but tyrants in the lust for power have broken rules as clearly stated as those found in the Constitution for the protection of the liberties of the people.

We may as well assume, if we accept that truth, that we have no written Constitution, or if we have one, it is what the judges say it is. If it is what the judges say it is, then the Congress and the Chief Executive have a tribunal with absolute power, able to destroy anything which may be done by either of these branches of government. These statements do not come from a vivid imagination. They are based on solid and substantial facts. Any body having supreme and absolute power in a republic, uncontrolled by the people or their representatives, is something that cannot be imagined by anyone unless he believes that for the protection of property and property rights it is necessary to have such a tribunal with supreme power over the life, liberties, and property of all the people.

It simply is not true that the fathers of this Republic, who won our freedom and independence after a long and bloody war, sought to place the people of the Nation under the absolute control of a small group of men. There can be no remedy by impeachment, there can be no remedy by removal, there can be no changing of the opinions of the Court after they have been rendered, and we have a body then erected by the Constitution at liberty to do as it pleases, whether it be composed of honest and upright men or whether it be composed of tyrants; whether it be composed of men in possession of all their faculties, or whether it be composed of men with their faces turned to the sunset with their light of reason growing dim.

Absolute power does not exist in a republic. Since, in my judgment, it has been clearly shown that there is something wrong with the opinions of the Supreme Court, and that by reason of conflicting views within the body itself there is something wrong with the Court, and as the Constitution was made for the purpose of preserving the life of the Nation, it must have been believed by those who framed it that it possessed every necessary power to meet every crisis, so that the life of the Nation might go on. If it fails to function from any cause, what is the duty of those who have sworn to uphold the Constitution and defend it? The answer is obvious. It is their duty to find a remedy within the Constitution, if it can be found there.

Those who say that we ought to take a chance by amending the Constitution are but reiterating arguments of the forgotten past. Where the Constitution vests in the Congress full and complete power to do a particular thing it is the height of folly for anyone to suggest that the Constitution should be now amended so that Congress would have conferred upon it the power to do that which it has always had the power to do. When we go to the source of the power of the Congress we find that the Supreme Court, as to the number of members, is a creature of Congress and has always been so treated. Congress may do what it pleases with the membership so far as numbers are concerned. The Congress may do what it pleases as to the appellate jurisdiction of the Court. The Congress may do what it pleases as to the salaries which shall be paid and the appropriations which shall be made for the maintenance of the Court. The Court, therefore, largely is a creature of Congress, set up as an advisor and not as a dictator.

There is a great cry going up against dictators and dictatorships. We who support this legislation are fighting for the maintenance of the freedom of the people of the Nation and against dictatorship. The Supreme Court now admittedly is a dictator, so far as economical and political principles are concerned, as they relate to the most vital questions in the Nation. This being true, then, what is the duty of Congress to avoid such dictatorship or to destroy it, if it exists?

The Justices may not be impeached, they may not be removed, they may not be recalled by the people, but the number of Justices which shall constitute this great body is subject to the will of Congress, and there is no other means which may be constitutionally employed to avoid the usurpation of power by the Supreme Court or to destroy a dictatorship which may be the Court itself. Louis XIV of France said, "I am the state." The Supreme Court of the United States has said, "We are the Constitution. We will make it or unmake it, controlled only by our self-restraint."

Some of the members of the Court have lost their self-restraint and seem bent upon the restrictions of national power. I agree with some of the great statesmen of the Nation, as well as some of the great Justices of the Court, that the life of the Nation is something even higher than the Constitution, and that there must be found in the Constitution that which is necessary to perpetuate the Nation and to maintain the integrity of our institutions. But it is said that the independence of the Court will be destroyed by legislation such as this. That is but a snare to catch rabbits. No one seeks to destroy the independence of the Court, unless by independence it is meant absolute power. The independence of the Court means no more than the Justices shall be free from any outside influence in reaching conclusions on the questions presented to them.

It is strange that after our long history a President has arisen who some Members of the Senate believe should not be allowed to appoint Justices of the Supreme Court because it would destroy the independence of the Court. The number of Justices is a matter for Congress to determine, and I cannot see why an appointment by Franklin D. Roosevelt would destroy the independent thinking of the Justices appointed any more than the independence of Justices appointed by other Presidents has been destroyed.

The letter of Theodore Roosevelt while he was President to Henry Cabot Lodge, written in 1902, expresses the views of every person who has ever appointed a Justice. The then President Roosevelt did not think that the man whose appointment was under consideration should be appointed unless he was a party man, constantly keeping in mind his adherence to the principles and policies under which his Nation has been built, and that he should also keep in mind his relations with his fellow statesmen, who in other branches of the Government were striving, in cooperation with him, to advance the ends of government. That was the opinion of President Lincoln, and that was the opinion of President Taft, and that has been the opinion of every President who has ever named Justices to the Supreme Court.

It appears that Mr. Lodge made a notation on this letter to the effect that a Justice should be a constitutional lawyer who believed in great party principles. So when the attempt is made to convince the public that President Roosevelt now proposes to pack the Court, it may be well denominated as a snare and a delusion. That he would seek to select Justices who are in sympathy with those principles of government which will promote happiness to the greatest number goes without saying. He would be false to his oath of office if he did less.

What are the provisions of the bill under consideration, stripped of all surplusage and freed from the wrappings of false arguments advanced by those who oppose it? The bill provides for the long suffering of the Nation in the hands of Justices who may be obsessed with the idea that the Court is greater than other branches of the Government. It is not proposed that they be disturbed even until they have reached that age when, according to the laws of nature, nine out of every ten men are incapacitated for such service. Nothing can be done until a Justice reaches the age of 75 years. At that time he has had 5 years in which he may have voluntarily retired. Even when he has reached that age, he is not compelled to retire under the provision of the proposed legislation. No one is appointed to take his place, and no one is appointed to be a wet nurse to him. The membership of the Court is automatically increased when a Justice reaches the age of 75 years, but as a further protection against even the temptation to pack the Court, it is provided that no more than one increase shall be made in any one calendar year. No one will be appointed for a particular Judge, but he is appointed in his own right, because the number of Justices has been increased.

No one can misunderstand that simple language, and that is all that the bill does to the Supreme Court. It is a plan for the future, and when the occasion arises, if ever, a new Justice may be appointed under such circumstances, because the membership of the Court has been increased, but when the circumstances have passed, and there are no Justices who have reached that ripe old

age, the Court is automatically reduced to the permanent membership of nine.

All the tumult and the shouting brought about by the Liberty League is over this simple provision, which, but for the efforts of entrenched power, at some other time would perhaps pass the Senate even without the formality of a roll call.

The Liberty League lost the election last November, but it appears that it is in a fair way to win it in the Congress. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that the defeat of this legislation means the defeat of all that we have fought for since Roosevelt became President. It means the destruction of the legislation that has been wrought out by those who believe in progressive measures who have been selected as the servants of the people.

Let us look a little into the provisions of the inferior Federal courts. There appears to be little objection to the appointment of an additional judge for each judge who has reached the age of 70. That means an increase of a few judges throughout the Nation, but the total number may not exceed 20, for the bill so provides. The objection which has been offered, and which affords some amusement to those who are familiar with the question, is that the bill would concentrate Federal power at Washington. The bill does provide that district and circuit judges may be assigned by the Chief Justice—not by the President—to the place or places in the Nation where their services are most needed. There are districts greatly congested, and there are other districts where the judge has little to do. Is it unfair to confer upon the Chief Justice the power to transfer a judge from one district to another, so that justice may more speedily prevail? That is all the provisions as to the inferior Federal courts.

And then great fear has been expressed about a proctor, not to be appointed by the President but by the Supreme Court. His duties are to check up on the dockets of the circuit and district courts and give detailed information to the Chief Justice, so that he may intelligently assign district and circuit judges. That is all there is to that provision.

The other provision in the bill relates to procedure in injunction suits and has no purpose other than to speed justice where it is now slow.

I have said, and I repeat, that the defeat of this legislation by the Congress means the defeat of the New Deal. The people believe in the New Deal, and they expect us to carry out such principles as will put it into effect, if we may do so within the limits of the Constitution. In this proposal we are within the limits of the Constitution. We are seeking to write into the statutes the will of the people in a perfectly constitutional way. I am not particular as to how the ends may be accomplished. I have at all times been ready to agree, so far as I am concerned, on any compromise that would tend to achieve the end sought. I am still willing to be convinced that some reasonable compromise is better than the provisions of the bill. Perhaps the Members of the Senate and the House might reach an agreement of some kind, but the New Deal cannot compromise with the Liberty League.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Kentucky whether the agreement should not be stated somewhat differently from the way it has been stated, namely, that the report hereafter to be made, which is contemplated by reference in his statement, is not to be a report on a bill to reform the judiciary, but a bill for reform of judicial procedure.

Mr. LOGAN. I wrote down the suggestion this morning and submitted it to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE] to know whether that was the proper form, and the writing which I submitted to him was that Senate bill 1392, with all amendments, should be re-referred to the Judiciary Committee with instructions to report a bill relating to judicial reform.

Mr. AUSTIN. Exactly.

Mr. LOGAN. Within 10 days. That is the exact language that was agreed upon, and that is the motion which I undertook to make.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I desire to know what the judicial reform refers to. Does it refer to the Supreme Court or to the inferior courts?

Mr. LOGAN. I may say to the Senator from California that the Committee on the Judiciary this morning had an understanding that we did not think it was proper to embrace in the motion what it should refer to. The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] wrote out what we had before us in the Committee on the Judiciary. It was a statement of what had been said, I believe, by the leader and some others, and that did not refer to the Supreme Court. That was not to be considered at all, I may say.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Supreme Court is out of the way?

Mr. LOGAN. The Supreme Court is out of the way.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Glory be to God! [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN].

Mr. McNARY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GILLETTE (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (when Mr. NORRIS' name was called). The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent from the Senate on account of illness. If present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LEWIS. I announce the absence of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] because of illness in his family.

Mr. ASHURST. I rise to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. HAYDEN] on account of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I make no announcement as to his position.

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—70

Adams	Davis	Lewis	Reynolds
Andrews	Dieterich	Lodge	Russell
Ashurst	Donahey	Logan	Sheppard
Austin	Duffy	Lonergan	Shipstead
Bailey	Frazier	McAdoo	Smith
Barkley	George	McCarran	Steiwer
Borah	Gerry	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Gibson	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Brown, Mich.	Gillette	Maloney	Townsend
Brown, N. H.	Glass	Minton	Tydings
Bulow	Hale	Moore	Vandenberg
Burke	Harrison	Murray	Van Nuys
Byrd	Herring	Nye	Wagner
Byrnes	Holt	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Overton	Wheeler
Clark	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	White
Connally	King	Pope	
Copeland	Lee	Radcliffe	

NAYS—20

Bilbo	Chavez	Hitchcock	Neely
Black	Ellender	Hughes	Schwartz
Bone	Green	La Follette	Schwellenbach
Bulkley	Guffey	Lundeen	Smathers
Caraway	Hatch	McKellar	Truman

NOT VOTING—5

Bankhead	Hayden	Norris	Pittman
Berry			

So Mr. LOGAN's motion to recommit to the Committee on the Judiciary the bill (S. 1392) to reorganize the judicial branch of the Government was agreed to.

NOTICE OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if I am in order, I wish to make an observation.

The Committee on the Judiciary this morning instructed the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], who is in charge of Senate bill 1392, to make the motion he made. The Senate, as it had a right to do, has just ordered the bill returned to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructons to report within 10 days.

I cannot escape the conviction that I ought to give the Senate and the country the assurance that the Committee on the Judiciary will be assembled on Monday morning at 10:30 a. m., and will with zeal and fidelity attempt to follow the wishes of the Senate and bring in within 10 days such a bill as the Senate desires.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, has it been agreed that we are not to meet until Monday?

Mr. ASHURST. If any Senator is of opinion that we should meet before Monday, the chairman will call a meeting for tomorrow.

Mr. BORAH. The work we have ahead of us which must be accomplished within 10 days will require that we get to work immediately.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is, as usual, correct. Therefore I now give notice that the Committee on the Judiciary will meet tomorrow at 10:30 a. m., at its regular meeting place in the Capitol Building, to try to carry out the order of the Senate.

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

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. Am I to understand from the statement of the Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that in the deliberations which the committee is to hold beginning tomorrow morning no consideration is to be given to adding judges to the Supreme Court or to any court on any other basis than that of need in order to perform the functions of the court?

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator from Nebraska is correct in his understanding of the situation.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am sure it will be a matter of great relief to the Senate if I say that I surrender whatever right I had to the floor. The action taken this afternoon makes it quite unnecessary to produce any further argument. The Court has been saved. Therefore, with the consent of the Chair, I yield all my parliamentary rights.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has yielded the floor. The clerk will state the first bill in order on the calendar.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

The first business on the calendar was the resolution (S. Res. 8) limiting debate on general appropriation bills.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask that the resolution be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

Mr. GLASS subsequently said: Mr. President, by reason of my inattention, I did not note when the first order of business on the calendar was reached and passed over. It is a resolution proposing a limitation of debate on appropriation bills. The resolution was presented by me and unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules. I think, however, there is no possibility of securing its consideration at this session, and I therefore ask to have the resolution recommitted to the Committee on Rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1436) providing for the employment of skilled shorthand reporters in the executive branch of the Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 419) to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 847) to prevent the use of Federal official patronage in elections and to prohibit Federal officeholders from misuse of positions of public trust for private and partisan ends was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 100) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies", approved July 2, 1890, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1261) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 69) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce", approved February 4, 1887, as amended and supplemented, by limiting freight or other trains to 70 cars was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4276) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", was announced as next in order.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2106) for the allowances of certain claims not heretofore paid, for indemnity for spoliations by the French, prior to July 31, 1801, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1760) to promote the safety of scheduled air transportation was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, by providing for the regulation of the transportation of passengers and property by aircraft in interstate commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. I also ask that that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 892) to repeal the act entitled "An act relating to Philippine currency reserves on deposit in the United States" was announced as next in order.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2113) to provide benefits on account of disability or death due to service in the armed forces of the United States in the event of war, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2226) to regulate interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6215) to repeal the provisions of the income-tax law requiring lists of compensation paid to officers and employees of corporations was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

OATH ON INCOME-TAX RETURNS

The bill (S. 2473) to provide that individual income-tax returns may be made without the formality of an oath, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I also ask that that bill go over.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Tennessee if he has investigated that bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I have investigated the bill. It is to repeal a bill the passage of which, as I recall, was secured by me.

Mr. WALSH. The bill is simply for the purpose of removing the necessity of an oath being attached by a taxpayer to his income-tax return. The bill is recommended by the Treasury Department. I wish the Senator would withdraw his objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the bill go over for the present, and I will examine into it further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. WALSH subsequently said: Mr. President, when Calendar No. 747, being Senate bill 2473, relating to individual income-tax returns, was called, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] objected. Since that time I have conferred

with the Senator from Tennessee, and I think he is now disposed to withhold his objection. I ask that the bill be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2473) to provide that individual income-tax returns may be made without the formality of an oath, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the words "Revenue Act of", to strike out "1934" and insert "1936"; on page 2, line 15, after the words "correct as to", to strike out the word "any" and insert the word "every"; on page 2, line 17, to strike out "1934 ed.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 51 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1936 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 51. Individual returns.

"(a) Requirement: The following individuals shall each make a return, which shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, stating specifically the items of his gross income and the deductions and credits allowed under this title and such other information for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe—

"(1) Every individual having a net income for the taxable year of $1,000 or over, if single, or if married and not living with husband or wife;

"(2) Every individual having a net income for the taxable year of $2,500 or over, if married and living with husband or wife; and

"(3) Every individual having a gross income for the taxable year of $5,000 or over, regardless of the amount of his net income.

"Whoever under such written declaration shall willfully and contrary to such declaration make and subscribe a return under this section which he does not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter, shall be subject to the penalties prescribed for perjury as provided in section 125 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 18, sec. 231).

"The fact that an individual's name is signed to a filed return shall be prima-facie evidence for all purposes that the return was actually signed by such person."

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall be effective and apply only to returns filed for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1937.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the clerk be authorized to renumber the sections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in connection with the bill just passed I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a short editorial.

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

WALSH'S TAX PLAN SOUND

The bill introduced by Senator WALSH, of Massachusetts, to permit the filing of individual Federal income-tax returns without the formality of an oath is a move in the right direction.

Such a change in both Federal and State laws would be a convenience, as well as a money saver, to literally millions of taxpayers.

According to Senator WALSH, the Treasury Department is contemplating presentation to Congress of a similar bill covering returns filed by employers and employees under the social-security law.

The Walsh bill provides that the individual taxpayer who knowingly makes a false statement in his return will be guilty of perjury and may be prosecuted for perjury.

The system he proposes has been used in connection with individual tax returns in Massachusetts for a number of years. It is just as effective as requiring each taxpayer to take an oath to the correctness of his return. And it saves him the trouble and expense of having his signature witnessed by a notary public.

It should make no difference to the Government whether an individual swears that his tax return is correct as long as he can be prosecuted if he knowingly makes a false statement. All the Government is interested in is getting a correct return or being able to prosecute those who file false returns.

Perjury is a sort of manufactured crime, anyway. A false statement made knowingly, even though it is not sworn to, can be made perjury just as much as such a statement that is given under oath.

In view of the enormous increase in tax returns, etc., which are being required from citizens, government should make the filing of these returns as easy and as inexpensive as possible.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2229) to permit members of Congress to enter into agreements under agriculture programs was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING and Mr. WHITE asked that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 18) to establish a National Safety Standards Commission to reduce the danger of accidents at highway grade crossings, and drawbridges, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2410) to amend the Judicial Code, as amended, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 144) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting child labor was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2512) to authorize an appropriation for the construction of small reservoirs under the Federal reclamation laws was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1507) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws and to punish the crime of lynching was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ASSIGNMENT OF NAVAL OFFICERS TO DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The bill (S. 2482) to provide for the assignment of officers of the Navy for duty under the Department of Commerce and appointment to positions therein, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in regard to Senate bill 2482. There is a vacancy in the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation of the Department of Commerce. The administration finds that it is impracticable to secure for that position a competent and able person who has not heretofore been employed by an owner or operator of an American vessel. It is important that the position be held by someone unobligated and free from any pressure of any kind by any steamship company. The importance of this position can be understood from what the Department of Commerce say about this position. The committee was informed that the Director of the Bureau had resigned and that after a careful canvass of available eligibles it has been decided that for the time being, at least, the position should be filled by a man who had the education, training, and broad experience of a naval officer.

The first bill that came before our committee sought to give to the President unrestricted authority to appoint active and retired naval and Army officers to any position in the Federal Government. The committee rejected that suggestion unanimously.

The next proposal was that the President be given authority to name active or retired naval officers to any position in the Department of Commerce. The committee rejected that proposal. The committee was of the opinion, and it is now of the opinion, that the President should be

permitted to name a naval officer to this most important position in the Department of Commerce, but that general authority for the President to name military offices to civilian positions should not be approved. It is a position that has been made important because of an unprecedented amount of legislation that has recently been enacted with regard to the functions of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation. The Bureau's authority and responsibilities have been extended requiring the examination and approval by the Bureau of plans for all construction, remodeling, and mechanically equipping of vessels, with the definite objective of reducing the hazards to life and property at sea. The next few years will be a crucial period in the Bureau, for it must put these new laws into effect, coordinate their provisions, and reorganize the entire personnel in the light of the increased duties and new procedure.

In view of the importance of this position, it seems to me that Congress ought to permit the President, if he considers a naval officer to be best suited and best fitted to hold this position, to select such officer. I hope there will be no objection made to the consideration of the bill and to the request of the administration.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am very sorry, but I will have to object for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 137) granting the consent of Congress to the minimum-wage compact ratified by the Legislatures of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING and Mr. McKELLAR asked that the joint resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2403) to prohibit the transportation of certain persons in interstate or foreign commerce during labor controversies, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE AT POPLAR POINT, MONT.

The bill (H. R. 6496) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana or the counties of Roosevelt, Richland, and McCone, singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Poplar, Mont., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2381) to amend the Criminal Code by providing punishment for impersonation of officers and employees of Government-owned and Government-controlled corporations was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH IN PENAL INSTITUTIONS

The bill (S. 2387) to authorize certain officers and employees of Federal penal and correctional institutions to administer oaths was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the warden and associate warden, the chief clerk, the record clerk, and one other officer or employee, to be designated by the Attorney General, of each Federal penal or correctional institution are hereby authorized and empowered to administer oaths to and take acknowledgments of officers and employees, as well as inmates, of such institutions.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2386) to give precedence to certain proceedings to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary will meet tomorrow to take up procedural matters, I suggest that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PROTECTION OF ALASKAN OYSTER CULTURE

The bill (H. R. 1561) for the protection of oyster culture in Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1924, entitled "An act for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes" (43 Stat. 464), as amended by the act of Congress approved June 18, 1926 (44 Stat. 752), is further amended by striking the period after the words "Alaskan Territorial waters", where they occur at the end of the second proviso, and inserting a colon in lieu thereof and after the colon the following: "*Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce, in his discretion, and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem fair and reasonable, is hereby authorized to lease bottoms in Alaskan Territorial waters for bona-fide oyster cultivation for commercial purposes."

CONSTRUCTION OF MARINE HOSPITAL IN FLORIDA

The bill (H. R. 4716) authorizing the construction and equipment of a marine hospital in the State of Florida, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I notice this bill proposes to authorize a large appropriation, amounting to $1,500,000. I inquire if the project has been recommended by the Department, and what is the necessity for such a large appropriation?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the bill was recommended by the Department, and, of course, has passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. KING. Is an appropriation of $1,500,000 for the purchase of ground?

Mr. PEPPER. It is for the construction of a marine hospital, such an institution being urgently needed in the State of Florida. The hospital proposed to be constructed is to be located at such place as the Federal Board of Hospitalization may select in that State. As I have said, the bill has been favorably recommended by the Department and has already passed the other House.

Mr. KING. Is there to be a marine hospital in every State bordering upon the Atlantic and the Gulf and the Pacific?

Mr. PEPPER. I suppose marine hospitals will be located at such places as they may be needed. It has been determined that at the present time there should be such a hospital located in Florida. In view of the consideration given to the matter by the other House and by the Senate Commerce Committee, and in view of the favorable recommendation of the Department, I hope the Senator from Utah will not object to the passage of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it expected that an appropriation will be made for the purposes of the bill during the present year?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know when the project will be consummated. I suppose the appropriation will come along in due course.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to look into this bill a little further, and probably at the next call of the calendar I will have no objection to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

SURVEY OF CAYUGA, BUFFALO, AND CAZENOVIA CREEKS, N. Y.

The bill (H. R. 4896) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Cayuga, Buffalo, and Cazenovia Creeks, N. Y., with a view to the control of their floods was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COAST GUARD STATION, BEAVER BAY, MINN.

The bill (H. R. 5040) to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station at or near Beaver Bay, Minn., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COAST GUARD STATION, ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.

The bill (H. R. 5140) to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station at or near St. Augustine, Fla., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENLISTMENTS IN THE COAST GUARD

The bill (S. 2335) to amend the laws relating to enlistments in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, there is on the calendar a House bill similar to the Senate bill, the House bill being No. 6916, Order of Business 923. I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6916) to amend the laws relating to enlistments in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of May 26, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 200; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 14, sec. 35), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(a) That all persons composing the enlisted force of the Coast Guard shall be enlisted for a term not to exceed 3 years, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall prepare regulations governing such enlistments and for the general government of the service: *Provided*, That an enlistment in the Coast Guard shall not be regarded as complete until the enlisted man concerned shall have served any time, in excess of 1 day, lost on account of unauthorized absence from duty, or injury, sickness, or disease, resulting from his own intemperate use of drugs or alcoholic liquors, or other misconduct, or while in confinement under sentence, or while awaiting trial and disposition of his case if the trial results in conviction.

"(b) The term of enlistment of any enlisted man in the Coast Guard may, by his voluntary written agreement, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, be extended for a period of 1, 2, or 3 full years from the date of expiration of the then existing term of enlistment, and subsequent to said date an enlisted man who extends his term of enlistment as herein authorized shall be entitled to and shall receive the same pay and allowances in all respects as though regularly discharged and reenlisted immediately upon expiration of his term of enlistment. No such extension shall operate to deprive the enlisted man concerned, upon discharge at the termination thereof, of any right, privilege, or benefit to which he would have been entitled if his term of enlistment had not been so extended.

"(c) The commanding officer of any vessel of the Coast Guard is authorized, in his discretion, to detain an enlisted man beyond the term of his enlistment until the first arrival of the vessel at its permanent station, or at a port in a State of the United States or in the District of Columbia, unless, in his opinion, the detention of such person for a further period is essential to the public interests, in which case he may detain him for a further period, not exceeding 30 days, after arrival at such station or port. Any person so detained shall be subject in all respects to the laws and regulations for the government of the Coast Guard until his discharge therefrom."

SEC. 2. The act entitled "An act extending the benefits of the marine hospitals to the keepers and crews of lifesaving stations", approved August 4, 1894, as amended (28 Stat. 229; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 24, sec. 8), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(a) Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the President, upon the recommendation of the Surgeon General with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, all commissioned officers, chief warrant officers, warrant officers, cadets, and enlisted men of the Coast Guard, including those on shore duty and those on detached duty, whether on active duty or retired, shall be entitled to medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization by the Public Health Service; and the dependent members of families of officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard shall be furnished medical advice and out-patient treatment by the Public Health Service at its first-, second-, and third-class relief stations, and such dependent members of families shall be furnished hospitalization at marine hospitals, if suitable accommodations are available, at a per-diem cost to the officer or enlisted man concerned equivalent to the uniform per-diem reimbursement rate for Government hospitals as approved by the President for each fiscal year. Collections of the Public Health Service for the hospitalization of such dependent members of families shall be credited to the applicable appropriation for the operation of marine hospitals and relief stations.

"(b) The act entitled 'An act to extend medical and hospital relief to retired officers and retired enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard', approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 603; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 14, sec. 179), is hereby repealed."

SEC. 3. Subdivision "Seventh" of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, and to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States", approved June 29, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 598; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 8, sec. 368), is hereby further amended by inserting in line 4 thereof after the words "Naval Auxiliary Service" the words "or the Coast Guard".

SEC. 4. Section 12 of the act entitled, "An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 789; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 10, sec. 1429), is hereby amended by inserting in line 8 thereof after the words "United States Navy" the words "or with the United States Coast Guard".

SEC. 5. Section 2 of the act of June 23, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 452; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 14, sec. 15), is hereby further amended by inserting the following sentence at the end thereof: "A cadet, upon admission to the Coast Guard Academy, shall be credited with the sum of $250 to cover the cost of his initial clothing and equipment issued, to be deducted subsequently from his pay in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury."

SEC. 6. Section 2 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act, approved July 31, 1894, as amended (28 Stat. 205; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 5, sec. 62), is hereby further amended by inserting in line 12 thereof, following the word "Navy", the words "or the Coast Guard".

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate and the next bill on the calendar—being Senate bill 2336—which is identical with a House bill now on the calendar—were recommended by the Treasury Department. They are intended merely to place the Coast Guard in exactly the same footing as is the Navy. The bills came to us from the Treasury Department with the request that they be passed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether, in view of the disparity in service as between those engaged in the Navy, who have to go to war, and visit into foreign ports, and the Coast Guard, whose duties, except perhaps in time of war, are limited to patroling the coast, the Coast Guard should be placed in the same category?

Mr. COPELAND. The Coast Guard are always at war. They patrol our coast. I know from personal observation on the Atlantic south of New York city how many lives have been saved by the Coast Guard and how they take their lives in their hands when they go out into the surf and storm. There can be no question that in peacetime the work which the Coast Guard is called upon to perform is infinitely greater than that required of the Navy.

Further than that, in the case of smuggling and bootlegging, the Coast Guard are constantly being called upon by the Government to give protection to the people and to protect the Nation's income.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has in mind, also, that the Coast Guard render an invaluable service in patrolling the ice regions of the north Atlantic Ocean. They are out there during the season of melting ice, making observations and reports, thus insuring safety in transiting the sea, one of the most valuable services the Coast Guard render.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill (S. 2335) to amend the laws relating to enlistments in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, will be indefinitely postponed.

PAY ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN COAST GUARD OFFICERS

The bill (S. 2336) to adjust the pay of certain Coast Guard officers on the retired list who were retired because of physical disability originating in line of duty in time of war, was announced as next in order.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, Calendar No. 925, being House bill 7611, relates to the same subject and is identical with the Senate bill. I ask that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and that it be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7611) to adjust the pay of certain Coast Guard officers on the retired list who were retired because of physical disability originating in line of duty in time of war, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 1, as amended, of the act of June 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 793,

ch. 563), any officer of the Coast Guard who has been retired since September 3, 1921, but prior to March 4, 1925, by reason of physical disability which originated in line of duty at any time between April 6, 1917, and March 3, 1921, inclusive, while holding higher temporary rank in the Coast Guard, shall receive from the date of the approval of this act the pay of the rank he holds on the retired list.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2336 will be indefinitely postponed.

REGULATIONS OF BUREAU OF MARINE INSPECTION AND NAVIGATION

The bill (H. R. 7017) to amend section 4450 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act of May 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1380, 1383; U. S. C. 1934 ed., title 46, sec. 239), was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York give us some information concerning the bill?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the bill was sent to us by the Department of Commerce. It provides in part that if the Director of Marine Inspection and Navigation shall find, after investigation, that a licensed officer has violated any of the provisions of the act or regulations thereunder, he shall in a written order suspend or revoke such officer's certificate. It is one of the bills which is believed by the Committee on Commerce to make for safety at sea. It has the recommendation of the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. McKELLAR. It does not require an appropraition?

Mr. COPELAND. Not at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4450 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of May 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1380, 1383; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 46, sec. 239), is amended by inserting in the third sentence of paragraph (g) of said section the words "suspended or", after the word "is" and before the word "revoked", so that the said paragraph (g) of said section, when amended, shall read as follows:

"(g) In any investigation of acts of incompetency or misconduct or of any act in violation of the provisions of this title, or of any of the regulations issued thereunder, committed by any licensed officer or any holder of a certificate of service, the person whose conduct is under investigation shall be given reasonable notice of the time, place, and subject of such investigation and an opportunity to be heard in his own defense. The whole record of the testimony received by the board conducting such investigation and the findings and recommendations of such board shall be forwarded to the Director of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, and if that officer shall find that such licensed officer or holder of certificate of service is incompetent or has been guilty of misbehavior, negligence, or unskillfulness, or has endangered life, or has willfully violated any of the provisions of this title or any of the regulations issued thereunder, he shall, in a written order reciting said findings, suspend or revoke the license or certificate of service of such officer or holder of such certificate. The person whose license or certificate of service is suspended or revoked may, within 30 days, appeal from the order of the said Director to the Secretary of Commerce. On such appeal the appellant shall be allowed to be represented by counsel. The Secretary of Commerce may alter or modify any finding of the board which conducted the investigation or of the Director of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, but the decision of the Secretary of Commerce shall be based solely on the testimony received by the said board and shall recite the findings of fact on which it is based."

STONY POINT LIGHT STATION RESERVATION, N. Y.

The bill (H. R. 7401) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the Commissioners of the Palisades Interstate Park, a body politic of the State of New York, certain portions of the Stony Point Light Station Reservation, Rockland County, N. Y., including certain appurtenant structures, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to convey to the Commissioners of the Palisades Interstate Park, for use for public-park purposes, certain portions of the Stony Point Light Station Reservation, State of New York, including certain appurtenant structures, which are not required to be retained for lighthouse purposes. The Secretary of Commerce shall describe by metes and bounds in the deed of conveyance the exact portions of the reservation transferred. The deed of conveyance shall also contain a clause that should the property so transferred at any time cease to be used for park purposes or for some other wholly public use, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 2. In exchange for the property to be transferred the Commissioners of the Palisades Interstate Park shall transfer title to the United States to the dwelling now erected on the portion of land retained by the United States for lighthouse purposes. The United States also reserves the rights-of-way over, underground, or across the area to be transferred for any use whatsoever in conducting the Lighthouse Service or other activities of the Government.

PYRAMID LAKE INDIAN RESERVATION, NEV.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 840) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev., which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue patents for certain lands entered pursuant to section 1 of the act of June 7, 1924, entitled "An act for the relief of settlers and town-site occupants of certain lands in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.", upon the payment of unpaid balances based upon reappraisals made in 1934 as follows: J. A. Ceresola, $4,595.89; W. J. Ceresola, $4,376.11; Domenico Ceresola, $4,926.63; M. P. Depaoli, $4,876.56; and the Garaventa Land & Livestock Co., $2,951.51: *Provided*, That the foregoing amounts shall be paid within 1 year from the date of the passage of this act: *Provided further*, That in the case of death of any of the entrymen, payments may be received from and patents be issued to the heirs or legal successors of the entrymen herein named.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

J. A. TIPPIT AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 1880) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Court of Claims to hear, consider, adjudicate, and enter judgment upon the claims against the United States of J. A. Tippit, L. P. Hudson, Chester Howe, J. E. Arnold, Joseph W. Gillette, J. S. Bounds, W. N. Vernon, T. B. Sullivan, J. H. Neill, David C. McCallib, J. J. Beckham, and John Toles", approved June 28, 1934, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress approved June 28, 1934, entitled "An act authorizing the Court of Claims to hear, consider, adjudicate, and enter judgment upon the claims against the United States of J. A. Tippit, L. P. Hudson, Chester Howe, J. E. Arnold, Joseph W. Gillette, J. S. Bounds, W. N. Vernon, T. B. Sullivan, J. H. Neill, David C. McCallib, J. J. Beckham, and John Toles", be, and it is hereby, amended by the addition thereto of the following sections:

"SEC. 6. In determining the liability of the United States for claims for reimbursement of expenses and for services rendered to enable the individual Mississippi Choctaw claimants benefited thereby to be identified, allotted, and enrolled in the Choctaw Nation in Oklahoma, said Court of Claims shall recognize and allow such items of expense and compensation for such services as were required to enable indigent Mississippi Choctaw Indians to be identified, allotted, and enrolled as members of the Choctaw Nation in Oklahoma under the provisions of the several statutes and rulings of the Interior Department relating to the identification, allotment, and enrollment of such Indians, or proper to be performed in their behalf: *Provided*, That said Court of Claims shall find that said persons for whose benefit said services were so performed and expenses incurred were indigent or for any other reason unable to meet the requirements of said statutes and rulings without assistance, and any provision of said original act inconsistent with the provisions of said section is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 7. All petitions heretofore filed in said court under said act of June 28, 1934, although the same may have been ordered dismissed under said original act, shall be reinstated and proceeded with under the provisions of said act as hereby amended: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this amendment shall apply only to the claims which were filed in said Court of Claims within the period of 1 year specified in the said act of June 28, 1934, and that no other period of limitations upon the filing of suits in said court shall be applicable to proceedings under said act as hereby amended.

"SEC. 8. That the name of David C. McCallib as it appears in said act should be amended to read 'David C. McCalib', and the claim referred to as that of J. T. Bounds designated the claim theretofore filed by J. S. Bounds as attorney in fact for T. A. Bounds, and the filing of said claim by the estate of T. A. Bounds shall be regarded as of sufficient compliance with the provisions of said jurisdictional act."

DELEGATE TO FIRST PAN AMERICAN CONGRESS OF DEAF MUTES

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 158) to provide for the appointment of a delegate to the First Pan American Congress of Deaf Mutes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized to appoint a member of the National Association of the Deaf as a delegate to represent the United States at the First Pan American Congress of Deaf Mutes, to be held at Buenos Aires, Argentina, on June 30, 1937. The delegate so appointed shall make a report to the President.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the expenses of such delegate and to be expended in such manner as the President may prescribe.

FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN SEVENTH WORLD'S POULTRY CONGRESS AND EXPOSITION

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 365) authorizing Federal participation in the Seventh World's Poultry Congress and Exposition to be held in the United States in 1939 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That pursuant to section 2 of the Public Resolution No. 113, approved June 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1568), authorizing and requesting the President to extend to the World's Poultry Science Association an invitation to hold the Seventh World's Poultry Congress and Exposition in the United States in 1939, and to extend an invitation to foreign governments to participate in and be represented by delegates and exhibits in such congress and exposition, the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the expenses of such meeting, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; stenographic reporting and translating services by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); rent; traveling expenses within the United States (and by indirect routes and by airplane if specifically authorized by the Secretary of State); purchase of necessary books, documents, newspapers, and periodicals; stationery; official cards; printing and binding; Government exhibits; entertainment; hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, including the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments may have been made for any of the purposes herein specified: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State is authorized to transfer to any department or independent establishment of the Government with the consent of the head thereof any part of the funds appropriated pursuant to this act for direct expenditure by such department or establishment for the purposes specified in this act.

M. M. TWICHEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2299) for the relief of M. M. Twichel which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,638.46 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for services rendered and expenses incurred in connection with the burial of Indians on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont." and to insert "$3,346.66, or so much thereof as may be necessary, in full and complete satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for services rendered and expenses incurred in connection with the burial of Indians on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont., prior to April 30, 1937: *Provided*, That before any payment is made hereunder the Secretary of the Interior shall certify that no part of the amount claimed has heretofore been paid", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to M. M. Twichel, of St. Ignatius, Mont., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,346.66, or so much thereof as may be necessary, in full and complete satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for services rendered and expenses incurred in connection with the burial of Indians on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont., prior to April 30, 1937: *Provided*, That before any payment is made hereunder the Secretary of the Interior shall certify that no part of the amount claimed has heretofore been paid.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2601) to provide for refund of amount, as tax under the Bankhead Cotton Act, 1934, the Kerr Tobacco Act as amended, and the Potato Act of 1935 was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

JOSEPH A. RUDY

The bill (H. R. 3251) for the relief of Joseph A. Rudy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

N. C. NELSON

The bill (H. R. 4246) for the relief of N. C. Nelson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HANS EVERSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3551) for the relief of Hans Everson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$3,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, the sum of $3,500 to Hans Everson, Phillips, Wisconsin, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for personal injuries suffered by him on February 12, 1935, when the sleigh on which he was riding was struck by a United States Civilian Conservation Corps truck, on County Highway E, Price County, Wis.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

WEYMOUTH KIRKLAND AND ROBERT N. GOLDING

The bill (H. R. 1086) for the relief of Weymouth Kirkland and Robert N. Golding was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MABEL F. HOLLINGSWORTH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 606) for the relief of Mabel F. Hollingsworth, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment at the end of the bill to add a provisio, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in the case of Mabel F. Hollingsworth, of West Allis, Wis., widow of William L. Hollingsworth, late a retired railway postal clerk, insofar as said Mabel F. Hollingsworth's claim for compensation for the death of said William L. Hollingsworth is concerned, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized and directed to consider and act upon any claim filed with the Commission, within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, by said Mabel F. Hollingsworth for compensation under the provisions of such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, for the death of said William L. Hollingsworth: *Provided*, That compensation, if any, shall commence from and after the date of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

DEWEY JACK KRAUSS

The bill (H. R. 1420) for the relief of Dewey Jack Krauss, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REIMBURSEMENT OF ENLISTED MEN OF NAVY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4688) to provide for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men and

former enlisted men of the Navy for the value of personal effects lost, damaged, or destroyed during a hurricane in Samoa on January 15, 1931, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "reimburse", to insert "after claimants shall have filed itemized statements showing actual damages sustained, by proper appraisal, and", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $440.15, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, after claimants shall have filed itemized statements showing actual damages sustained, by proper appraisal, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, enlisted men or former enlisted men of the Navy, for the value of personal effects lost, damaged, or destroyed as a result of a hurricane which struck Ofu and Ta'u, Samoa, on January 15, 1931: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4689) to provide an additional sum for the payment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain officers and enlisted men or former 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", approved January 21, 1936 (49 Stat. 2212), was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF CLINCH COUNTY FROM SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

The bill (S. 2115) to amend section 77 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to transfer Clinch County from the southern district of Georgia to the middle district was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, let us have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this bill merely provides for the transfer of Clinch County from the southern district of Georgia to the middle district. It adds no cost and does not affect anyone except the residents of that county. The transfer of the county to the middle district will afford them a more convenient place for holding court.

Mr. KING. Would it require the construction of another courthouse and employment of additional personnel?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no. The bill would simply attach the county to another district.

Mr. KING. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2115) to amend section 77 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to transfer Clinch County from the southern district of Georgia to the middle district was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsection (d) of section 77 of the Judicial Code, as amended, is amended by inserting after the name "Berrien" a comma and the name "Clinch."

(b) Subsection (f) of section 77 of the Judicial Code, as amended, is amended by striking out the following: "Clinch.".

WILLIAM T. J. RYAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2557) for the relief of William T. J. Ryan, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 649), relating to the support of families of enlisted men in the Military Establishment who served during the expedition into Mexico, the claim of William T. J. Ryan, then sergeant, Headquarters Battery, Seventy-sixth Regiment United States Field Artillery, Fort D. A. Russell, Wyo., for Federal support of his wife, Beulah E. Ryan, be held and considered to have been received in the office of the depot quartermaster, Washington, D. C., on or before June 30, 1917, in view of the fact that delay in receipt occurred through no fault of the soldier but through loss or miscarriage of his application in the mails.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, let us have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, a bill identical with the one under consideration passed the Senate during the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses in behalf of the claimant, William T. J. Ryan. The enactment of this legislation will occasion the Government an expense of only $164, and will operate to discharge a just obligation. While in the Army during the World War, Ryan made application for an allotment under the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 619–649), for the support of his wife, Mrs. Beulah E. Ryan. His application was either lost in the mails or otherwise misplaced, and the allotment was never paid.

Evidence before the committee shows that he did submit his application for this allotment to his commanding officer, and that it was forwarded through official channels. Therefore the subsequent misplacing of the application was in no way the claimant's fault. Under these circumstances, the committee feels that the claimant is entitled to the favorable consideration of the bill under discussion.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Texas why the Secretary of War recommended adversely?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The War Department, as a rule, recommends adversely in matters of this kind, and there must be particular facts showing particular equities, otherwise we would not differ from the Department.

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

E. SULLIVAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2232) for the relief of E. Sullivan, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. Sullivan, captain, Air Corps, United States Army, the sum of $1,613.25; such sum representing stoppage in his pay on account of the embezzlement by E. J. Barricklow, a civilian employee, of public funds for which said E. Sullivan was held accountable as agent finance officer at Kelly Field, Tex., from June 1927 to June 1928.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there seems to be an adverse report from the Department. Will the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] give us an explanation?

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is another case where the committee, after going into the facts, feels that the claimant is justified. I shall be glad to give the Senator a further statement regarding it if he desires.

Mr. KING. Very well.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Capt. E. Sullivan the sum of $1,613.25, representing stoppage in his pay on account of the embezzlement of public funds by a civilian employee. Sullivan was held accountable for this amount while agent finance officer at Kelly Field, Tex., from June 1927 to June 1928. An identical bill passed the Senate during the last Congress in behalf of Captain Sullivan.

When the irregularities at Kelly Field were detected, an investigation was instigated, which was participated in by agents of the Justice Department and Secret Service men of the Treasury Department, as well as inspectors of the Army. It was found that for a period of about 2 years a civilian employee had been preparing false short-form rolls, bearing fictitious names of from one to five alleged employees, to which rolls he forged the names of the fictitious employees and the name of the quartermaster as certifying officer. Some of these fraudulent rolls were presented to the local agent finance officer, accompanied by forged hand receipt of the quartermaster. Through this procedure, and on these rolls duly and properly prepared as to form but forged, the civilian employee obtained the money in cash and misappropriated it to his own use.

The Army inspector in the corps area reported that there was no carelessness or negligence on the part of the several agent officers in making payments of the sums charged against them, and that "they took every precaution required of them." The corps area commander concurred in this report, but the report was overruled by the War Department, and it was held that these men, including Sullivan, were to be held responsible. The corps area commander ordered a second investigation, and on the basis of this second study of the matter again held that Sullivan and these men could not be held responsible. However, the corps area authorities were overruled. The committee believes Captain Sullivan's claim is meritorious, and has again reported favorably on legislation to reimburse him for the amount he was called upon to pay as a result of the activities of the civilian employee.

Mr. KING. I have no objection.

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

COL. JOHN A. LOCKWOOD, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2273) granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Col. John A. Lockwood, United States Army, retired, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the President is hereby authorized to cause the recommendation for the award of a decoration to Col. John A. Lockwood, United States Army, retired, who served as a captain in the United States Army, commanding Troop M, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, during October, November, and December, 1899, for distinguished conduct in the Philippine Islands, to be considered by the proper boards or authorities, and such award made to the said John A. Lockwood, as his said conduct merits.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the consideration of the recommendation of an award for distinguished service to Col. John A. Lockwood, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes."

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR HOLDING COURT AT COLUMBIA, TENN.

The bill (H. R. 6358) to amend section 107, as amended, of the Judicial Code so as to eliminate the requirement that suitable accommodations for holding court at Columbia, Tenn., be provided by the local authorities was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the second proviso of section 107, as amended, of the Judicial Code (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 28, sec. 188) is amended by striking out the period at the end of said proviso, and adding the following: "until, subject to the recommendation of the Attorney General of the United States with respect to providing such rooms and accommodations for holding court at Columbia, a public building shall have been erected or other Federal space provided for court purposes in said city."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 537) to provide suitable accommodations for the district court of the United States at Glasgow, Mont., was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there is an adverse report on that measure by the Attorney General. I suggest that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

GREEN BAY & MISSISSIPPI CANAL CO.

The bill (H. R. 5552) to provide for the relinquishment of an easement granted to the United States by the Green Bay & Mississippi Canal Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to release to the Green Bay & Mississippi Canal Co., its successors or assigns, the easement heretofore granted by the Green Bay & Mississippi Canal Co. to the United States of America for the construction and maintenance of an 8-inch sewer or drain, together with necessary manholes, from a point in the southeasterly side of the post-office site, distant approximately 122 feet northwardly from the northeasterly bank of the Power Canal, and thence traversing in a southeastwardly direction lots 4 to 14, inclusive, in block 2, a distance of approximately 550 feet to the northwesterly side of the open sewer which flows in a northeastwardly direction along the southeasterly side of said lot 14 and to pass drainage and sewage from the site through said 8-inch sewer into said open sewer, in the city of Kaukauna, Outagamie County, Wis.

ADA SAUL AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2091) for the relief of Ada Saul, Steve Dolack, and Marie McDonald, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Treasury", to strike out "not otherwise appropriated" and insert "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, (1) to Ada Saul, of Belt, Mont., the sum of $5,000 in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States resulting from the death of her daughter, Isabel Saul, who was killed when a Civilian Conservation Corps truck in which she was riding, driven by Enrollee Cecil Simpson, overturned on January 20, 1936, about 1 mile from Armington, Mont.; (2) to Steve Dolack, of Armington, Mont., the sum of $5,000 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States resulting from the death of his son, Anthony Dolack, who was killed in the same accident; and (3) to Marie McDonald, of Belt, Mont., the sum of $3,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States resulting from personal injuries sustained by her in the same accident: *Provided,* That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claims. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claims, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

EARL HILL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 449) for the relief of Earl Hill, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Treasury", to strike out "not otherwise appropriated" and insert "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to Earl Hill, of Clarksville, Ark., the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for permanent personal injury received when he was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck as it passed the truck in which he was a passenger on State Highway No. 7, between Clarksville and Cowell, Ark., August 4, 1935: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONSOLIDATED AIRCRAFT CORPORATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1881) for the relief of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$89,645.56. Such sum represents" and insert "$79,116.88, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for", and at the end of the bill to insert a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Consolidated

Aircraft Corporation the sum of $79,116.88, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for additional costs incurred by such corporation in the performance of a contract with the Department of the Navy dated June 13, 1933 (contract numbered No–31792): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] favor us with an explanation of this bill?

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, in 1933 the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation had a contract with the Navy Department for building airplanes. With the adoption of the National Industrial Recovery Act it became necessary for this contractor, like many other contractors, to increase the amount of compensation paid to its employees. That was done under the provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act. Later, Congress passed an act which provided that compensation for such additional costs should be paid to the various companies which had contracted. As a result of that act, an audit was made of the books of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, and the amount to which the bill is amended, $79,116.88, is the amount recommended by the Navy Department as a result of the audit made by the auditors of the Navy Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I reserve the right to move to reconsider the votes by which this bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and passed. I wish to look into the bill tomorrow and will ask to have it withheld from transmission to the House of Representatives so that I may have a chance to examine the bill.

REDUCTION OF RATES IN CASE OF EARTHQUAKE, FLOOD, OR OTHER DISASTER

The bill (S. 2619) to amend paragraph (1) of section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of paragraph (1) of section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, as reads as follows: "Nothing in this part shall prevent any carrier or carriers subject to this part from giving reduced rates for the transportation of property to or from any section of the country with the object of providing relief in case of earthquake, flood, fire, famine, drought, epidemic, pestilence, or other calamitous visitation or disaster, if such reduced rates have first been authorized by order of the Commission (with or without a hearing); but in any such order the Commission shall define such section and shall specify the period during which such reduced rates are to remain in effect" is amended to read as follows: "Nothing in this part shall prevent any carrier or carriers subject to this part from giving reduced rates for the transportation of property to or from any section of the country with the object of providing relief in case of earthquake, flood, fire, famine, drought, epidemic, pestilence, or other calamitous visitation or disaster, if such reduced rates have first been authorized by order of the Commission (with or without a hearing); but in any such order the Commission shall (1) define such section, (2) specify the period during which such reduced rates are to remain in effect, and (3) clearly define the class or classes of persons entitled to such reduced rates: *Provided*, That any such order may define the class or classes entitled to such reduced rates as being persons designated as being in distress and in need of relief by agents of the United States or any State authorized to assist in relieving the distress caused by any such calamitous visitation or disaster. No carrier subject to the provisions of this part shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of such part with respect to undue or unreasonable preference or unjust discrimination by reason of the fact that such carrier extends such reduced rates only to the class or classes of persons defined in the order of the Commission authorizing such reduced rates."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2579) to provide more effectively for the marking of wrecked and sunken craft for the protection of navigation, to improve the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TWIN RIVER POINT LIGHTHOUSE RESERVATION, WIS.

The bill (H. R. 1961) to authorize the conveyance by the United States to the State of Wisconsin of a portion of the Twin River Point Lighthouse Reservation, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to the conditions hereinafter specified, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to convey to the State of Wisconsin for State park purposes all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the Twin River Point Lighthouse Reservation, Manitowoc County, Wis., which is not required to be retained for lighthouse purposes. The Secretary of Commerce shall describe by metes and bounds in the deed of conveyance the exact portion of such reservation transferred.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain the express condition that if the State of Wisconsin shall at any time cease to use the property as a State park for public recreation, or shall alienate or attempt to alienate such property, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 3. The United States reserves the right to resume ownership, possession, and control for Government purposes, of any property conveyed under authority of this act, at any time and without the consent of the State of Wisconsin.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Commerce is also authorized, in his discretion, to lease to the State of Wisconsin for a period of 25 years that portion of the Twin River Point Lighthouse Reservation not conveyed by him under authority of this act. Such lease shall be subject to revocation at any time by the Secretary of Commerce.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5860) making further provision for the fisheries of Alaska was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I should like an opportunity to look into this bill. It involves the question of fisheries in Alaska. I did not know of the bill until the calendar was called today. I ask that it go over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

WILLIAM C. WILLAHAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2444) for the relief of William C. Willahan, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$719.40" and insert "$421.65"; in line 8, after the word "amounts", to strike out "paid by" and insert "withheld from"; in line 11, after the word "July", to strike out "24" and insert "14"; and in the same line, after "1934", to strike out "and in settlement no. G–68976–IN, dated February 25, 1935", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William C. Willahan, formerly superintendent and special disbursing agent at the Sisseton Indian Agency, Sisseton, S. Dak., the sum of $421.65, representing amounts withheld from him in settlement of the charges made against his accounts by reason of disallowances in settlement no. F–24532–IN, dated July 14, 1934, such disallowances being due to embezzlement on the part of a subordinate employee and made without the knowledge or procurement of said William C. Willahan. The sum paid under this act shall be exempt from the claims of creditors and shall not be liable to attachment, levy, or seizure under any legal or equitable process, before or after payment; and no part of such sum shall be withheld from said William C. Willahan, by reason of, or be applied to the payment of, the charges against his accounts hereinbefore referred to.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2670) to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife restoration projects, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. May we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. KING. I ask that the bill go over. It is too important a bill to be considered under the 5-minute rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

SAMUEL L. DWYER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2417) for the relief of Samuel L. Dwyer, which had been reported

from the Committee on Claims with an amendment at the end of the bill to insert a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel L. Dwyer, of Palmerdale, Ala., the sum of $2,500, in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for damages sustained by him for medical expense and by his 5-year-old son, Luther Allen Dwyer, for permanent disfigurement, when the explosion of a dynamite cap with which the latter was playing, after finding it on the homestead of his father where said cap had been negligently left by employees of the Resettlement Administration engaged in clearing such land, blew off two fingers of his left hand below the first joint: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SCOTT HART

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2261) for the relief of Scott Hart, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after "$5,663',, to insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States", and at the end of the bill to insert a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Scott Hart the sum of $5,663, in full settlement of all claims against the United States, for injuries sustained by him on or about November 17, 1935, when an automobile in which he was a passenger struck a ditch which had been dug across the public highway by personnel of the Lewes Coast Guard Station: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

WILLIAM E. JONES AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 667) for the relief of William E. Jones, Walter M. Marston, William Ellery, Richard P. Hallowell, 2d, and Malcolm Donald as executors under the will of Frank W. Hallowell; and Malcolm Donald as executor under the will of Gordon Donald, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to receive, consider, and determine, in accordance with law but without regard to any statute of limitations, any claims filed not later than 6 months after the passage of this act by William E. Jones, of Newton, Mass.; Walter M. Marston, of Newton, Mass.; William Ellery, of Brookline, Mass.; Richard P. Hallowell, 2d, and Malcolm Donald as executors under the will of Frank W. Hallowell, late of Newton, Mass.; and Malcolm Donald as executor under the will of Gordon Donald, late of Wellesley, Mass., for the refund of Federal income and excess-profits taxes collected from the said William E. Jones, Walter M. Marston, William Ellery, Frank W. Hallowell, and Gordon Donald for the year 1917 in excess of the amounts properly due; and any claim so filed shall be regarded and treated for all purposes as if it had been duly filed within the period fixed by any statute of limitations which, except for the passage of this act, would be applicable thereto: *Provided*, That in the settlement of any claim so filed there shall be no allowance of interest.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] if the bill places any limitation upon the amounts which may be awarded, and, if not, what standards are to be applied in determining the obligation, if any, of the Government.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, under the law as it existed in 1917, as it was interpreted by the Court in a decision handed down in 1926, the proper rule of construction as to the determination of these income taxes was passed upon by the Court, was accepted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and was thereafter followed. This bill was introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]; but I think I am wholly correct in saying that the law as it was laid down in the decision of 1926 will be determinative of the amount involved in this case.

Mr. KING. What reason is there for waiving the statute of limitations in this case? I will say, by way of parenthesis, that the Finance Committee has been very liberal in extending the period beyond which claims of this kind may be barred.

Mr. WHITE. The reason is, Mr. President, that in passing upon this case originally, the Bureau of Internal Revenue laid down an entirely erroneous rule of law. The Bureau held that the persons concerned were not entitled to recover. Subsequently to that ruling by the Internal Revenue Bureau, the court, in a case which was before it, completely reversed the Internal Revenue Bureau; and then, of course, the Internal Revenue Bureau accepted the decision of the court, and, in similar cases, acted on it. This bill is simply to give these persons the opportunity to go before the Bureau of Internal Revenue and seek a refund according to the law as the court has laid it down. That is all that is involved in the measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, why did the Treasury Department report against the bill?

Mr. WHITE. I think because of the fact that before the decision of the court was handed down, the statute of limitations had run against a refund; and the Treasury, following its invariable rule, declined to consider a case where the statute had once run against it. Then came the decision of the court which declared that the ruling of the Internal Revenue Bureau was wrong. In those circumstances it seemed to the committee that these persons ought to be permitted to go before the Treasury Department and establish their rights according to the law as the court had laid it down.

That is all that is involved in the case.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a great many demands have been made to set aside the statute of limitations. In some instances the demands were warranted. There were equities that appealed to the Committee on Finance and to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I fully appreciate what the Senator is saying, and I realize the force of his statement.

This provision of law existed only during 1917, however, and the Congress then repealed it; and where the Bureau manifestly has made an error, which the Bureau itself acknowledges, it does seem that a statutory bar ought not to be set up against the right of these persons to appear before the Bureau and make out a case within the rules of law.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Maine whether similar bills have not been favorably reported and passed by the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. I think that is true in the case of some bills, although, of course, this is a very unusual case, a court having directly overruled a prior decision of the Treasury Department. In those circumstances it seems clear that the claimants ought to have their rights according to the law.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not a fact that the Committee on Claims was unanimously of the opinion that this is a meritorious case?

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

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

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The case impressed me thus: The claimant was right in the first instance but was ruled against by one who was afterward overruled by the final authority.

Mr. WHITE. That is true.

Mr. McCARRAN. Therefore, he was right in the first instance, and should be accorded his rights.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should be the last person in the world to seek to have the Government take advantage of a rich man or a poor man. It is the province of the Government to be fair and just to everyone. A great many demands have been made, however, to waive the statute of limitations and permit the presentation of claims 5, 10, and as many as 15 years after payment was made.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I do not recall any case in which it was perfectly clear that the Government was in error where Congress has refused to remove the bar of the statute.

Mr. WALSH. And, may I add, where the decision of the court pointing out the error was made after the statute of limitation had run.

Mr. WHITE. That is correct.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine state the amount that is claimed?

Mr. WHITE. I do not know the actual amount. Of course, that would be a matter of proof before the Department.

To me, the amount was not of consequence. What impressed me in connection with this case was that a wrong decision had been made which prejudiced these persons; a court had declared the decision wrong; and it seems to me just plain equity and right that these claimants should have an opportunity to go before the Department.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill, but I shall enter a motion to reconsider the action upon it; and tomorrow I shall confer with the Treasury Department and find out whether there are any valid objections to the bill, in which event I shall then move to take up the question for reconsideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion of the Senator from Utah to reconsider the votes by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and passed will be entered.

CONTROL AND PREVENTION OF CANCER

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am under obligation to leave the city at 4 o'clock, and I desire to say a word at this time.

The Committee on Commerce reported favorably today Senate bill 2067, authorizing the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to control and prevent the spread of the disease of cancer. It is a unique bill. It was introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and has been endorsed by every Senator. I have never known anything like it; every other Senator joins with the Senator from Washington in advocating the bill.

We have seen fit to make some changes in the committee, to revise the bill, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert new language.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, what is the measure to which the Senator is referring?

Mr. COPELAND. It is the so-called cancer bill. I ask the Senator from Utah to bear with me, because of my personal obligation to leave the chamber in a few minutes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be taken up at this time, so that the Senator from Washington may have it passed. He deserves great credit, and I am sure every one of us wishes to assist him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

Mr. McNARY. What is the bill?

Mr. COPELAND. It is the "cancer bill."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New York one question?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. KING. We have appropriated a considerable sum of money, as I recall, for the establishment of a public-health institute. I may not give the correct name.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KING. It was presumed when the law was enacted creating that organization that it would have to deal with investigations in regard to curable diseases, and so on. Why should not that organization take up the matter covered under the measure to which the Senator refers? Does the bill commit the investigation to the Public Health Institute?

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator is referring to the Ransdell bill?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. That was a splendid measure. It had to do largely with the erection of buildings to be used by the Institute of Public Health. The bill to which I am referring does not create a new board. It puts the work in charge of the very institution to which the Senator has called attention. We held a hearing the other day under the direction of the Senator from Washington, who had present representatives of all the great medical concerns and research bodies of this country and of Canada, and one witness from England.

Mr. President, I do not wish to make the speech of the Senator from Washington, because sometime ago he made an address on the subject which would do credit to the best-informed research expert in cancer in this country or in any other country. The bill provides that there shall be a steady attack upon cancer. We did not go as far as the Senator from Washington wished. He provided for the appropriation of $1,000,000 a year. We reduced the amount to $700,000. The investigation is to be carried out wholly under the direction of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and I am sure that no finer act can be done by the Congress than to pass the bill.

I do not wish to say more, because the Senator from Washington had the inspiration and the genius to bring the subject before us, following the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] who made the same effort some years ago. I hope the Senate will unanimously and speedily pass the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2067) authorizing the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to control and prevent the spread of the disease of cancer, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That for the purposes of conducting researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, diagnosis, and treatment of cancer; assisting and fostering similar research activities by other agencies, public and private; and promoting the coordination of all such researches and activities and the useful application of their results, with a view to the development and prompt widespread use of the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of cancer, there is hereby established in the Public Health Service a division which shall be known as the National Cancer Institute (hereinafter referred to as the "Institute").

SEC. 2. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (hereinafter referred to as the "Surgeon General") is authorized and directed for the purposes of this act and subject to its provisions, through the Institute and in cooperation with the National Cancer Advisory Council hereinafter established—

(a) To conduct, assist, and foster researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of cancer;

(b) To promote the coordination of researches conducted by the Institute and similar researches conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals;

(c) To procure, use, and lend radium as hereinafter provided;

(d) To provide training and instruction in technical matters relating to the diagnosis and treatment of cancer;

(e) To provide fellowships in the Institute from funds appropriated or donated for such purpose;

(f) To secure for the Institute consultation services and advice of cancer experts from the United States and abroad; and

(g) To cooperate with State health agencies in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created the National Advisory Cancer Council (herein referred to as the "Council"), to consist of six members to be appointed by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and of the Surgeon General, ex officio, who shall be chairman of the Council. The six appointed members shall be selected from leading medical or scientific au-

thorities who are outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of cancer in the United States. Each appointed member shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Surgeon General at the time of appointment, two at the end of the first year, two at the end of the second year, and two at the end of the third year after the date of the first meeting of the Council. No appointed member shall be eligible to serve continuously for more than 3 years, but shall be eligible for reappointment if he has not served as a member of the Council at any time within 12 months immediately preceding his reappointment. Each appointed member shall receive compensation at the rate of $25 per day during the time spent in attending meetings of the Council and for the time devoted to official business of the Council under this act, and actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while away from his place of residence upon official business under this act.

SEC. 4. The Council is authorized—

(a) To review research projects or programs submitted to or initiated by it relating to the study of the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis and treatment of cancer, and certify approval to the Surgeon General for prosecution under section 2 (a) hereof any such projects which it believes show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis and treatment of cancer;

(b) To collect information as to studies which are being carried on in the United States or any other country as to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of cancer, by correspondence or by personal investigation of such studies, and with the approval of the Surgeon General make available such information through the appropriate publications for the benefit of health agencies and organizations (public or private), physicians, or any other scientists, and for the information of the general public;

(c) To review applications from any university, hospital, laboratory, or other institution, whether public or private, or from individuals, for grants in aid for research projects relating to cancer, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of grants in aid in the cases of such projects which show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of cancer;

(d) To recommend to the Secretary of the Treasury for acceptance conditional gifts pursuant to section 6; and

(e) To make recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. In carrying out the provisions of section 2 the Surgeon General is authorized—

(a) With the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to purchase radium, from time to time, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; to make such radium available for use in carrying out the purpose of this act; and, for such consideration and subject to such conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, to lend such radium to institutions, now existing or hereafter established in the United States, for the study of the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of cancer, or for the treatment of cancer;

(b) To provide the necessary facilities where training and instruction may be given in all technical matters relating to diagnosis and treatment of cancer to such persons as in the opinion of the Surgeon General have proper technical training and shall be designated by him for such training or instruction; such persons while receiving training or instruction may, with the approval of the Surgeon General, receive a per-diem allowance to be fixed by the Surgeon General but not to exceed $10;

(c) To establish and maintain, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, research fellowships in the Institute with such stipends or allowances (including traveling and subsistence expenses) as the Surgeon General may deem necessary to procure the assistance of the most brilliant and promising research fellows from the United States or abroad;

(d) To secure for the Institute, from time to time and for such periods as may be advisable, the assistance and advice of experts, scholars, and consultants from the United States or abroad who are learned and experienced in the problems involved in accomplishing the purposes of this act;

(e) To make grants in aid for research projects certified by the Council pursuant to section 4 (c); and

(f) To adopt, upon recommendation of the Council and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, such additional means as the Surgeon General may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of this act.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States gifts made unconditionally by will or otherwise for study, investigation, or research into the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of cancer, or for the acquisition of grounds or for the erection, equipment, and maintenance of premises, buildings, and equipment for the Institute. Conditional gifts may be accepted by the Secretary if recommended by the Surgeon General and the council. Any such gifts, if in money, shall be held in trusts and shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in securities of the United States, and the principal or income thereof shall be expended by the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the purposes prescribed by this act, subject to the same examination and audit as provided for appropriations made for the Public Health Service by Congress. Donations of $500,000 or over in aid of research under this act shall be acknowledged permanently by the establishment within the Institute of suitable memorials to the donors.

SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $750,000 for the erection and equipment of a suitable and adequate building and facilities for the use of the Institute in carrying out the provisions of this act. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, a suitable and adequate site or sites in or near the District of Columbia for such building and facilities, and to erect thereon, furnish, and equip such buildings and facilities when funds are made available.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $700,000 for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act (except subsection (a) hereof). Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection may be expended in the District of Columbia for personal services, stenographic recording and translating services, by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; traveling expenses (including the expenses of attendance at meetings when specifically authorized by the Surgeon General); rental, supplies, and equipment, purchase and exchange of medical books, books of reference, directories, periodicals, newspapers, and press clippings; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding (in addition to that otherwise provided by law); and for all other necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appointed in the Public Health Service, in accordance with applicable law, such commissioned officers as may be necessary to aid in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(b) This act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting (1) the functions, under any other act, of the Public Health Service or any other agency of the United States relating to the study of the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of cancer; or (2) the expenditure of money therefor.

(c) The Surgeon General with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(d) The Surgeon General shall include in his annual report for transmission to Congress a full report of the administration of this act, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements.

(e) This act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

(f) This act may be cited as the "National Cancer Institute Act."

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I do not wish to debate the bill at length. I desire, however, to point out anew that the Members of the Senate with whom I have discussed the bill, have without a single exception been very responsive to the urging from many sources that the Federal Government now bring to bear on the problem of cancer the best that it has to offer in the way of scientific assistance. It was only a few years ago that it began to recognize the dire significance of this scourge. Cancer is now killing more people every 2 years than have been killed in all the wars in which this country has been engaged since the birth of the Republic, and they die in a horrible fashion.

Science so far has been unable to put its finger on the cause of cancer, and the bill is aimed in only one direction and has only one objective, that is, to bring all the magnificent agencies of science to bear, through the assistance, aid, and cooperation of the Government, on finding the cause of cancer, not the cure, because the hospitals and medical associations of the country can take care of that, but the cause of this disease, which now is completely shrouded in mystery. I do not believe we could find a greater challenge to our best efforts than is the challenge of this disease which so terribly destroys more people every 2 years than have been killed in all the wars of the Republic. God knows the wars have cost enough money; they have cost hundreds of millions and billions of dollars; yet this fell destroyer is taking more lives than have been taken in all the wars concerning which we have heard in song and story which have thrilled us from childhood.

I hope there will be no objection to the bill, and that it will be passed forthwith.

Mr. BONE subsequently said: Mr. President, at the time of my brief statement in reference to Senate bill 2067, the so-called cancer bill, I omitted to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] desired

that his name be added to those of the other 94 Senators whose names appear on the bill.

I also have received a request from the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] that his name be added to the bill. At the time the bill was introduced the Senator from New Jersey was not a Member of the body, not having been sworn in. So I take it that the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] will be added to the bill. It is a matter of form, but I am a little uncertain as to the other portion of the request. I ask unanimous consent that despite the fact that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] was not a Member of the body at the time the bill was introduced, his name be added to the list of those sponsoring the bill.

Mr. KING. Nunc pro tunc.

Mr. BONE. Nunc pro tunc. I wish to have this action taken for the purpose of the RECORD, to show that every Senator now joins me in introducing the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] will be included in the list of those joining in introducing the bill.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to cancer; to establish the National Cancer Institute; and for other purposes."

THE CORBITT CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1514) for the relief of the Corbitt Co., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "Treasury", to strike out the word "is" and insert "be, and he is hereby"; on line 7, to strike out "such sum representing the amount of" and to insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for"; and to insert a proviso at the end of the bill, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Corbitt Co., of Henderson, N. C., the sum of $6,659.80, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for liquidated damages for delinquency in making deliveries charged against such company in the settlement of a certain contract (numbered W-ord-226) entered into by such company with the War Department, for furnishing twenty T9 scout cars and a quantity of spare parts: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, this bill, introduced by me, is for the relief of the Corbitt Co., of Henderson, N. C., a company engaged in the manufacture of motor-driven vehicles. The bill was reported by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], but I do not see him in the Chamber at the present time. My colleague, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and I were interested in the matter, and I see my colleague is now in the Chamber.

The Corbitt Co. entered into a contract with the War Department for the manufacture of 20 T9 scout cars. As a result of the trucks not having been delivered at the time or times specified in the contract, the War Department withheld approximately $7,000, charging liquidated damages on account of the delay.

When the matter was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], referred it to a subcommittee of which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN] served as chairman. I recall that he held hearings on the matter, and made an investigation, and referred the claim to the War Department for their opinion. They in turn referred it to another department of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. To the Acting Comptroller.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; to the Acting Comptroller; and I shall come to his letter in a moment.

Liquidated damages in the sum of approximately $7,000 were withheld by the War Department on account of the fact that the trucks were not delivered at the times specified in the contract. But I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that on investigation it was learned that the delay was not the fault of the Corbitt Co., but was the fault of the War Department, for the reason that they had not provided inspection of the trucks at the time the trucks were completed and ready for delivery by the Corbitt Co. In other words, the Corbitt Co. had completed the trucks and had them on their property at Henderson, N. C., and were ready and willing and waiting to make delivery as per the terms of the contract, but they could not make the delivery until the trucks had been duly inspected by the representatives of the War Department.

After having made investigation, the Senator from Kentucky, as chairman of the subcommittee, recommended that the Corbitt Co. be not occasioned the loss of six thousand three hundred and some odd dollars of the $7,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Were the trucks actually delivered?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Oh, yes, the trucks have been delivered. I see in the report made by the Senator from Kentucky a letter under date of March 5, 1937, addressed to my colleague the senior Senator from North Carolina, by Hon. Harry Woodring, Secretary of War, and another letter addressed by the Accounting Department to my colleague under date of April 20.

After thoroughly investigating the matter the Senator from Kentucky, chairman of the subcommittee, stated that it was not the fault of the Corbitt Co. that the delay was occasioned, but that the fault was attributable to the fact that the inspection had not been provided by the War Department, and I understand it was not provided at that time on account of the fact that they had other inspections to make. It was no fault of the Corbitt Co., of Henderson, N. C.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I understand the bill is a meritorious measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

CLAIMS OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS OF WISCONSIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2060) to amend the Wisconsin Chippewa Jurisdictional Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. L. 1049) which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, on page 4, line 18, after the word "Code", to insert "(Revised Statutes, sec. 2103)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first, second, and third sections of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin to submit claims to the Court of Claims", approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. L. 1049), are amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That all claims of whatsoever nature which any tribe or band of Chippewa Indians now residing in Wisconsin, or any tribe or band of Chippewa Indians heretofore a part of or affiliated with the Lake Superior Band of Chippewa Indians and now residing in Michigan or Minnesota, may have against the United States, which have not heretofore been determined by the Court of Claims or the Supreme Court of the United States, may be submitted to the Court of Claims with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States by either party, anything in the Judicial Code of the United States or amendments thereto to the contrary nowithstanding, for determination of the amount, if any, due said Indians from the United States under any treaties, agreements, or laws of Congress, or for the misappropriation or waste of any of the funds or lands of said Indians or band or bands thereof, or for the failure of the United States to pay said Indians any money or other property due; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims, with the said right of either party to appeal, to hear and determine all legal and equita-

ble claims, if any, of said Indians against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon.

"SEC. 2. If any claim or claims be submitted to said courts they shall settle the rights therein, both legal and equitable, of each and all of the parties thereto, notwithstanding lapse of time or statutes of limitations, and any payment which may have been made upon any claim so submitted shall not be pleaded as an estoppel, but may be pleaded as an offset in such suits or actions, and the United States shall be allowed credit for all sums heretofore paid or expended for the benefit of said Indians or any band thereof, including gratuities, and that laches shall not be pleaded as a defense thereto. The claim or claims of the said Indians, or any band or bands thereof, may be presented separately or jointly by petition, subject, however, to amendment, to conform to the evidence at any time prior to argument before the Court of Claims of the case on its merits, suit to be filed within 8 years after the passage of this act; and such action shall make the petitioner or petitioners party plaintiff or plaintiffs and the United States party defendant, and any band or bands of said Indians or any other Indians or band of Indians the court may deem necessary to a final determination of such suit or suits may be joined therein as the court may order. Such petition, which shall be signed by the attorney or attorneys employed by said Indians or any bands thereof, or by the State of Wisconsin in their behalf, shall set forth all the facts on which the claims for recovery are based and said petition shall be signed by the attorney or attorneys so employed, and no other verification shall be necessary. Official letters, papers, documents, and public records, or certified copies thereof, may be used in evidence, and the departments of the Government shall give to the attorney or attorneys of said Indians or bands thereof access to such treaties, papers, correspondence, or records as may be needed by the attorney or attorneys for said tribe or bands of Indians.

"SEC. 3. Upon final determination of such suit, cause, or action, the Court of Claims shall decree such fee and necessary expenses as it shall find reasonable and proper to be paid to the attorney or attorneys employed therein by said tribe or bands of Indians under contracts executed and approved as hereinafter provided, and in no case shall the fee decreed by said Court of Claims be in excess of the amounts stipulated in said contracts. Such contract on behalf of any tribe or band which has organized and adopted a constitution and bylaws pursuant to section 16 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), shall be executed and approved in conformity with the provisions of the constitution and bylaws of the tribe or band. Contracts on behalf of any unorganized tribe or band shall be executed in conformity with the requirements of section 81, title 25, United States Code (Revised Statutes, sec. 2103). No attorney shall have the right to represent the said Indians or any band thereof in any suit, cause, or action under the provisions of this act until he has been employed under a contract executed and approved as provided herein: *Provided*, That any attorney appearing for said Indians under any law of the State of Wisconsin authorizing him to prosecute such claims against the Federal Government shall not be required to file a contract of employment, and no compensation shall be allowed such attorney where he is so compensated by the State. The State shall be allowed out of any judgment recovered such necessary and proper expenses as the court may find to have been incurred by the attorney so employed. The fees decreed by the court to the attorney or attorneys of record, except such as shall be employed by the State, shall be paid out of any sum or sums recovered in such suits or actions, and no part of such fees shall be taken from any money in the Treasury of the United States belonging to such tribe or bands of Indians in whose behalf the suit is brought: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the fees decreed by said court amount to more than 5 percent of the amount of the judgment recovered in such cause, to be paid only to contract attorneys, if employed. Should an attorney be employed by the State to assist in the prosecution of any suit filed hereunder the court shall determine the value of his services on a quantum-meruit basis and such amount shall be withheld from the said 5 percent and become available to said Indians as a part of said judgment.

"SEC. 4. The net amount of any judgment recovered shall be placed in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said Indians, and shall draw interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum and shall be thereafter subject to appropriation by Congress for educational, health, industrial, and other purposes for the benefit of said Indians, including the purchase of lands and building of homes, and no part of said judgment shall be paid out in per-capita payments to said Indians: *Provided*, That in making an award under this act all gratuities paid said Indian tribe by the United States Government shall be offset against any judgment or award made to them."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this bill is simply an amendment of the existing jurisdictional law. All it does is first, to permit Indian tribes, or parts of tribes, to file suits. Secondly, it extends the time from 5 to 8 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

LULU M. PEIPER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 744) for the relief of Lulu M. Peiper, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after "$5,000" to strike out "as compensation" and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States", and at the end of the bill to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lulu M. Peiper, of Wallingford, Conn., the sum of $5,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her son, Raymond E. Monson, late apprentice seaman, United States Navy, who was killed in the performance of his duties at Newport, R. I., on May 14, 1928: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

WILLIAM F. KIMBALL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2305) for the relief of William F. Kimball, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,885.74" and insert "$1,208.01", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William F. Kimball, of Mud Butte, S. Dak., the sum of $1,208.01 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the remainder of a refund due him on account of the cancelation of a certain contract entered into between the said William F. Kimball and the Department of the Interior in 1920, relating to the purchase of certain lands owned by the heirs of His Red Horse, deceased Standing Rock allottee no. 2186. Payment to said William F. Kimball shall be conditioned upon his executing and delivering to the Secretary of the Interior an assignment, satisfactory to the Secretary, assigning to the United States all his right, title, and interest in and to the remainder of such refund. All sums recovered from the estate of His Red Horse by the United States under such assignment shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2372) for expenditure of funds for cooperation with the public-school board at Wolf Point, Mont., for completing the construction, extension, equipment, and improvement of a public-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. On this bill there is an adverse report. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LEASING OF INDIAN LANDS IN WASHINGTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 608) to authorize the leasing of certain Indian lands, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "lands", to strike out "allotted under the treaty of January 22, 1855, between the United States and the Dwamish, Suquamish,

and other allied and subordinate tribes of Indians in Washington Territory (State of Washington)" and insert "on the Port Madison and Snohomish or Tulalip Indian Reservations in the State of Washington", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Indian lands on the Port Madison and Snohomish or Tulalip Indian Reservations in the State of Washington may be leased with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, and upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, for a term not exceeding 25 years; and an option for the renewal of the lease for an additional term not exceeding 25 years may be included therein.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

PER-CAPITA PAYMENT TO SEMINOLE INDIANS IN OKLAHOMA

The bill (S. 2263) providing for per-capita payments to the Seminole Indians in Oklahoma from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay to the enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma entitled under existing law to share in the funds of said tribe, or to their lawful heirs, out of any money belonging to said tribe in the United States Treasury or deposited in any bank or held by an official under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, not to exceed $35 per capita: *Provided*, That said payment shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided further*, That in cases where such enrolled members or their heirs are Indians who belong to the restricted class, the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, withhold such payments and use the same for the benefit of such restricted Indians: *Provided further*, That the money paid to the enrolled members or their heirs as provided herein shall be exempt from any lien for attorneys' fees or other debt contracted prior to the passage of this act: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to use not to exceed $2,000 out of said Seminole tribal funds for the payment of salaries of necessary employees and other expenses for the distribution of said per-capita payments.

PURCHASE OF LANDS ADJACENT TO TURTLE MOUNTAIN INDIAN AGENCY, N. DAK.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1774) to authorize the purchase of certain lands adjacent to the Turtle Mountain Indian Agency in the State of North Dakota, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized to purchase privately owned lands and improvements within and adjacent to the Turtle Mountain Reservation, N. Dak., title to be taken in the United States of America in trust for the Indians of the Turtle Mountain Reservation, and for that purpose there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000, which sum when appropriated shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That title to the land so purchased may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be taken for the surface only: *Provided further*, That lands purchased under this authority shall not be allotted in severalty.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of the adverse recommendation, I inquire of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER], whether this is wise or proper legislation at this time.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, the Office of Indian Affairs were favorable to the appropriation. They state in their report in connection with the bill that there are 688 families of Indians there, aggregating approximately 3,000 Indians on 23,000 acres of land, which is not enough land to support them. The direct relief and work relief amounted to not more than $100,000 last year. This bill would not take care of all of them, but it would be a step in the right direction. Senators will note that the Acting Secretary said that the bill is "not in accord at this time with the President's program."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from North Dakota why, when the Interior Department appropriation bill was under consideration, which measure was presumed to take care of the needs of the Indians for the next year, and which carried a large appropriation—much larger than it should have done—provision was not made for the purchase of these lands as a wise and a just measure.

Mr. FRAZIER. The Office of Indian Affairs recommended the purchase, but the item was cut out.

Mr. KING. By the Appropriations Committee, after full investigation?

Mr. FRAZIER. No; by the Bureau of the Budget, as I understand.

Mr. KING. Was not the item eliminated by the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. FRAZIER. No; I think not. A year ago an appropriation of $100,000 was authorized to buy land in this region; but this particular group of Indians voted not to go in under the so-called Indian Reorganization Act, and the Department held that they were not eligible to receive the money that was appropriated for them.

Mr. KING. Do these Indians belong to any tribe which had land, and which had some treaties with the Government under the terms of which large appropriations were to be made annually by the Government?

Mr. FRAZIER. In this case the treaty with the Indians provided that they could have allotments at the Turtle Mountain Reservation. When the treaty was adopted several years later—it was held up for a certain length of time—the land had been taken up to a great extent, and there was not enough land for them. More than 3,000 Indians and a number of white settlers are crowded on two townships.

Mr. KING. In view of the wrongs to which the Indians have been subjected and the way we have plundered them for more than 100 years, I do not think I can object.

Mr. FRAZIER. This is merely an authorization, of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7472) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask the leader to give us an opportunity tomorrow to take up this bill for consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the call of the calendar it is the purpose to make this bill the unfinished business.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, are Senators referring to the District tax bill?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I had intended to move the consideration of Senate bill 69. I cannot go along unless there is some understanding with reference to Senate bill 69, for the reasons I have stated to the new leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let us conclude the call of the calendar at this time.

ROBERT L. SUMMERS

The bill (S. 2317) for the relief of Robert L. Summers was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 1118, Revised Statutes, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to reenlist in the United States Army, Robert L. Summers, Medical Department, Fort Sill, Okla., at the expiration of said Robert L. Summers' present period of enlistment on November 12, 1937, and on such future dates as the said Robert L. Summers may make application for reenlistment.

COMPROMISE OF SUITS ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS OF INSURANCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2383) to amend the act authorizing the Attorney General to compromise suits on certain contracts of insurance, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sixth paragraph following the subtitle "Veterans' Administration" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1934, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 283, ch. 101), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby authorized to agree to a judgment to be rendered by the presiding judge of the United States court having jurisdiction of the case, pursuant to compromise approved by the Attorney General upon the recommendation of the United States attorney charged with the defense, upon such terms and for such sums within the amount claimed to be payable, in any suit brought under the provisions of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, on a contract of yearly, renewable term insurance which may be now pending or hereafter may be filed, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to make payments in accordance with any such judgment: *Provided*, That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers of the Veterans' Administration for all payments of insurance made in accordance with any such judgment: *Provided further*, That all such judgments shall constitute final settlement of the claim and no appeal therefrom shall be authorized."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], who honors us with his presence here, explain the bill?

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, under the act passed March 20, 1933, the Attorney General was authorized to compromise certain insurance suits that had been brought under the World War Veterans' Act. After that time another act was passed, and other suits have been brought which did not come under the former act. A number of those suits are now pending, and there is no authority for the Attorney General to compromise the later suits. This bill authorizes the Attorney General to consider and to compromise the later suits which have been brought since the acts referred to were passed and which are now pending.

Mr. KING. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

PUNISHMENT OF OFFENDERS AGAINST NARCOTIC LAWS

The bill (S. 2388) to increase the punishment of second, third, and subsequent offenders against the narcotic laws was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, a bill has come over from the House which is similar to the Senate bill 2388. The House bill (H. R. 6283) will be found on the calendar on page 13, being Calendar No. 922. I ask that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill.

Mr. KING. I have no objection to that course.

Mr. HUGHES. I also ask that the Senate bill be stricken from the calendar.

Mr. KING. I have no objection to that. Then, Mr. President, let the House bill go over. The request of the Senator from Delaware is that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill; and after that substitution is made I object to its consideration today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, House bill 6283, being Calendar No. 922, will be substituted for Senate bill 2388, being Calendar No. 904; and, without objection, Senate bill 2388 is indefinitely postponed.

At the request of the Senator from Utah, House bill 6283 will be passed over.

BILL AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2475) to provide for the establishment of fair labor standards in employments in and affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 140) authorizing an investigation of the delivery or nondelivery of mail to establishments where industrial strife is in progress was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I do not see the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] present, and I suggest that the resolution be passed over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

JOSEPH W. BOLLENBECK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1168) for the relief of Joseph W. Bollenbeck, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "retired", to insert "on May 31, 1935,"; on the same page, in line 10, after the words "accident of", to strike out:

Service, and in the grade of major which he would have attained upon such retirement: *Provided*, That in determining the pay period of this officer there shall be added the length of accrued leave to which he would have been entitled prior to retirement: *Provided further*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, allowances, or any payment provided under the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, 1924, as amended, or other benefit whatsoever to which said person may be or become entitled by law shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

And insert:

Service: *Provided*, That no back pay, allowance, compensation, pension, or other benefit shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon retired officers of the United States Army, Joseph W. Bollenbeck, captain, United States Army, shall be held and considered, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to have been classified in class A and to have been retired on May 31, 1935, under section 1251 of the Revised Statutes for incapacity which was a result of an accident of service: *Provided*, That no back pay, allowance, compensation, pension, or other benefit shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL TO HAROLD R. WOOD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 126) authorizing the President to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Harold R. Wood, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, in line 3, after the word "present", to strike out the comma and the words "in the name of Congress, a medal of honor" and insert "a Distinguished Service Medal", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to present a Distinguished Service Medal to Harold R. Wood, formerly a corporal of the United States Marine Corps, for conspicuous bravery on the night of October 31–November 1, 1919, as an officer of the Gendarmerie d'Haiti.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the President to present a Distinguished Service Medal to Harold R. Wood."

EMORY M. M'COOL

The bill (H. R. 6402) for the relief of Emory M. McCool, United States Navy, retired, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act approved May 23, 1930 (46 Stat. 375; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 790), Emory M. McCool, chief machinist's mate, United States Navy, retired, shall be held and considered to have completed 30 years' service, including naval service, time in the Fleet Naval Reserve, and Army service, including double time for service in the Philippines from November 28, 1899, to May 18, 1901, for the purpose of transfer to the retired list of the United States Navy, on May 19, 1929, and the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Emory M. McCool the sum of $630, which sum represents allowances at $15.75 per month, covering the period from May 19, 1929, to and including September 30, 1932, authorized by existing law (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 431) to be paid to enlisted men upon transfer to the retired list of the Navy upon completion of 30 years' service.

SALE OF OLD POST OFFICE BUILDING, LOUISVILLE, KY.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6899) to repeal the limitation of the sale price on the old post office

and courthouse site and building at Fourth and Chestnut Streets, Louisville, Ky., which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso (45 Stat. 179), contained in section 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes", approved March 5, 1928, Public Law No. 93, Seventieth Congress (45 Stat. 162), requiring that the old post office and courthouse site and building at Fourth and Chestnut Streets, Louisville, Ky., shall not be sold for an amount less than $2,500,000 is hereby repealed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Kentucky to explain the bill just read, which provides for the sale of the post office at Louisville, Ky.?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the bill authorizes the sale of the post-office building in the city of Louisville.

Mr. McKELLAR. The old post-office building.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; the old post-office building. The building, which has been vacant and unoccupied for the last 5 or 6 years, is located in the heart of the city. At the last session of Congress a bill was passed authorizing its sale but fixing a minimum price of $2,500,000. Both departments concerned have reached the conclusion that they are not able at this time to dispose of the property at that minimum price. This bill authorizes them to enter into negotiations for the sale of the property at a price less than that previously fixed. The fact is, the passage of the bill is desired by the Department, and I think it ought to pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT GRAND ARMY ENCAMPMENT

The bill (H. R. 7641) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Madison, Wis., September 5 to 10, inclusive, 1937, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DECORATION OF SGT. FRED W. STOCKHAM, DECEASED

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 153) providing for consideration of a recommendation for decoration of Sgt. Fred W. Stockham, deceased, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Whereas on the nights of June 13–14, 1918, at Belleau Woods, Fred W. Stockham, deceased, formerly a gunnery sergeant, United States Marine Corps, in action involving actual conflict with the enemy, distinguished himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty; and

Whereas a citation citing said Fred W. Stockham for the extraordinary heroism displayed by him at such time was written but, through accident, was not published and is not recorded in the War Department; and

Whereas no decoration has been awarded to said Fred W. Stockham for the extraordinary heroism displayed by him at such time: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That any recommendation for decoration by the United States of America of Fred W. Stockham, deceased, formerly a gunnery sergeant, Ninety-sixth Company, Second Battalion, Sixth Division, United States Marine Corps, shall be considered and acted upon in the same manner as such recommendation would have been considered and acted upon if it had been pending on May 26, 1928.

The preamble was agreed to.

MARIHUANA EXCISE TAX

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6906) to impose an occupational excise tax upon certain dealers in marihuana, to impose a transfer tax upon certain dealings in marihuana, and to safeguard the revenue therefrom by registry and recording, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Michigan if all the provisions of this bill, which seem to be rather multitudinous, are necessary to deal with this simple, though perhaps very deleterious, drug?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. President, there is no question that the Treasury Department feels that the various regulations contained in the bill are necessary. The bill was considered by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives; it passed that body and then came before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Finance. Hearings were conducted; all those who were interested in the industrial production of marihuana were present, and a general agreement was reached to add two or three minor amendments. The only amendment of moment was that we reduced the tax on the producers from $5 an acre to $1 an acre. That is the only material difference between the bill as reported to the Senate and the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. KING. Let me inquire of the Senator whether only the one drug marihuana is involved in this bill?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. That is the only drug covered by this bill.

Mr. KING. I have no objection to its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Finance was, in section 1, paragraph (b), page 2, line 6, after the word "plant", to insert the words "fiber produced in such stalks"; in line 8, after the word "any", to insert "other"; in line 10, before the word "oil", to insert "fiber", so as to make the paragraph read:

(b) The term "marihuana" means all parts of the plant Cannabis sativa L., whether growing or not; the seeds thereof; the resin extracted from any part of such plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such plant, its seeds, or resin; but shall not include the mature stalks of such plant fiber produced from such stalks, oil or cake made from the seeds of such plant, any other compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such mature stalks (except the resin extracted therefrom) fiber, oil, or cake, or the sterilized seed of such plant which is incapable of germination.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, paragraph 2, page 3, line 9, after the word "subsection)", to strike out "$5 per year" and insert "$1 per year, or fraction thereof, during which they engage in such activity", so as to read:

SEC. 2. (a) Every person who imports, manufactures, produces, compounds, sells, deals in, dispenses, prescribes, administers, or gives away marihuana shall (1) within 15 days after the effective date of this act, or (2) before engaging after the expiration of such 15-day period in any of the above-mentioned activities, and (3) thereafter, on or before July 1 of each year, pay the following special taxes respectively:

(1) Importers, manufacturers, and compounders of marihuana, $24 per year.

(2) Producers of marihuana (except those included within subdivision (4) of this subsection), $1 per year, or fraction thereof during which they engage in such activity.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, paragraph (b), page 4, line 7, after "(1)" to strike out ", (2)," so as to read:

(b) Where a tax under subdivision (1) or (5) is payable on July 1 of any year it shall be computed for 1 year; where any such tax is payable on any other day it shall be computed proportionately from the first day of the month in which the liability for the tax accrued to the following July 1.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 6, line 10, after the name Columbia to insert "or"; in line 11, after the word "possession", to strike out "or the Canal Zone"; in line 14, after "Columbia", to insert "or"; and in line 15, after the words "United States", to strike out "or the Canal Zone", so as to read:

SEC. 5. It shall be unlawful for any person who shall not have paid the special tax and registered, as required by section 2, to send, ship, carry, transport, or deliver any marihuana within any Territory, the District of Columbia, or any insular possession, or from any State, Territory, the District of Columbia, any insular possession of the United States, or the Canal Zone, into any other State, Territory, the District of Columbia, or insular possession of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, paragraph (3), page 8, line 10, after "Columbia", to insert "or"; and in

line 11, after the words "United States", to strike out "or the Canal Zone", so as to read:

(3) To the sale, exportation, shipment, or delivery of marihuana by any person within the United States, any Territory, the District of Columbia, or any of the insular possessions of the United States, to any person in any foreign country regulating the entry of marihuana, if such sale, shipment, or delivery of marihuana is made in accordance with such regulations for importation into such foreign country as are prescribed by such foreign country, such regulations to be promulgated from time to time by the Secretary of State of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section, paragraph (5), page 8, line 26, after the word "to", to strike out "a person, registered as a producer under section 2, for use by such person for the further production of such plant, or to a person, registered under section 2 as a manufacturer, importer, or compounder, for use by such person for the manufacture of birdseed or for the manufacture of seed oil, seed cake, or any compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such oil or cake", and insert "any person registered under section 2"; so as to read:

(5) To a transfer of any seeds of the plant Cannabis sativa L. to any person registered under section 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 15, page 15, line 20, after the name "Hawaii", to strike out "the Canal Zone"; on page 16, line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "Canal Zone and the"; and in line 9, after the word "the", to strike out "Canal Zone and the"; so as to make the section read:

SEC. 15. The provisions of this act shall apply to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, and the insular possessions of the United States, except the Philippine Islands. In Puerto Rico the administration of this act, the collection of the special taxes and transfer taxes, and the issuance of the order forms provided for in section 6 shall be performed by the appropriate internal-revenue officers of that government, and all revenues collected under this act in Puerto Rico shall accrue intact to the general government thereof. The President is hereby authorized and directed to issue such Executive orders as will carry into effect in the Virgin Islands the intent and purpose of this act by providing for the registration with appropriate officers and the imposition of the special and transfer taxes upon all persons in the Virgin Islands who import, manufacture, produce, compound, sell, deal in, dispense, prescribe, administer, or give away marihuana.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

GEORGE R. SLATE

The bill (S. 2159) for the relief of George R. Slate was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers George R. Slate, who was a member of Company G, Third Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of that organization on the 2d day of July 1898, and notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary in the act relating to pensions approved April 26, 1898, as amended by the act approved May 11, 1908: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY AT WEST POINT MILITARY RESERVATION

The bill (S. 2751) to authorize the transfer to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury of portions of the property within the West Point Military Reservation, N. Y., for the construction thereon of certain public buildings, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to make transfers to the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of the Treasury of such portions of the property at present included within the West Point Military Reservation, N. Y., and upon such conditions as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to construct within the limits of the property so transferred such building or buildings, appurtenances, and approaches thereto as he may deem adequate and suitable for the use of the Treasury Department as a depository, and for use in carrying out any other functions or duties of the Treasury Department: *Provided*, That upon cessation of such use the premises or any part thereof so transferred shall revert to the jurisdiction of the War Department.

AMENDMENT TO BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2215) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 75 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", as amended, be further amended by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) At any time after this section takes effect, a petition may be filed by any farmer, stating that the farmer is insolvent or unable to meet his debts as they mature, and that it is desirable to effect a composition or an extension of time to pay his debts. The petition or answer of the farmer shall be accompanied by his schedules. The petition and answer shall be filed with the court, but shall, on request of the farmer or creditor, be received by the conciliation commissioner for the county in which the farmer resides and promptly transmitted by him to the clerk of the court for filing. If any such petition is filed, an order of adjudication shall not be entered except as provided hereinafter in this section."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill, on page 2, after line 9, it is proposed to add two new sections, as follows:

SEC. 2. That section 75 of said act be further amended by amending paragraph 5 of subsection (s) to read as follows:

"This act shall be held to apply to all existing cases now pending in any Federal court, under this section, as well as to future cases. All cases under this section that have been dismissed by any conciliation commissioner, referee, or Federal court because such court erroneously assumed or held that subsection (s) of section 75 of this act was unconstitutional, shall be promptly reinstated, without any additional filing fees or charges. Any farm debtor who has filed under the General Bankruptcy Act may take advantage of this section upon written request to the court; and a previous discharge of the debtor under any other section of this act shall not be grounds for denying him the benefits of this section."

SEC. 3. That section 75 of said act be further amended by striking out and repealing paragraph 6 of subsection (s).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I inquire if the amendment was submitted to the committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment was not submitted to the committee; but I may say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that it merely gives to those who, by reason of the original act being declared unconstitutional, fell outside the provisions of that act the benefit of the provisions of the act, it having since been held to be constitutional.

Mr. GUFFEY. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

NAVIGATION FACILITIES ON COLUMBIA RIVER

The bill (S. 607) to authorize improvement of navigation facilities on the Columbia River, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause such alterations in existing bridges across the Columbia River at Cascade Locks and Hood River, Oreg., as will render navigation for ocean-going vessels in the pool formed by the Bonneville Dam reasonably free, easy, and unobstructed, and to reimburse the owners of said bridges for the actual cost of such alterations from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for maintenance and improvement of rivers and harbors.

WABASH RIVER BRIDGE, LOCKPORT, IND.

The bill (H. R. 6636) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Carroll, in the State of Indiana, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across

the Wabash River at or near Lockport, Ind., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MERRIMACK RIVER BRIDGE, LOWELL, MASS.

The bill (H. R. 6920) granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Middlesex County, and the city of Lowell, Mass., or any two of them, or any one of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Merrimack River at Lowell, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACADEMIC STANDING OF MILITARY AND NAVAL SCHOOLS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1971) to provide for the recognition by the Government of the United States of the academic standing of military and naval schools under its jurisdiction, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, after line 6, to strike out "all military and naval schools (including the United States Coast Guard Academy)" and insert "the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Coast Guard Academy", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the executive departments and independent establishments and agencies of the Government shall give equal recognition to all academic work certified to have been completed in, and certificates of academic credit furnished by, the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Coast Guard Academy, under the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States, whether or not such schools have been accredited by the Association of American Universities.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the consideration of bills on the calendar.

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR DISTRICT COURT AT GLASGOW, MONT.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to Order of Business 879, being Senate bill 537, to provide suitable accommodations for the district court of the United States at Glasgow, Mont. The bill was objected to when reached on the calendar by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. I have explained it to him; I think he has no further objection; and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have no objection to returning to the bill and to having it considered now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 537) to provide suitable accommodations for the district court of the United States at Glasgow, Mont., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments on page 1, line 8, after the word "amount", to insert "not in excess of $100,000"; and on page 2, line 2, after the word "necessary" to insert "not in excess of $100,000"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to provide suitable rooms and accommodations for holding terms of the district court of the United States in the Federal building proposed to be constructed in Glasgow, Mont. The limit of cost for such building is hereby increased by such amount not in excess of $100,000 as may be necessary for that purpose; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary not in excess of $100,000 in addition to the sums heretofore appropriated and allocated, for the construction of such building.

SEC. 2. So much of section 92 of the judicial code, as amended, as heads *"Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Glasgow, Lewiston, and Havre are furnished free of all expense to the United States" is amended to read as follows: *"Provided*, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Lewiston and Havre are furnished free of all expense to the United States."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

WILLIAM K. RICHARDSON—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 88)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, Senate Joint Resolution 30, entitled "For the relief of William K. Richardson."

Some time ago William K. Richardson brought suit against the United States in the Court of Claims to recover the sum of $10,000,000 for an alleged infringement of a patent relating to artillery projectiles. The Court of Claims, after taking testimony and hearing the case on the merits, made comprehensive and detailed findings of fact and rendered an opinion dismissing the petition. While sustaining the validity of the patent, it upheld the contention of Government counsel that the patent had not been infringed by the Government.

The purpose of the present resolution is to remand the case to the Court of Claims for reconsideration, subject to the limitation that the amount claimed should be reduced to 3 percent of the original amount, to wit, $300,000. In addition, by the recitals contained in the preamble, the resolution would practically declare the prior decision of the court erroneous, and would affirmatively declare that the Government infringed the patent, in spite of the ruling of the court to the contrary. Further, it would expressly waive certain affirmative defenses of the Government, such as the effect of the prior adjudication.

The claimant has had his day in court. After a full hearing on the merits, the tribunal to which the law gave him recourse reached the conclusion that his claim was not well founded. Reasons of policy, as well as appropriate regard for orderly judicial procedure, would seem to require that the parties should abide by the result of the litigation. Sufficient reason does not appear for reversing the decision of the court by legislative action.

In view of the foregoing considerations, I feel constrained to withhold my approval from the joint resolution.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 19, 1937.*

DIVISION OF WATERS OF THE YELLOWSTONE RIVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 534) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; which was on page 2, line 8, after "within" to insert "or tributary to."

Mr. WHEELER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MARITAL STATUS IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there was reported today from the Civil Service Committee, House bill 3408. This bill provides that no person by reason of marital relation "shall be discriminated against in any case because of his or her marital status in examination, appointment, reappointment, reinstatement, reemployment, promotion, transfer, retransfer, demotion, removal, or retirement."

The bill repeals, in substance, section 213 of the Economy Act of 1933. The bill was reported unanimously by the committee, and I think everyone believes that the act referred to should be repealed. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Tennessee if the committee was unanimous in reporting the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; the committee was unanimous.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the bill (H. R. 3408) to amend the Civil Service Act approved January 16, 1883 (22 Stat. 403), and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States" (act of Jan. 16, 1883, 22 Stat. 403), is hereby amended by adding at the end of the sixth paragraph of section 2 of the act a new paragraph, as follows:

"And no person shall be discriminated against in any case because of his or her marital status in examination, appointment, reappointment, reinstatement, reemployment, promotion, transfer, retransfer, demotion, removal, or retirement. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TAXES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7472, being calendar no. 901, which is a bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7472) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. MINTON in the chair] laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported adversely the nomination of Charles I. Davis to be postmaster at Leesville, La., in place of B. F. Cowley, removed.

He also, from the same committee, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported favorably the nominations of sundry officers for promotion in the Navy.

Mr. COPELAND, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the nominations of several citizens (or officers) for appointment as officers in the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Newman Alderson to be State administrator of the Works Progress Administration for West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc. That concludes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, July 23, 1937, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 22, 1937

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George T. Summerlin, of Louisiana, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Panama, to be Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

Clinton E. MacEachran, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a consul, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

Horatio Mooers, of Maine, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a consul, to be also a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

John H. Morgan, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a consul, to be also a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

Carl A. Fisher, of Utah, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

James L. Houghteling, of Illinois, to be Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization for the Department of Labor.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Ralph J. Rivers, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for the fourth division, District of Alaska. (Mr. Rivers is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 13, 1937.)

Berthold J. Husting, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin. (Mr. Husting is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 13, 1937.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Paul E. Ruppel, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois. (Mr. Ruppel is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 12, 1937.)

John P. Logan, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma. (Mr. Logan is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 16, 1937.)

John M. Comeford, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal for the western district of Wisconsin. (Mr. Comeford is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 13, 1937.)

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Thomas F. Thomas, of Utah, to be register of the land office at Salt Lake City, Utah. (Reappointment.)

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Clement L. West, of Omaha, Nebr., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 46, with headquarters at Omaha, Nebr. (Reappointment.)

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named doctors to be assistant surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to take effect from date of oath:

Leon S. Saler

Richard H. Smith

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from July 2, 1937:

Ralph S. Lloyd
George E. Jones
John W. Knutson
William P. Kroschel

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO SIGNAL CORPS

First Lt. Andrew Donald Stephenson, Infantry, with rank from June 13, 1936.

TO INFANTRY

Lt. Col. Robert Lawrence Eichelberger, Adjutant General's Department, with rank from August 1, 1934.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Norman McLean Scott, Medical Corps, from July 25, 1937, subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Oral Bevoly Bolibaugh, Medical Corps, from July 25, 1937.

Maj. Charles Edward Sima, Medical Corps, from July 25, 1937.

Maj. Frank Walker Young, Medical Corps, from July 25, 1937.

Maj. Roy Farrington Brown, Medical Corps, from July 25, 1937.

Maj. Richard Turberville Arnest, Medical Corps, from July 25, 1937.

Maj. Charles Levi Maxwell, Medical Corps, from July 27, 1937.

Maj. William Love Starnes, Medical Corps, from July 28, 1937.

Maj. Orlando Jefferson Posey, Medical Corps, from July 28, 1937.

Maj. Levy Steven Johnson, Medical Corps, from July 28, 1937.

Maj. Daniel Franklin, Medical Corps, from July 29, 1937.

Maj. Haskett Lynch Conner, Medical Corps, from July 30, 1937.

Maj. Arthur Howard Nylen, Medical Corps, from July 31, 1937.

Maj. William Walker McCaw, Medical Corps, from July 31, 1937.

Maj. Arthur Raymond Gaines, Medical Corps, from July 18, 1937.

Maj. Frederick Arthur Blesse, Medical Corps, from July 18, 1937.

Maj. Samuel Augustus White, Medical Corps, from July 19, 1937.

Maj. Francis Moylan Fitts, Medical Corps, from July 19, 1937.

Maj. George Franklin Aycock, Medical Corps, from July 19, 1937.

Maj. Frank Smeeton Matlack, Medical Corps, from July 19, 1937.

Maj. Lewis Edwin Joel Browne, Medical Corps, from July 19, 1937.

Maj. Charles Earle Brenn, Medical Corps, from July 19, 1937.

Maj. Douglas Hamilton Mebane, Medical Corps, from July 19, 1937.

Maj. Cleon Joseph Gentzkow, Medical Corps, from July 20, 1937.

Maj. Robert Alexander Hale, Medical Corps, from July 20, 1937.

Maj. Gouverneur Hammeken Boyer, Medical Corps, from July 20, 1937.

Maj. James Claude Kimbrough, Medical Corps, from July 20, 1937.

Maj. Arthur George Compton, Medical Corps, from July 21, 1937.

Maj. John Jay Moore, Medical Corps, from July 21, 1937.

Maj. Harold Dana Rogers, Medical Corps, from July 21, 1937.

Maj. Alfred Robert Thomas, Jr., Medical Corps, from July 23, 1937.

Maj. Logan Mitchel Weaver, Medical Corps, from July 24, 1937.

To be captains

First Lt. William Sterling Hargan, Medical Corps, from July 23, 1937.

First Lt. Lewis Calvin Shellenberger, Medical Corps, from July 23, 1937.

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Daniel Bratton, Dental Corps, from July 25, 1937.

Maj. Thomas Luther Spoon, Dental Corps, from July 25, 1937.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Josiah Wistar Worthington, Veterinary Corps, from July 27, 1937.

Maj. Fred Chester Waters, Veterinary Corps, from July 30, 1937.

Maj. Harry Edward Van Tuyl, Veterinary Corps, from July 31, 1937.

Maj. Howard Mayo Savage, Veterinary Corps, from July 19, 1937.

Maj. Burlin Chase Bridges, Veterinary Corps, from July 19, 1937.

Maj. James Earl Noonan, Veterinary Corps, from July 23, 1937.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Maj. Thomas B. Gale to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of June 1937.

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July 1937:

Melvin E. Fuller
Francis I. Fenton
Gerald C. Thomas

First Lt. Otho C. Ledbetter to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of August 1936.

First Lt. Harry C. Lang to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of August 1936.

First Lt. Albert F. Moe to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1936.

First Lt. Joseph H. Berry to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1936.

First Lt. Orin K. Pressley to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1936.

First Lt. John B. Hill to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 19th day of February 1937.

First Lt. Chester R. Allen to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1937.

First Lt. William F. Parks to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of April 1937.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of June 1937:

Clarence J. O'Donnell
George H. Cloud
Wallace M. Greene, Jr.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, revocable for 2 years, from the 1st day of July 1937:

Richard A. Beard, Jr., a citizen of Georgia.
Colland L. Clark, Jr., a citizen of Washington.
Parker R. Colmer, a citizen of Massachusetts.
John P. Coursey, a citizen of Georgia.
Edmond M. Glick, a citizen of Illinois.
Robert D. Heinl, Jr., a citizen of the District of Columbia.
William F. Lantz, a citizen of California.
Neil R. MacIntyre, a citizen of California.
William J. O'Neill, a citizen of Idaho.
Ronald R. Van Stockum, a citizen of Washington.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Ellen Clark Martin to be postmaster at Beaumont, Calif., in place of B. H. Gantt, deceased.

Ward Robertson to be postmaster at Delano, Calif., in place of J. M. Hayden, deceased.

Ray Brackett to be postmaster at Geyserville, Calif., in place of L. G. Brackett, removed.

COLORADO

Mary A. Morrison to be postmaster at Climax, Colo., in place of A. D. Mackey, resigned.

Henry R. Riddle to be postmaster at Walden, Colo., in place of B. M. Norris, removed.

CONNECTICUT

James L. Grote to be postmaster at Chester, Conn., in place of P. N. Shailer. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1934.

Catherine O'Brien to be postmaster at Gildersleeve, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1936.

Evangeline M. Cassidy to be postmaster at Southbury, Conn., in place of C. W. Tyler. Incumbent's commission expired June 20, 1934.

FLORIDA

Alonzo W. Sias to be postmaster at Clewiston, Fla., in place of A. W. Lawrence. Incumbent's commission expired June 9, 1934.

Martha J. Metz to be postmaster at North Miami, Fla., in place of R. B. Terrell, removed.

IDAHO

Agnes G. Barry to be postmaster at Ketchum, Idaho. Office became Presidential October 1, 1936.

Martha Hentley to be postmaster at McCall, Idaho, in place of H. M. Cook. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1936.

ILLINOIS

Bohumil Plos to be postmaster at Lyons, Ill., in place of H. J. Hosman, removed.

Kenneth Pat Wilkerson to be postmaster at Mount Carroll, Ill., in place of C. E. Hartman. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Thomas E. Morrow to be postmaster at Seneca, Ill., in place of H. R. Morrow, deceased.

INDIANA

Marshall A. Dismore to be postmaster at Wolcott, Ind., in place of Edgar Spencer. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

IOWA

Kenneth F. Baldridge to be postmaster at Bloomfield, Iowa, in place of K. F. Baldridge, resigned.

Lynn W. McCleerey to be postmaster at Oto, Iowa, in place of J. R. Willmott, removed.

KANSAS

Frank F. Pauls to be postmaster at Buhler, Kans., in place of P. H. Adrain. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

LOUISIANA

Viley Joseph Chauvin to be postmaster at Franklin, La., in place of G. W. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1936.

Leroy P. Fulmer to be postmaster at Homer, La., in place of W. L. Barrow. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1936.

James H. Broyles to be postmaster at Kentwood, La., in place of J. M. Hutchinson. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1936.

Clifton T. Bigner to be postmaster at Pollock, La., in place of J. H. Gray, deceased.

Miles Kern Hartsell to be postmaster at Rodessa, La. Office became Presidential January 1, 1936.

Frank Godfrey Rieger to be postmaster at Scotlandville, La., in place of F. G. Rieger. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1933.

James L. Derouen to be postmaster at Welsh, La., in place of J. R. Romero, resigned.

MARYLAND

Melvin L. Ridgely to be postmaster at Gaithersburg, Md., in place of H. L. Diamond, removed.

MICHIGAN

John Kennedy to be postmaster at Carsonville, Mich., in place of F. D. McCaren, removed.

MINNESOTA

Mary A. Culhane to be postmaster at Rushford, Minn., in place of W. W. Parish. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1934.

MISSISSIPPI

John R. Meunier to be postmaster at Biloxi, Miss., in place of J. R. Meunier. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1934.

Troy McGehee to be postmaster at Brookhaven, Miss., in place of C. E. Day, removed.

Virginia C. Welborn to be postmaster at Electric Mills, Miss., in place of E. A. Temple, resigned.

William J. Pettyjohn to be postmaster at Marks, Miss., in place of L. M. Wilson, resigned.

MISSOURI

Loiel Earl Barnett to be postmaster at Lancaster, Mo., in in place of O. H. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1936.

Joseph F. Suellentrop to be postmaster at Linn, Mo., in place of T. C. Vaughan, removed.

MONTANA

Lee Jellison to be postmaster at Hobson, Mont., in place of Lee Jellison. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

NEBRASKA

Fred Hlavac to be postmaster at Brainard, Nebr., in place of A. J. Kriz, resigned.

Bernard M. Diers to be postmaster at Scottsbluff, Nebr., in place of Edward Emerine, resigned.

A. Otto Erdman to be postmaster at Venango, Nebr., in place of A. E. Watkins, removed.

NEVADA

Meryl J. Larson to be postmaster at Manhattan, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1, 1936.

NEW JERSEY

Vincent J. Tuite to be postmaster at Harrison N. J. Office established.

Frank A. Hynes to be postmaster at North Bergen, N. J. Office established.

Kemp C. Wetmore to be postmaster at Tuckerton, N. J., in place of J. W. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1934.

NEW MEXICO

Gladys Richardson to be postmaster at Hurley, N. Mex., in place of H. B. Hickman, resigned.

Jeff Boone to be postmaster at Mogollon, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1937.

NEW YORK

Mary J. O'Brien to be postmaster at Bedford, N. Y., in place of M. J. O'Brien. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

Edward T. Hayden to be postmaster at Castle Point, N. Y., in place of Joseph Hrabovsky, resigned.

Darius P. Marlette to be postmaster at Fultonville, N. Y., in place of C. T. E. Van Horne. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1936.

Walter A. Soule to be postmaster at Minoa, N. Y., in place of J. A. Strodel, deceased.

Arthur Congdon to be postmaster at Palenville, N. Y., in place of Edgar Griffin, removed.

NORTH CAROLINA

Mary Jane Higgins to be postmaster at Pomona, N. C., in place of R. C. Edwards, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Celeste M. Reiman to be postmaster at White Earth, N. Dak., in place of F. E. Reiman, deceased.

OHIO

Clarence Hicks to be postmaster at Chesapeake, Ohio, in place of A. C. Singer, removed.

Eusebio Pera to be postmaster at Geneva-on-the-Lake, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1937.

Virginia Lange to be postmaster at Kelleys Island, Ohio, in place of F. J. Lange, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Ray W. Swiercinsky to be postmaster at Elgin, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1936.

Arlie A. Collins to be postmaster at Konawa, Okla., in place of Ida White, removed.

Delia L. Sapp to be postmaster at Leedey, Okla., in place of R. L. Hogan, removed.

A. Ramsey Pierce to be postmaster at Waynoka, Okla., in place of M. D. Eaton. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1933.

PENNSYLVANIA

Catherine McElhinny to be postmaster at Lincoln Place, Pa., in place of A. W. Kerr. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1936.

Lewis H. Mensch to be postmaster at Marienville, Pa., in place of L. H. Mensch, resigned.

Sara A. Jeffries to be postmaster at New Salem, Pa., in place of E. C. Cassidy, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Johnnie F. Moore to be postmaster at Donelson, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1936.

TEXAS

Fowler Magee to be postmaster at Montague, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1936.

Ruth L. Hooks to be postmaster at Saratoga, Tex., in place of A. C. Saxon, removed.

Dorothy B. Statton to be postmaster at Skellytown, Tex., in place of H. M. Campbell, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Henry H. Dickenson to be postmaster at Lebanon, Va., in place of W. W. Flannagan, deceased.

Nannie Lee Stickley to be postmaster at Rose Hill, Va., in place of F. D. Coleman, removed.

Violet I. Pick to be postmaster at Rustburg, Va., in place of M. H. Gettle, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Elmer G. Rose to be postmaster at Caretta, W. Va., in place of R. Y. Henley, resigned.

Earl E. Bennett to be postmaster at New Cumberland, W. Va., in place of J. R. Plattenburg, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Grace R. Miller to be postmaster at Shiocton, Wis., in place of F. H. Colburn. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1934.

Roberta B. Andrews to be postmaster at South Wayne, Wis., in place of J. L. Denny, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 22, 1937

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

Joseph Newman Alderson to be State administrator in the Works Progress Administration for West Virginia.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Maj. Leo Vincent Warner to Adjutant General's Department.

Capt. John Arthur Weeks to Quartermaster Corps.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Edmund Russell Andrews to be colonel, Infantry.

Joseph Albert Rogers to be colonel, Field Artillery.

Max Robert Wainer to be colonel, Quartermaster Corps.

Karl Ferguson Baldwin to be colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.

Charles Holmes Cunningham to be lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers.

Dwight Frederick Johns to be lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers.

William Arthur Snow to be lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers.

Thomas Dewees Finley to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.

Elroy Sandy Jackson Irvine to be lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers.

Stanley Eric Reinhart to be lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery.

Archibald Luther Parmelee to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.

Walter Byron Fariss to be major, Infantry.

John Patrick Crehan to be major, Field Artillery.

Donald Sutter McConnaughy to be major, Field Artillery.

Richard Brownley Gayle to be major, Infantry.

Robert Tappan Chaplin to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.

Raymond Edwin Vermette to be major, Infantry.

Abraham Robert Ginsburgh to be major, Field Artillery.

Thomas Grant Tousey to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Charles Granville Souder to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Edwin Forrest Shaffer to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Harrison Horton Fisher to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Charles August Stammel to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Laurent Liscelles La Roche to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Stanley Gibson Odom to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Horace Sumner Villars to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Burgh Smith Burnet to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Joseph Richards Shelton to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

John Marion Stanley to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Robert Keith Simpson to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Don Guernsey Hilldrupp to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Henry Wiley Grady to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Percy Elisha Duggins to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Brown Shirk McClintic to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Henry Cheesman Dooling to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Carl Hamlin Witherell to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Paul Henry Streit to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Earle Douglass Quinnell to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Frank McAlpin Moose, subject to examination required by law, to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Emory Howard Gist to be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps.

Edward Rudolf Wernitznig to be captain, Medical Corps.

Harold Emerson Albaugh to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

Harry Edwin Smalley to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

William Dale White to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

Neal Anthony Harper to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

Earle Jefferson McClung to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

Earl Lee Hering to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

Samuel John Rohde to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

Leroy Poston Hartley to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

Nathan Corr Pickles to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

Oliver James Christiansen to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

Lawrence K. Anderson to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

William Crittenden Webb, Jr., subject to examination required by law, to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

Edward Crawford Alley to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

Lynn Harold Tingay to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

Marhl Hector Welch to be lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps.

Kenneth Pearce Fulton to be major, Dental Corps.

Stanley Clifford Smock to be lieutenant colonel, Veterinary Corps.

John Truman Kendall to be chaplain, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Gail I. Gardner, Prescott.

ARKANSAS

Emery E. Noe, Flippin.

IOWA

Clyde B. Richardson, Keosauqua.

KENTUCKY

Mary S. Chaffin, Grayson.

LOUISIANA

John Allen, Denham Springs.
Caliste Alexis Duplantis, Houma.
Phyne Uli, Independence.

MASSACHUSETTS

Elise Dunham, Bass River.
Marjorie N. Bowman, Cataumet.
Homer L. Simmons, Chartley.

MISSISSIPPI

Mattie B. Catching, Georgetown.

TENNESSEE

William Walter Eledge, Sr., Englewood.
Fred G. Ezell, Townsend.

WISCONSIN

John J. G. Laing, Waukesha.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1937

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Eternal God, our Father, source of all wisdom and truth, we pray that we may approach Thee with renewed confidence and faith in the things that make for righteousness and purity. Do Thou inspire us with broad, comprehensive views of life. Thou hast given us Thy holy law to guide, enlighten, and admonish us. Grant, O Lord God, that we may not break its bands asunder or cast away its cords. Let us seek the integrity of soul that shall preserve us from all evil. Blessed be Thy holy name for all the tokens of Thy presence, for the power Thou dost give to Thy truth, and for the inspiration to labor which Thou dost breathe into all true hearts. May the Master, the revelation of divine love, be our personal ideal; thus may we work for the good of our country, softening misfortune and hastening the better day. Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On July 12, 1937:

H. R. 1851. An act for the relief of W. D. Davis; and

H. R. 2774. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Division of Investigation, Department of the Interior, and certain disbursing officers of the Department of the Interior.

On July 13, 1937:

H. R. 2901. An act to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to certain employees in the legislative and judicial branches of the Government.

On July 16, 1937:

H. R. 7865. An act making appropriations for certain necessary operations of the Federal Government for the last half of the month of July 1937.

On July 17, 1937:

H. J. Res. 431. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the control of outbreaks of insect pests.

On July 19, 1937:

H. R. 458. An act for the relief of Eva Markowitz; and

H. R. 7493. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I have been granted permission to address the House on tomorrow for 15 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that that time may be extended to 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the business of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona and Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania, by unanimous consent, were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) from the Committee on Printing, authorizing the printing of the report of the subcommittee on technology, submitted to the National Resources Committee, entitled "Technological Trends and National Policy, Including the Social Implications of the New Inventions", as a document, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 21

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Report of the Subcommittee on Technology, submitted to the National Resources Committee, entitled "Technological Trends and National Policy, Including the Social Implications of the New Inventions", be printed as a House document; and that 10,000 additional copies shall be printed, of which 2,900 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 7,100 copies shall be for the use of the House.

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, may we have the title explained before we give consent?

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the President's National Resources Committee made public a 450,000-word report on Technological Trends and National Policy, Including the Social Implications of New Inventions. The report

presents a survey of most of the great fields of technology and applied science, namely, agriculture, mining, transportation, the metallurgical and chemical industries, and electrical manufactures.

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

Mr. BARRY. Later.

Mr. TABER. Is this the book?

Mr. BARRY. That is it.

Mr. TABER. It is some 400 pages?

Mr. BARRY. I refuse to yield, Mr. Speaker.

This work, prepared by a large group of scientists, educators, and engineers identified with industrial, academic, and governmental activities, has received widespread praise in the Nation's press. President Roosevelt, when he authorized the release of the report, stated:

A review of new inventions and problems of change which they carry with them is made for the first time by the Federal Government in this comprehensive survey of technological trends in major industries. For the continuous revision of plans we need continuing surveying agencies. In our planning of the Nation we must view general causes and trends that bear on our welfare. Any specific program may be affected by forces originating outside a particular problem.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] cannot be taken off his feet by such a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 118]

Allen, Del.	Flannagan	Keller	Robsion, Ky.
Bates	Flannery	Kerr	Ryan
Bernard	Fleger	Kloeb	Sabath
Binderup	Forand	Kniffin	Sadowski
Boehne	Fries, Ill.	Lemke	Schuetz
Brewster	Fuller	Long	Shanley
Buckley, N. Y.	Fulmer	Luckey, Nebr.	Sirovich
Byrne	Garrett	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Caldwell	Gasque	McFarlane	Smith, W. Va.
Cannon, Wis.	Gifford	McGroarty	Stack
Casey, Mass.	Gilchrist	McMillan	Starnes
Chandler	Gray, Ind.	Mason	Sullivan
Clark, Idaho	Greenwood	Meeks	Sweeney
Crosby	Haines	Mitchell, Ill.	Taylor, Colo.
Culkin	Hancock, N. Y.	Mosier, Ohio	Taylor, S. C.
Ditter	Harlan	O'Malley	Teigan
Driver	Harrington	Palmisano	Tinkham
Duncan	Harter	Parsons	Vincent, B. M.
Eaton	Hildebrandt	Peterson, Fla.	White, Idaho
Ellenbogen	Hill, Ala.	Peyser	Withrow
Englebright	Hoffman	Plumley	Woodruff
Ferguson	Holmes	Poage	
Fernandez	Hook	Rayburn	
Fish	Imhoff	Reed, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-eight Members present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement explaining an item in the third deficiency bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by me over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. EICHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the research subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to continue hearings during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION LAID ON TABLE

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to lay House Resolution 269, a rule making in order the consideration of certain flood legislation be laid on the table as the bill to which it refers has already been passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] is recognized.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, this report holds out the hope that we can anticipate some of the effects of the major inventions and make plans to meet new situations that will arise as these inventions come into widespread use. While it is certain that much of the unemployment caused by the march of technological advance is absorbed by new occupations born of the new industries, it is equally true that in the meantime labor carries a very heavy burden through the readjustment and adaptations necessary on the part of the workers whose jobs are affected by change. Employers, likewise, are deeply affected by swift technological changes producing obsolescence and displacement of capital investment.

More than jobs and investment are affected by technical change: Family, church, community, State, and all industry are subject to its influence. Study and investigation of technological advances and their social implications constitute one of our most important American planning problems.

I commend this report for earnest consideration in solving the great problem of how best to conserve and develop our vast national resources. A study of this report will be of help not only to public servants in the legislative, executive, and judicial positions of the Government but also to others in private employ, business, journalism, agriculture, and the teaching professions.

The purpose of this resolution is to have printed 10,000 copies of this report, 2,900 of which shall be for the use of the Senate and 7,100 copies for the use of the House.

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

Mr. BARRY. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the distribution be through the folding room, where the copies will be placed to the credit of the Members, or through the document room, where the first fellows who get there get them all?

Mr. BARRY. I understand that each Member will have 16 copies. I do not know all the details of the mechanics of distribution.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not think a resolution such as this ought to be passed unless it is therein provided that the reports shall be distributed through the folding room, for then each Member will get his number. Otherwise they will be placed in the document room, and the fellow who does not get there by 10 a. m. of the second day will find them all gone.

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

Mr. BARRY. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Under a resolution of this character the documents must be distributed through the folding room. There is no other way in which they can be distributed, even though it is not so mentioned in the resolution, it is made mandatory by the Printing Act of 1895. Each Member receives a certain number, all being treated alike.

I had an opportunty to see an advance copy of this report. It contains 388 pages. Of course, I did not go into it as thoroughly as I would have liked to, but that part of the report which I read was very informative. It is really alarm-

ing to know the situation that confronts us today in reference to labor-saving and labor-displacing devices, as well as the situation that is going to confront us in the future. This report enumerates many various new inventions. I will refer to just a few. For instance, they have in the Pennsylvania Station in New York today a beam of light. When you walk through that light a gate automatically opens. It takes the place of the gateman.

There is another invention in existence where you can walk up to a door, speak, and the door will open. Do you realize they can produce food inside the home today? Whether you realize it or not it is being done. This is no laughing matter, it is too serious. Go through this document and you will then realize what I say is true. They are making gasoline from coal. That will sound good to the miner, but they also are mining coal now with about 50 percent of the labor formerly used. A device has been invented for the picking of cotton. If it is ever perfected practically 90 percent of the Negroes of the South who are now existing through the work they receive picking cotton will be thrown upon the public because they will have no means of earning a livelihood. I realize some will say this cotton picker will never do what is claimed for it but others, just as well informed, insist it will be a grave menace to the South if it is ever put to use.

Every big newspaper in the country last Sunday carried articles about this report on the first page under double-column headlines, and on Monday and Tuesday they followed with editorials. This report is one of the most valuable documents that I have ever seen come from any Government agency since I have been in Congress. Every library should have a copy and every businessman in the country should read it. There is a possibility for great industries to be destroyed overnight. I predict if labor-saving and labor-displacing devices continue to be placed in industry the day will arrive when you will be taxing machines to take care of those thrown out of employment by their operation. Dreaming, some will say. My answer is too much has already been accomplished to refer to these inventions in that way.

What are we going to do, others will ask. As I see it we will make a most serious mistake if the great minds of the country do not join and plan for the future. We should by all means accept the suggestion found in this report to set up a proper organization to prepare suggestions to meet the conditions that are bound to confront either this generation or the next. How can we overlook the prediction that if some of these inventions are perfected in order to put the same number of people back to work that were employed in 1929 we will be required to increase the production of that year 125 percent? What would we do with the food and articles if we produced 125 percent more than we did in 1929?

I hope the House will unanimously approve the resolution.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], a member of the committee.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the House that on Tuesday I secured a copy of the President's National Resources Committee report on technological trends and national policy, of which our committee was asked to have 10,000 printed and placed in the folding room. I spent the greater part of Tuesday looking this volume over. The more I read the more bewildered I became; the less I knew about the subject discussed.

There are many things in here in the way of recommendations that are a good bit like some of these stockbrokers' prospectus who try to sell you something that will tell you how to purchase stock. After you have read it, then you wonder what action should be taken in the purchase of stocks, whether to buy a certain stock or leave it alone. No definite information. So a great deal of the report that we have here seems to be in that category. I may say, however, that there are some things in here that probably will be of great value to the people of this country if they will study it. This book contains 388 pages. If we publish 10,000 copies, 16 will go to each Member of the House and 29 to each Member of the Senate. This will take up about 9,800 copies. Then the depository libraries will receive 500 copies, the Senate document room 150 copies, the House document room 500 copies, the Secretary of State 20 copies, the White House 10 copies, and several other minor distributions.

If the Members of the Congress who receive this book will study and read it, then I would feel it is money well spent; but if they get this book and let it lay on their shelves and not look at it at all, it is money unwisely spent. If you Members of Congress do not distribute it to people in your respective districts who will use it, then the money will be wasted. Therefore it is up to every Member of the House to use diligence in the distribution of this book.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to some statements that caused me to believe that this book should be published. Of course, I do not agree with the statement I am about to quote; but thinking perhaps I might be wrong, I felt this should be published to give the benefit of the doubt. It says here in the foreword:

> For instance, even if industrial techniques remained the same, the volume of production would have to be greater in the future than in 1929 in order to absorb the increase in working population and keep unemployment to the level of that date. If the productivity of 1935 (the latest year for which figures are available) continues the same in 1937, and the composition of the Nation's total product remains unchanged, production would have to be increased 20 percent over that of 1929 to have as little unemployment as existed then. Failing this, there will be more unemployment; and if labor efficiency is increased by new inventions or otherwise, then the production of physical goods and services must be more than 120 percent of what it was in 1929.

Now, that is quite a statement to be made by the ones who edited this book.

I call attention to the fact that in part 1 of this book the people who edited it are college professors. Section 2 of the book was also composed by college professors. I have the criticism to make that if some practical men had helped write this book, some men who have had practical experience, a little different idea might have been conveyed with reference to the ultimate conclusions.

I think we ought to give consideration to the fact this book has been compiled and edited primarily by college professors. In the future when they want to find out the difference between theory and practice, we have got to put some practical men on the board to edit an edition of this kind.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COCHRAN. The fact is, no matter who prepared this report, they have given the practical men something to think about, something that shows a serious situation ahead; is that not true?

Mr. RICH. I would say it gave them something to think about because it has made me think. [Laughter and applause.] I am going to give them the benefit of the doubt and I agree to go along with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] to recommend the expenditure of over $5,000 so that we may have some knowledge of what the professors are talking about. There has been much propaganda in the papers about this report appearing in print. This administration is a past master in propaganda.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. Speaker, I favor this resolution. In this respect I differ from some of my colleagues. I believe this is one of the most timely documents that has even been offered the House and Senate in my 6 years as a Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, education has been defined as the problem of diffusing knowledge and research has been defined as the problem of extending the borders of knowledge. This book is an expression in both education and research, measured by that yardstick. It has chapters on technology in agriculture, mineral industries, transportation, communication, power, chemistry, electricity, metallurgy, and with reference to the construction industries. It deals with the vital

problem of adapting the inventive genius of mankind to modern life in labor and in industry.

I hope the resolution passes unanimously. I predict you will find a greater demand from your constituents for this book than for any printed document the Government has put out this year. It is timely, and follows the trend of the times. The expense is only $5,900. The other day we appropriated $225,000 on a small book about the Constitution. Here is an expenditure of only $6,000 for something which is worth while and which points out ways and means and methods to meet the changing conditions in industry and labor, with especial emphasis on unemployment and increasing productivity. I hope the House will favor this resolution.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Is there any opportunity to offer an amendment providing that this document shall be distributed through the folding room rather than the document room, so each Member will get his share of copies?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state in answer to the parliamentary inquiry, that after the previous question has been ordered no amendment is in order.

The Chair may further state that under the provisions of the Printing Act of 1895 these documents automatically must be distributed through the folding room.

The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS (H. DOC. NO. 306)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report of the Secretary of State enclosing a certified copy of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas, executed on May 10, 1937, by the Governors of the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, New Mexico, and Colorado, which has been deposited in the Department of State of the United States in accordance with the provisions contained therein. The compact refers to the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas executed at Dallas, Tex., on February 16, 1935, which received the consent of the Congress in Public Resolution No. 64, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 27, 1935. As the above-mentioned compact will expire on September 1, 1937, the present compact provides that the original compact shall continue in force for 2 years from that date. In a letter from the Secretary of the Interior dated July 8, 1937, enclosed with the report of the Secretary of State, the opinion is expressed that some good may be accomplished by this compact.

Accordingly, I hope that Congress will enact appropriate legislation giving its consent to this interstate compact, as required by article I, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 19, 1937.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 23 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico, and for other purposes", I transmit herewith certified copies of laws enacted by the Thirteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico during its fourth special session, September 21–22, 1936, and by the Fourteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico during its first regular session, February 8 to April 15, 1937.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 19, 1937.*

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1938

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 90: Page 86, after line 9, insert the following: "Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado: For construction in accordance with the plan described in Senate Document No. 80, Seventy-fifth Congress, $900,000: *Provided*, That no construction thereof shall be commenced until the repayment of all costs of the project shall, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, be assured by appropriate contracts with water conservancy districts, or irrigation districts or water users' associations organized under the laws of Colorado, or other form of organization satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CUMMINGS].

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, if a man were to approach his banker and ask for a loan of funds, he would expect to make a statement to that banker which would show his financial ability to repay the loan. The people of northeastern Colorado, the district which I represent, are today asking the Members of the House as representatives of the Government to provide for the advancement of funds out of the funds of the Bureau of Reclamation for the purpose of constructing an irrigation project in northeastern Colorado.

May I say to you now, in all candor and all frankness, that after you have heard the presentation of this case if you feel this district is not only willing but able financially to reimburse the Government, then as Members of this House it is your duty to vote against it. We are not asking for something we cannot repay. In the average irrigation and reclamation projects the money is spent in developing new land. I am not seeking to take any fall out of those irrigation projects, because I know they are right and in time will repay the money spent on them; but today I am coming before you to ask for the advancement of funds for a district, part of which has been under irrigation since 1870.

This map before you shows the land involved. It is about 200 miles from there to this part. There are 850,000 acres under irrigation; 650,000 acres of it are affected by this project. There are 175,000 people living in that area today. If this bill is passed it will make it possible for another 50,000 people in the near future to live there, and in the years to come no one knows how many can live there. We have an assessed valuation of $175,000,000, plus $30,000,000 which is now invested in irrigation projects that are not taxed. The last session of our legislature passed without a dissenting vote a law which made it legally possible to put an assessment of 1 mill on every dollar's worth of property in this district, in the city as well as on the farm, which will raise $150,000. This means that some $400,000 will be raised by payments on this land.

I have owned and operated irrigated farms in this section for 30 years. I have owned stock in one ditch company all that time. Our bylaws provide that your water is not turned out unless you pay your assessments, and if you do not pay your assessments your stock is sold for the purpose of paying them. In my 30 years' experience there has never been a share of stock sold. Why? Because the water is worth more than the land, and without the water the land is practically useless.

In this territory today we feed 25 percent of all the lambs and 11 percent of all the cattle dry fed in the United States. During the campaign in the fall when they were processing the sugar beets, every day in the week, 7 days a week, we manufactured 100 carloads of sugar. There are 12 large fac-

tories in that district. We buy hundreds of thousands of dollars, millions of dollars, in fact, worth of corn and cotton cake.

May I call the attention of you people in the South to one thing specifically, that if this water is not used in the State of Colorado and the northern States it will go to Old Mexico. I made a trip to northern Old Mexico last fall and traveled over one ranch of 800,000 acres, of which 600,000 acres can be irrigated. They grew 90,000 acres of cotton on that land last year. I visited their gin in Mexicali, said to be the largest on the North American Continent.

They were ginning this cotton, shipping it to Japan to be manufactured into cheap cotton goods, and reshipping it to the United States. You people in the South are as much interested in this matter as we are.

Today I am going to just touch on the financial part of this proposition, and, as I have said, if you think it will not repay the fund, or if you think it is going to cost the taxpayers anything, do not vote for it.

In addition to the irrigation features of the project, it is the largest power development in the West except Grand Coulee, Boulder Dam, and the Tennessee Valley, and the people who propose to pay for this are building a tunnel 13 miles through the hills, building reservoirs on the western slopes, and we are providing for 350 cubic feet of water every day in the year with a fall of 3,200 feet, and as I have said, it will generate more power than any project in the United States except the ones I have just mentioned. The engineers say this project will pay for itself in 40 years, plus $90,000 per year to the Government, and will furnish a supplementary water supply for 650,000 acres.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I only have a few minutes, but I yield briefly.

Mr. COLDEN. Does the diversion of this water impair in any way the allocation of water under the Colorado Basin compact?

Mr. CUMMINGS. It does not; and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], who has opposed this project, has consented to it, and this project will only take 350,000 feet of water out of the 14,000,000 that passes Lees Ferry, 60 percent of which is furnished by the State of Colorado.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. And is not this one of the very few projects that Colorado has to utilize its portion of the allocation of water to the upper basin States?

Mr. CUMMINGS. So far as I know, it is the only one of any importance that can use it.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. And is it not a fact that Colorado furnishes 60 percent of the water that flows into Lake Mead?

Mr. CUMMINGS. It does.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. How much power did the gentleman say this will produce?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I say it is the fourth largest in the United States, and the gentleman can answer that better than I can. There is 350 cubic feet of water, with a fall of 3,200 feet, and the first drop is 730 feet.

Some question has been raised about where the funds will come from and whether or not we are overloading the Interior appropriation bill, and also whether or not the Bureau of the Budget has agreed to this.

I call your attention to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget for this year authorized $41,151,000 for reclamation purposes, and for Indian reclamation projects $3,515,000, or a total of $44,640,000. The appropriation for the Indians has been increased by over $3,000,000, but the total for irrigation and reclamation this year, as compared with last year, shows a decrease of over $12,000,000.

In other words, if this bill is passed, we will be appropriating less by $12,000,000 than was appropriated last year.

I do not know that there is much more I can add, except to say that within this district we have the State university, the State agricultural college, the State teachers' college, 13 large sugar factories, and 175,000 people, taxable today at probably $175,000,000, and this is in a district that feeds, as I have said, 11 percent of all the cattle and spends millions of dollars in buying feed from the outside.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield.

Mr. GREEVER. And this brings no new land of any kind into cultivation, as I understand it?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Not a foot.

Mr. GREEVER. And is merely a supplementary water supply to lands that have been under irrigation for a long time?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Some of them since 1870.

It may interest you gentlemen to know the kind of crops we will grow.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield, briefly.

Mr. DOWELL. As I understood the gentleman, if this project goes through, 50,000 people are to occupy this land?

Mr. CUMMINGS. There are 175,000 people living there now, and this will make it possible for at least another 50,000, and in the years to come several times that number.

Mr. DOWELL. Will this change the character of the agriculture in that country?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to refuse to answer any further questions, because I want to call your attention to the crops grown there now.

The average crop in the three largest counties is 32 percent alfalfa, 10⅔ percent beets, 12.39 percent barley.

I want to add the statement that another reason we can pay for this project is because three counties in this district in the year 1936 paid a quarter of a million dollars of income taxes to this Government.

I would like to tell you more about this proposition, but, as I have stated, I am trying to confine my statement to the financial part of it, and I want to convince you that we are not asking for charity, and we are not asking for something we cannot repay, because if $175,000,000, plus 175,000 hard-working people, cannot repay $22,000,000 for irrigation, plus $7,000,000 for power, then the country is in bad shape.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it a fact that the water supply which you have heretofore enjoyed is being greatly diminished by natural causes?

Mr. CUMMINGS. In the last 10 years there has been a gradual reduction in the water supply, but this entire irrigation system would have paid for itself in the last 8 years if we had had it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If this additional water is given you, in order to make room for the increased population, will you have to more intensely cultivate the land and bring about greater production or change your method of crop rotation, or just how would you go about that?

Mr. CUMMINGS. The land will be more intensely cultivated. We will grow less corn and barley and raise more vegetables, and I may say that one day last August 50 percent of all the vegetables loaded in the United States were loaded in the State of Colorado, and every carload was grown by irrigation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think that an actual view of this situation is necessary to permit this House to have a fair judgment of what it should do. There is involved in this proposition, including the complete development, approximately $44,000,000. There is, as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CUMMINGS] has told you, 615,000 acres of irrigable lands which is now, or has been at some date in the past, under cultivation. I think we might as well be frank about this. The reason these people want it is that formerly they used to grow, as the gentleman from Colorado has told

you, corn and barley and grains of all kinds, and now they are getting into intensive cultivation. As a result of that intensive cultivation, the growth of vegetables, melons, and that sort of thing, more water is required per acre. They are unable to irrigate all of the land with the water which is available on the east side of the Rockies, so they propose to build a tunnel under the mountain, which at that point, I think, is about 12,000 feet high, about some 12 miles long, to carry the water through from the west side of the mountain to the east side of the mountain. The gentleman from Colorado tells you that it will provide homes and work for 50,000 more people in this territory. I believe that is true, because that intensive cultivation of vegetables, which go into the market and compete with other vegetables and that sort of thing, raised upon land not irrigated, would probably, with this Government subsidized land, drive out of business some of our farmers in other places. I know it would compete very seriously with those in my territory. The question is whether at this time, with the agricultural situation as it is, we should go ahead and provide additional funds to the tune of about $44,000,000 to embark upon an additional reclamation project at a time when there is other land in private ownership already available to take care of the situation.

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

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. This irrigation project, plus the first power plant, cost $29,000,000. The balance of the $44,000,000 will not be expended until such time as the Government in its wisdom proposes to expend it for the purpose of developing electrical energy, to be used for the benefit of the people.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman. I hope this House will reject this motion to concur in the Senate amendment because of the fact that it is inadvisable economically to go ahead with more reclamation projects with the present agricultural situation in this country. I hope that we will consider it on the basis of what ought to be done and not because of some nice feeling we may have for someone else. I like to see everybody happy, and I like to see development of resources, but I do not believe in subsidizing with Government funds the development of land for irrigation purposes in times like these, when land already in private ownership and operated by farmers on their own land is able to supply the food demand of the people. I hope the motion will be rejected.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I find myself reluctant to take a position in opposition to the desires of the congressional contingent from Colorado. I do not believe there is in this House a delegation from any State in the Union that is collectively so affable and so temperate in its demands and which stands in such high esteem in the estimation of this House as do the four sincere, stalwart horsemen from the State of Colorado—and I refer to Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. CUMMINGS. [Applause.] However, despite the affection which I have for them, I must oppose this proposition and the Senate amendment. I can agree with everything that Mr. CUMMINGS has said on the floor and still sincerely oppose what was written into this bill at the other end of the Capitol, and my opposition is predicated upon the fact that even though this will enrich that territory, even though it will provide work for 50,000 people, even though there is need for 300,000 acre-feet of water, there is this fact to be considered, and that is the integrity of the national-park system of this country.

The proposition, briefly, is to impound the headwaters of the Colorado in a reservoir at Granby; to pump the water into Shadow Mountain Lake, a part of Grand Lake; and then, by means of a canal and tunnel, carry the waters under the Continental Divide and there send them into reservoirs and ultimately divert them out into these irrigation purposes. The matter has been considered before the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of the House. I take no position with respect to the power involved and the benefits involved, but I do believe that this is an essential point which the Members of the House ought to remember, and that is that, so far as we can learn from the record, no alternative proposal has been submitted which will keep intact the integrity of the national-park system. Once this Congress authorizes the beginning of commercial exploitation either of the park system or of the areas adjacent thereto it will be the beginning of the destruction of the park system of this country.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot yield now.

Back in 1870 a little contingent of men went to Yellowstone Park. They for the first time appreciated the natural beauties of that country, and out of that little meeting there ultimately evolved a desire and a program for a park system. So Rocky Mountain Park, commonly known as Estes Park, was created in 1914 or 1915. Two years thereafter—bear that in mind—2 years thereafter the National Park Service was created. Consequently, there was no administrative commission to look after the parks, to inspire appreciation on the part of the public, until 2 years after this park was set up, until 2 years after that provision was put in the park act that authorized the ultilization of flowage rights in the park. But I admonish the Members of this House that once we start we never know where the end will be. I realize that this does not particularly cut right into the heart of the park. The east end of this diversion tunnel is located in Wind River Basin, which has been authorized for acquisition by the Congress, but, as I understand, has never been acquired. This tunnel goes under the Continental Divide. I am informed that there are 25,000 linear feet of brittle rock-soil structure that may be imperiled by the tunnel. There are 23 lakes adjacent to or over this tunnel that may be imperiled if the tunnel is put under the Continental Divide. Those dangers could be avoided if some alternate route had been examined and surveyed and proposed, even though it might cost more out of the Federal Treasury. I believe the Congress of the United States stands in the fiduciary relation of a trustee to the people of the 48 States of the Union, for the purpose of preserving the integrity of these parks and to resist every effort at exploitation.

In 1920, when John Barton Payne was Secretary of the Interior, a proposal was submitted to dam up Yellowstone Lake. They wanted to go into the park because of free land and lower cost. They brought almost the identical reasons to bear by saying that if they had to acquire land for the reclamation project it would be prohibitive in cost. The answer of John Barton Payne, the then Secretary of the Interior, was that if they could not make the proposition go on the basis of acquiring the land it ought to be abandoned. Since that time there have been any number of abortive attempts at commercial exploitation of our public-park system, and always they have been successfully resisted.

Let me say to you gentlemen from New York, suppose the board of aldermen had given ear to every proposal to improve Central Park, there would not be enough greensward nor enough lawn left in Central Park in New York City for a boy to stand on in order to change a bathing suit. If the park board in Chicago had given willing ear to every proposal to change Lincoln Park and to improve it, there would not be enough grass and lawn there for a child to sit down and play mumblety-peg. Once it is started you cannot stop that exploitation. Once we establish this precedent there will come a time when they will want to look into the mineral possibilities of the park. They will want to look into the grazing possibilities when a drought comes to the available grazing lands of the West. They will want to establish airplane landing fields and they will want to put in railroads. They will want to put in ski jumps and all that sort of thing. Always the argument will be made that it is not ruining the scenery; it is not marring the natural beauty; it will do no harm. But effects are cumulative and in the years to come

our scenic resources will be despoiled and posterity will then lament our lack of vision.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINGS. We already have the ski jumps.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Possibly so.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Put in by the park people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For the comfort of the visitors in the park. Last year 500,000 people visited Rocky Mountain Park. We have $6,000,000 invested in that park at the present time. Are we this day going to make the first step that will ultimately impair the integrity of the national park system?

I say to my good friends from Colorado that I am making no commitment upon the purposes and the merits of this proposal, but let us take out this amendment. Let us vote it down. Let us send this proposition back, and let us insist that the reclamation engineer explore alternative methods and routes, even though it may cost a great deal more. Thereby Coloradoans can have their cake and the park system of the country will be preserved for the perpetual enjoyment of the people of the 48 States of the Union. Remember that we stand in a fiduciary relation to the people of the country today. Five hundred thousand people went to Estes Park in 1936. Shall we today permit exploitation either adjacent to or in the park, or take a chance on impairing some of these natural beauties? I think it can be worked out so that the people on the western slope will get their water and the park system will be preserved.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Of course the gentleman has visited the park?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The gentleman never visited Rocky Mountain National Park?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Where does the gentleman get his information, may I ask?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say first of all that the information comes from the National Park Service, and from the hearings. Even the Secretary of the Interior has not yet passed on the matter. He was in the hospital when this controversy was going on.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Read the Secretary's statement on page 9 of the hearings, in which he says a twofold duty of looking after the Reclamation Service which is in the Department of the Interior, and also preserving the integrity of our National Park System, which is in the Department of the Interior. According to this letter, which is dated June 24, 1937, addressed to Mr. CARL HAYDEN, United States Senate, the matter has not been passed upon by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Does the gentleman believe that a tunnel 9 feet in diameter, the nearest point of which is 400 feet from the surface, varying from that to 8,000 feet below the surface, would permit water to seep down into it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think there is always that possibility, especially in the case of this tunnel, for it goes through very brittle rock, and must be provided with surface vents.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Possibility! Water does not seep into the East River Tunnel in New York.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Maybe not. This is not East River.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is not any chance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They will have to bore vents in order to drive that tunnel, as I understand, and then there will be the question of the disposition of the debris. I was a contractor for a number of years in the dirt game and I know a little something about what happens when tunnels are drilled and dirt removed. You have to deposit the excavated materials somewhere. Provision must be made for construction rigs, for debris, for canals, for power lines, and what not. So, in my opinion, you are taking a chance upon impairing this park. We ought to send this project back by voting the Senate amendment down and insist that the proponents come in here with an alternate proposition whereby our friends from Colorado can be taken care of and our park system preserved. [Applause.]

Since Thursday last, when discussion on this conference report was suspended, I have heard much about this project. I have read much about it. There has been the usual bogey man cry that opposition to this amendment was being inspired by the power interests. There has been the contention that the arguments of those who are opposed to this amendment are silly and ridiculous. Doubtless, those same things will be said in the course of the discussion this afternoon. Let us see, therefore, just how silly they are.

If any single person should have expert knowledge on this subject and if any single person should be able to see both sides of this picture without prejudice or rancor, that person would be Mr. A. E. Demaray, Associate Director of the National Park Service in the Department of Interior. He works for Secretary Ickes.

If Mr. Demaray was found within shouting distance of a power lobbyist, how long would he keep his job? If he showed an interest in the park service that would lead him to distort the facts or becloud the truth, how long could he remain in the Interior Department. With this qualification of the witness, I suggest that every Member of the House examine his testimony as it appears on pages 42, 43, and 44 of the hearings on the bill S. 2681 which authorizes this project.

Mr. Demaray acknowledges the right to use flowage in the national parks under the act of 1915 and then points out that it was 2 years later before the National Park Service was created.

He points out that alternate routes are available for this project and that they have not been explored. Nowhere is this statement controverted so far as I can find in the hearings.

He points out that the eastern portal of the tunnel lies in an area that has been authorized by Congress for acquisition and annexation to the park.

He points out that the debris will be deposited within this area that has been authorized for annexation to the park.

He points out that a portion of Grand Lake has been authorized for addition to the park, and that Grand Lake, or a portion thereof, will be flooded and become an artificial reservoir.

He points out that 6,900 feet of bad ground and 17,500 feet of ground that must be shored up will be encountered in driving the tunnel.

He points out that there is a shearing and breakage of the rock structure on both sides of the Continental Divide in close proximity to this proposed tunnel.

He points out that nobody can state with certainty what the effect of this construction work will have on the 23 adjacent lakes which are integral elements in the scenic beauty of this park.

He points out that the approach roads will be paralleled by canals, power lines, towers, and other incidents of construction.

And finally, when quizzed about other routes, he stated:

> I do not think there have been other surveys. I think Mr. Page (referring to John C. Page, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation) can answer that. I think they have dismissed the possibility of making detail surveys because of the evident advantage of the route which was selected for a complete survey.

Nowhere do I find an answer from Mr. Page respecting other surveys and so the record must stand that the first advantageous route surveyed was adopted, irrespective of what it might do to our park system. Studies were made but no surveys on the ground that it would be too expensive. What justification can there be for withholding these surveys when $44,000,000 is involved in this project.

This should be answer enough to those legislative engineers who may characterize these contentions against this proposal as silly and ridiculous.

Now, then, for the other witnesses who can be marshalled in opposition to this proposal. Will anyone say that the testimony of Robert Sterling Yard, of the Wilderness Society, who appeared in opposition, is ridiculous or lacking in substance. Will anybody believe that the opposition of Mr. Frederick Delano, chairman of the National Resources Committee, is lacking in substance.

Will anybody believe that the opposition of the Izaak Walton League of America, as expressed by its vice president, Mr. D'Arcy Magee, is capricious or silly. Will anybody believe that the opposition of Mr. C. H. Collingwood, forester of the American Forestry Association, was for light or transient reasons. Here are the people whose genuine interest in the outdoors and in the preservation of our exhaustible scenic and natural resources has never been questioned. They speak as experts and here they are marshalled against this proposal. Perhaps all argument is ridiculous. Who knows?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on my way over to the House this morning it recurred to me that I had the privilege of witnessing the opening of the first reclamation project constructed by the Government of the United States, which involved the construction of a tunnel. That was the Gunnison tunnel project by means of which, by the boring of a tunnel 6 miles long through a mountain range, the waters of the Gunnison River were diverted to the Uncompahgre Valley on the western slope of the State of Colorado to irrigate the land of that valley. That was in 1910. That project was dedicated by William H. Taft, President of the United States, not down here in the White House but in person on the ground. That is of how much importance that project was thought to be.

I had the honor of being at that time a Member of this body and of traveling with President Taft to the project on his private car. I can recall that scene at this moment. President Taft stated to me afterward that he was positively electrified by the two local speeches that were made at the dedication, one of them by Hon. John Calhoun Bell, a Member of this body for 10 years, from the Fifty-third to the Fifty-eighth Congresses, and the other by State Senator Horace T. DeLong, of Grand Junction, a brilliant lawyer, the one a Democrat, the other a Republican, who made two of the most powerful 10- or 15-minute speeches I ever listened to.

I want to remind our Republican friends that reclamation was established by their party as a part of a great national program of conservation of the natural resources of the Western States of the Union. It was established under a Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, and a Republican Congress. In my judgment, the great contribution of Theodore Roosevelt to the welfare of America was the conservation policy.

I want to say to my Democratic friends that while that section of the country is at this time largely represented by Democrats in the House of Representatives, there is no politics over reclamation in the West. Everybody in the West is for reclamation as essential to the very future existence, progress, and welfare of that country; and regardless of politics they have no place in their calculations for the representatives of any party which would seek to obstruct or destroy this policy.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I have only a few minutes; I am sorry, but I cannot yield.

Mr. Speaker, I have no reclamation project in my district, although it is located wholly in the Rocky Mountain and irrigation region, but I hope some day to have a comparable project in my district. Mr. Speaker, this is not a congressional district question; it is not a State question; this is a question vital to the welfare of at least one-half the geographical area of the United States. I doubt whether Members from the South and East fully realize that one-half of the geographical area of the United States, embracing all or parts of 15 large States, is dependent for its agricultural, domestic, and industrial water supply on reclamation and irrigation, on the storing and distribution of water—not water that falls from the clouds, but water that is gathered out of the rivers and streams and stored and distributed, and mostly by direct distribution.

I have stated before when kindred matters were up in the House that not only water but irrigation water is the lifeblood of the West. To withhold from that great area aid for the development of systems for the storage and distribution of water is to deny it the development of the two great indispensable bases of life—land and water.

A lesson as to the value of water in the West may be drawn from the very fights, such as the Gila project fight, which have occurred on this floor between western Representatives. These fights, it is true, have been used to discredit reclamation, but they were fights for life. Water in the West is real estate, conveyed by deed separately from the land. The use of irrigation water is rigidly regulated by State laws and court decrees. State irrigation superintendents and commissioners oversee its distribution. Armed ditch riders patrol the ditches, strictly enforcing the law and seeing that each user gets only what is his. Men are shot down in the West for unlocking a small sluice box out of turn to let a little water run on their soil. Men are brought into court and sent to jail for running a little extra water on their crops, of which they must rob their neighbor. Larceny of water is punishable by fine and imprisonment in Colorado, and I presume in all the irrigation States.

For 30 years Colorado and Kansas have been in the Supreme Court of the United States over the water of the Arkansas River. All western States are in court with each other all the time over the waters of their rivers, because that water is life. These controversies reach down to the individual farmer, the individual ditch, and the different sections of a State. So it is that the farmers of the Platte Valley in Colorado are willing, under the reclamation law, to mortgage their lands to the Government to get the water which in the eastern and southern sections of the country falls freely from the heavens. When they get it, they will be in their fields at all hours of the night in gum boots and with shovels, letting the life-giving fluid down the crop rows. Irrigation farming is hard labor.

In Colorado nature has furnished us with a special problem. As shown on the national map, Colorado is bisected from north to south by the main range of the Rocky Mountains, known as the Continental Divide. The waters falling on one slope find their way to the Pacific and on the other slope to the Atlantic, and it gives rise to what we in Colorado call the western and eastern slopes. But this Divide lies, as the map shows, closest to the western boundaries of the State, with the result that the western slope has the greater part of the water and the eastern slope the greater part of the land. The western slope also enjoys the heavier rainfall, so that where many parts of the eastern slope are nearly bare the other side is heavily timbered. This project represents a practical effort, now agreed upon by the people of both slopes after a generation of controversy, to get the landless water to the waterless land. The water is certainly there, the land is certainly there, and it can be done.

Mr. Speaker, the main objection, apparently, to this project is not its cost, is not its practicability; apparently the main objection is the alleged injury to Grand Lake and the surrounding area. Grand Lake means more to the city of Denver than it means to all the rest of the country. Grand Lake and its surrounding area was the playground of the city of Denver long before it was ever heard of or visited by the people of any other State, and it is the playground of Denver today. Denver is behind this project, and I know as well as I am standing here that if the area were endangered by this project, as gentlemen claim it is, Denver would be down here fighting it if it dried up every farm in the Platte Valley in Colorado. Leave it to Denver to determine whether

this project will injure Grand Lake and the surrounding national-park area.

As shown by the very excellent model prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, instead of damaging Grand Lake, the project will result in the creation of two additional and much larger lakes. If the man who makes two blades of grass grow where one grew before is a benefactor of mankind, in the semiarid western half of the United States he is no less a benefactor who makes two drops of water grow where one grew before. The creation of these additional lakes will not only guarantee an additional permanent water supply to both the eastern and western slopes, but they will reinforce Grand Lake itself.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other objection raised to this legislation which I am at a loss to understand, and that is that it may injure the wildlife of the area. A few days ago in conversation with a former Member of this body who lives in St. Louis, I asked him, without disclosing the object of my question, about reports that the Keokuk Dam across the Mississippi had injured the wildlife in that area. On the contrary, he said there were various kinds of wildlife there now that had never been seen before, and he followed up by saying that the same thing was true of the great lake constructed a few years ago in Missouri, having a circumference of something like 150 miles. I am at a loss to understand how it could be otherwise. The very jewels of my district—they always look to me like miracles on the face of Nature—are a few lakes a few miles in extent. I only wish there were 10 times as many.

As for the cost, it will be a lien on the Platte Valley, one of the two great agricultural valleys in Colorado. It claims to be the greatest, and for the sake of the argument on this appropriation I will concede it, notwithstanding many people think I live in the greatest agricultural valley in Colorado. The other day in the other body an appropriation was thrown into a House bill for a water project of the estimated cost of $112,000,000. No battle was waged over that. When you leave out of the picture the power feature of reclamation projects, the reclamation cost of all the projects the Government has ever financed from the beginning would hardly exceed the rivers and harbors appropriation of the Seventy-fourth Congress, not one penny of which will ever directly return to the Treasury of the United States. This project must be paid for by the beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, it is my philosophy that every section of this country ought to be encouraged and aided according to the nature of its resources, whether its resources are cotton-fields or mines, whether they are harbors or reservoirs. The West must augment its water supply by storing and using its surplus waters running away to the seas or it must suffer arrested development and decline. Our natural river runs of water no longer suffice. We must store and we must divert. Hence this project. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, as has been said this morning here on the floor of the House, the Members from Colorado certainly are putting up a big fight for this project.

When we have a nice model or design set up here in the hall adjoining the House it is hard to do anything other than help get votes, because they are all good fellows; but this is not a question of good fellowship. I would like to do anything I could for my friends from Colorado. We have to consider this on its merits. We have to consider the merits of the project and whether we can afford to go ahead this year and do something in this respect now contrary to the policy of the Department of Agriculture.

We are asked to appropriate $900,000 and eventually we must spend $44,000,000 to complete this project. Remember, it will cost $900,000 to get your nose under the tent, then $44,000,000 to complete the project. This is something the Members want to give consideration to, especially when economy has been pleaded so hard this year and when you on the Democratic side are talking about reducing Government expenses. The President has asked you to cut down expenses. Will you do it?

During this session of Congress we have appropriated over $10,000,000,000. Let me refer to the statement of July 17, which shows you have spent $214,380,486 more than you received since July 1. Compare that with the first 17 days of the last fiscal year. You will find you have spent over $10,400,000 a day more this year than you did last year, a startling revelation.

This Big Thompson project in Colorado has never been authorized by Congress. Its sponsors have never brought it on the floor of the House, where we could have an opportunity to discuss the project. They hooked it on in the Senate as an amendment and then come over here and ask us to pass it without consideration. We should not permit the Senate to do that. The Members of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives all through the hearings never had an opportunity to discuss this matter or consider it.

There are 7 projects on the Colorado River and 10 projects on the Eastern Slope, making 17 major projects in this bill. I am going to insert in the RECORD the names of these various projects, together with the expenditures called for.

Estimated cost chargeable to irrigation feature

Willow Creek feeder canal		$733,203
Granby Reservoir		2,813,703
Granby pumping plant		1,250,000
Granby pump canal		417,553
North Fork diversion dam		483,928
Continental Divide tunnel		7,271,371
Carter Lake supply canal		710,629
Horsetooth supply canal		1,208,391
St. Vrain feeder canal		368,951
Big Thompson feeder canal		155,246
Poudre feeder canal		632,843
Poudre Valley feeder canal		11,436
North Poudre feeder canal		128,889
North Poudre pumping plant		200,000
Horsetooth Reservoir		3,625,021
Arkins Reservoir		1,859,323
Carter Lake Reservoir		1,925,253
Green Mountain Reservoir (52,000 acre-feet replacement) (100,000 acre-feet for power)		3,776,032
Improvement of Colorado River above Kremmling to maintain fishing and to adjust the present irrigation system to the altered conditions		300,000
		27,871,772
Less the following items tentatively chargeable to power:		
One-half cost of Arkins Reservoir	$929,661	
Portion of cost of Green Mountain Reservoir for 100,000 acre-feet	2,276,032	
		3,205,693
Cost of irrigation features		24,666,079

Power plant no. 1 construction costs

Power plant no. 1 near Estes Park	$1,778,000
Conduit from east portal Continental Divide tunnel to power plant no. 1	1,101,000
Transmission lines connecting power plant no. 1 with Granby pumping plant—with Valmont and line to North Poudre pumping plant	440,000
Commercial substation (30,000 kilowatts)	300,000
Headquarters at power plant no. 1 for operation of power system	100,000
Subtotal	3,719,000
Interest during construction, 3 percent	112,000
Total repayable in 50 years with interest	3,831,000
One-half cost of Arkins Reservoir	929,661
Portion of cost Green Mountain Reservoir, for 100,000 acre-feet allocated to power	2,276,032
Payable on 40-year basis without interest	3,205,693
Total cost power plant no. 1, including other items that are required to be accomplished with the initial development	7,036,693

Full power development

The following is an estimate of the cost of the additional power plants that may be constructed in the future, but are not a part of the initial development:

Power plant no. 5	$1,190,000
Green Mountain-Ka Rose transmission line	130,000
Operators' quarters	60,000
Substation (20,000 kilowatts)	200,000
Subtotal	1,580,000
Interest during construction, 3 percent	47,400
	1,627,400

The above plant, together with plant no. 1, will produce: 113,000,000 kilowatt-hours firm power annually; 92,000,000 kilowatt-hours secondary power annually.

The following are the construction costs of developing power plants nos. 2, 3, 4, and 4–A with appurtenant structures:

Power plant no. 2	$2,325,000
Power plant no. 3	665,000
Power plant no. 4	760,000
Power plant no. 4–A	420,000
Power canal no. 2	2,444,000
Power canal no. 3	493,000
Power canal no. 3–A	113,000
Power canal no. 4	1,194,000
Operators' quarters	150,000
Substations (90,000 kilowatt-hours)	900,000
Additional transmission lines	311,000
Subtotal	9,775,000
Interest during construction, 3 percent	293,250
Total repayable in 50 years with interest	10,068,250
Arkins Canal feeder, payable in 40 years without interest	351,000
Total power plants nos. 2, 3, 4, and 4–A	10,419,250
Total power plant no. 5	1,627,400
Total second-stage development	12,046,650
Primary development plant no. 1	7,036,693
Cost of full power development	19,083,243

It would be a revelation if you would but read and study the above figures. The only time we have had on this side to study it has been during the past week. We asked for and received the reports that were given to the Senate. There has not been a Member of the House who has had the opportunity to discuss this matter; neither has the committee. It is not right. It is not a sound way to legislate.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield at this time. The gentleman talks about increasing the production of sugar beets in this territory. They are trying to increase the production of sugar beets in Colorado, when the Department of Agriculture is trying to curtail the production of sugar beets. If you are going to permit sugar to come in from foreign countries and spend $44,000,000 to increase production, I say it is inconsistent. One department curtailing and paying farmers to reduce crops and Congress spending the money to increase production.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The gentleman wants to be fair. That is wrong.

Mr. RICH. I want to be fair.

Mr. CUMMINGS. That is why I want to tell the gentleman something.

Mr. RICH. The cost of the irrigation feature alone is $24,650,000.

Mr. CUMMINGS. That is right.

Mr. RICH. The cost of the power for this project is $19,083,240.

Mr. CUMMINGS. And all the power belongs to the Government.

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. We are giving it to the Government.

Mr. RICH. But you are spending more money to get it, and the Government will not get the money back.

Mr. CUMMINGS. We are giving you the use of the tunnel and the reservoir.

Mr. RICH. You are spending more money on this project than you will get back in the next 50 years. This is the time for economy and not the time for additional expenditures. All you know is spend, spend, spend.

Mr. CUMMINGS. We are giving you money.

Mr. RICH. That is what we in this body ought to give consideration to; that is, stop needless spending and pay some more attention to getting in revenues if we want to keep from wrecking our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN].

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope a spirit of fair play will prevail in the consideration of this measure. I come from a State in which our problem is to get the water off of the land rather than put it on.

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation held hearings on this bill, and as a member of that committee I am frank to say that I began the consideration of this bill with some prejudice; but after I had heard the various witnesses may I say to you that I could not find one single valid reason or objection why this bill should not be enacted into law. [Applause.]

My colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania talks about economy. Why, the reclamation fund is made up by the sale of land, oil, and minerals in the Rocky Mountain States. It does not come from the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I decline to yield.

One-third of the land in Colorado belongs to the Government. The reclamation fund belongs to the people of Colorado and the other Western States. I say in a spirit of fairness we should permit these people to enjoy the benefits of that fund. [Applause.] It is the equitable and right thing to do.

The engineers for the Reclamation Department told us that it was economically sound and was justified from an engineering standpoint. Why, they surveyed for 2 years locating this route, and it was their final determination that it was sound as an engineering proposition.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of that committee, may I say that the committee sought to find out what opposition there was to this bill, and the only opposition came from certain organizations throughout the country that wanted to act as godfathers for the people of Colorado and other Western States in looking after our national parks. We asked them in what way this would injure the Rocky Mountain State Park. The only answer was, "It might injure this park."

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is under the control of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the gentleman's request if it does not come out of the 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rules, the gentleman from Oklahoma controls the time.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I think sufficient explanation has been made to dispose of any apprehension of danger coming from water flowing hundreds of feet under the ground. Some of these same guardians who are voicing their sentiments here today stated they might object to an airplane flying over this park, because it might destroy the serenity of the guests in the park. Proceeding under the old common-law principle that the owner of land owned it adcaelum ad avernum, from "heaven to hell", they believed this park should extend not only to heaven but to hell also. They did not even want any disturbance hundreds of feet under the surface. The beginning of this tunnel under the ground starts outside of the park, on the west side, comes out on the eastern side outside of the park, and does not touch the Rocky Mountain State Park in any place. As my colleague the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN] has stated, if there were any danger of marring the beauty of this park the people of Denver and the people of Colorado would be down here fighting for the park. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this subject cannot be covered in 2 minutes or 2 hours, but I may point

out to the Members one or two matters which influence my judgment.

We held hearings on this project, and when the hearings were started I believe the committee was almost unanimously prejudiced against this project. After 2 or 3 days of hearings the committee unanimously reported this project favorably for the consideration of the House.

The Izaak Walton League objected because they claimed this project would destroy some of the beauties of the park. However, the President of the league, before the hearings were ended, arose in the committee room and said his objections had all been answered. I understand he has since telegraphed the committee that this bill should be passed and that his league was for the project. The Park Service has made some feeble effort to show the project interferes with the best interest of the Rocky Mountain National Park, but no one has been able to point out one item, one single thing, which would in any way interfere with the scenic beauties of the park. The argument about money of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is absolutely fallacious. Not one dollar of this money comes from the Federal Treasury. That argument is just a smoke screen. The money comes from the Reclamation Fund.

You people from the Eastern States must realize that after engineers designated by you to find the facts have passed favorably on this project, and the Bureau of Reclamation, after years of study, comes back and recommends that this project be approved, the project is a worthy one and should have your approval.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not feel that the Chair should entertain that request, the time being fixed under the rules of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The time being fixed, I should have to object if it comes out of my time, but I have no objection to the gentleman's getting the unanimous consent of the House to proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I want to proceed in an orderly way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand time can be extended by unanimous consent under the circumstances.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, if there is any objection or any question about it, I shall yield the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SNELL. It is against the rules of the House, that is the only thing I care about. I think the rules ought to be observed occasionally.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in all earnestness, I say to those who do not live in the West that water is life to us. We Representatives from Colorado are fighting here for existence of a large part of our State. In this vote today there is involved the future existence of northeastern Colorado.

Our entire delegation in the Congress, in both the Senate and the House, is unanimously and earnestly asking for the approval of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. The beloved dean of the Colorado delegation [Mr. TAYLOR], who for a time and for good and sufficient reasons was objecting to some details of this project, has had all his objections met. I would not give my active support to this project until the grounds for Mr. TAYLOR's objections were removed. As you know, he is now rapidly recuperating from a recent illness and is resting in a suburb of Washington. A few days ago he wrote me a letter, which reads as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C., July 13, 1937.

HON. LAWRENCE LEWIS, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LAWRENCE: Inasmuch as all differences concerning the Colorado-Big Thompson reclamation project have recently been adjusted between the representatives of the eastern slope and the western slope of Colorado and in a manner satisfactory to my constituents, I sincerely hope the House will concur in the Senate amendment to the Interior Department appropriation bill which provides $900,000 for beginning construction of this project.

Very cordially yours,

EDWARD T. TAYLOR, *Chairman.*

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

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I am sorry, but I shall yield later.

This is the first time the Colorado delegation has ever come to the Congress of the United States asking for an appropriation for any reclamation project for that part of our State lying east of the main range of the Rocky Mountains, where a million people live. The Colorado delegation today is not asking for an ordinary thing—we are asking for a chance for those million people to continue to live there. But, actually, we speak for a million and a quarter people, because all the people of Colorado unanimously urge this project now. And we speak for a State which has helped all the others, a State which furnishes 60 percent of the water which goes into Lake Mead behind Boulder Dam, and which helped to save our friends in southern California from a similar water shortage. I know they will help us. I know all others who are familiar with our problems will help us.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. COLDEN. Will not the artificial lakes in that project add to the beauty of the Rocky Mountain area as well as add to the value of this land?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Absolutely.

We have heard much from nonresident and self-constituted guardians of the State of Colorado and of our natural scenic beauties and of our national parks. Doubtless they are sincere, but they have been misinformed. They have been flooding Members of the House with misleading propaganda. They came before the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of the House during the 2 days of hearings and admitted—as did one of my good friends a few minutes ago in this debate, who also has been misinformed—and admitted that they had never been in Rocky Mountain National Park. Senator ADAMS and Senator JOHNSON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MARTIN, and I have lived all, or practically all, of our lives in Colorado. In the Sixty-third Congress, Mr. TAYLOR, who was then serving his third term as Congressman at Large from Colorado, sponsored and secured the passage through the House on January 18, 1915, of the bill establishing Rocky Mountain National Park. We have visited it in spring, summer, autumn, and winter. We know it and love it well. Do you think we would be such fools, do you think we would be so silly, as to do or suffer to be done anything that would impair the beauty or attractiveness of Rocky Mountain National Park? We regard it is a priceless heritage of indescribable beauty and grandeur that has come down to us from primeval times. We are far more jealous than any nonresident could be to preserve it unimpaired for the enjoyment and inspiration of future generations. We Coloradans are not idiots; we are not fools. Apart from the fact that Rocky Mountain National Park is of rare beauty and grandeur, it is an economic asset to our State in that hundreds of thousands of people from all parts of the world come to visit it. And most of them, in so coming, visit my city of Denver.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. GREEVER. Is it not a fact that the act constituting the Rocky Mountain National Park contained a provision that a trans-mountain diversion could occur there?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Absolutely; that is in the act of Congress creating the park. I know considerable about that because my family had something to do with interesting the people of our State in urging our Senators and Representatives then in the Congress to secure the passage of the act creating this and other national parks in Colorado. Both parents of Senator ADAMS—and his father served two terms as Governor of Colorado—had something to do with

urging the creation of national parks in our State. In the act of Congress creating this park there is an express reservation of the right to have this reclamation project established.

Now, I ask, is the Congress of the United States going to break faith with the State of Colorado by refusing to approve this project? Furthermore, when the question later came up in the Colorado Legislature with respect to ceding jurisdiction of this park, Senator ADAMS and I helped and solicited the help of others to secure passage by a reluctant Colorado Legislature of the State statute ceding jurisdiction to the United States. That cession would not have been made if that condition had not been in the act of Congress creating the park. The act of Congress authorizing the creation of Rocky Mountain National Park reserved the right for the Bureau of Reclamation to survey and construct an irrigation project within the boundaries of the park. No part of the present project, except the tunnel far underground, will be within the boundaries of the park. Those of us who are familiar with the proceedings in the Colorado Legislature at the time the State statute ceding jurisdiction was enacted are confident this cession of jurisdiction would not have been made if the act of Congress had not contained the reservation to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The act of Congress creating the Rocky Mountain National Park, enacted January 26, 1915, and being chapter 19, section 1, volume 38, statutes 798 (title 16, sec. 191, U. S. C.), contains the following provision:

> United States Reclamation Service may enter upon and utilize for flowage or other purposes any area within said park which may be necessary for the development and maintenance of a Government reclamation project.

The Colorado statute ceding jurisdiction over park area is found in Colorado Session Laws, 1929, page 475.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time has been fixed and is in control of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from the Colorado delegation sent to each Member of the House:

> CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
> HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
> *Washington, D. C., July 14, 1937.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The entire Colorado congressional delegation earnestly urge that you support the Senate amendment to the Interior Department appropriation bill which provides $900,000 from the reclamation fund for beginning the construction of the Colorado-Big Thompson reclamation project.
>
> No one has greater interest in the welfare of Colorado than the Senators and Representatives from Colorado or would oppose more bitterly any project which would impair the scenic attractions of their State which they recognize are among the greatest resources of Colorado.
>
> From personal knowledge, the Colorado delegation wish to assure you that fears that the project will impair or damage the Rocky Mountain National Park or commercialize it, or set a precedent for the commercialization of other parks are entirely unfounded. Those who have protested against the project doubtless are sincere, but their objections are based upon misinformation.
>
> The Honorable EDWARD T. TAYLOR, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, who is now recuperating from a recent illness, wrote to a member of the delegation the following letter:
>
> "Inasmuch as all differences concerning the Colorado-Big Thompson reclamation project have recently been adjusted between the representatives of the Eastern Slope and the Western Slope of Colorado and in a manner satisfactory to my constituents, I sincerely hope the House will concur in the Senate amendment to the Interior Department appropriation bill which provides $900,000 for beginning construction of this project."
>
> The act of Congress creating Rocky Mountain National Park recognized the advisability of this project and specifically reserved the right to the Reclamation Service to enter the park for its construction.
>
> The request for the appropriation was presented first to the Senate because an agreement essential to settlement of differences between eastern and western sections of Colorado was not concluded until after the Interior Department appropriation bill had passed the House.
>
> The amendment made by the Senate is supported by a bill (S. 2681) authorizing the construction, which has passed the Senate and has been reported favorably by unanimous vote of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation after full hearings.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> ALVA B. ADAMS.
> EDWIN C. JOHNSON.
> LAWRENCE LEWIS.
> FRED CUMMINGS.
> JOHN A. MARTIN.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a ruling on the question of whether it is proper to extend the time of each speaker by unanimous consent. I am not opposed to it, but I think we should follow the usual procedure of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that time can be extended by unanimous consent, but that is contrary to the practice of the House.

Mr. SNELL. I know it is contrary to the practice of the House and I object to time being extended in that way. If we want to follow the regular procedure and extend the time beyond the 1 hour of debate, we should do so.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. SNELL. I object to that procedure, because it is not in accordance with the usual procedure of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWOPE].

Mr. SWOPE. Mr. Speaker, this project affects two factors—what will happen to our national-park system and how it affects the expenditures of the Federal Government.

Let me say first of all that I have not been in the Rocky Mountain National Park, so that if anyone wants to ask me the question, it is now answered, but we come here from every section of the United States to exercise our judgment upon legislation that affects many sections that we have not seen and we are therefore forced to get our information from such sources as may be available.

So far as the effect upon the beauties of the national-park system is concerned, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I think, has presented the problem in a very fine manner. In my city of Harrisburg, Pa., there resides Mr. J. Horace McFarland, former chairman of the Board of the American Planning and Civic Association. Over that board now presides Mr. Frederic A. Delano. Mr. McFarland has informed me that his association and seven kindred associations have expressed apprehension and objection to this project and to projects of a similar character.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWOPE. I have only a few minutes, and this is my first offense. I will yield next year. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I will wait.

Mr. SWOPE. When we want to know something about dentistry, we consult a dentist; when we want to know something about engineering, we consult an engineer; and when we want to know something about the beauties of our national-park system we consult people who have made a study of the scenic beauty of our national-park system.

So far as the Budget is concerned, it is acknowledged that this will cost probably $44,000,000, and it is alleged by many it will cost $60,000,000. It was stated on the floor here that if this project had been in effect some years ago, the cost of it would have been returned within the last 8 years. Let me say to the Members of the House that in the State of Pennsylvania we have a device which would take care of such a situation by the State of Pennsylvania. In the State of Pennsylvania we have erected a State authority, and the State authority is empowered to issue bonds for the consummation of projects which are for the good of the State. These bonds are sold to the investing public and the bonds stand upon their own bottom. If the project is good the bonds can be sold and the project returns the cost thereof and the bonds are retired, and let me say, Mr. Speaker, it is time we were returning to principles of this kind. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, in view of the short time allotted me, I shall not be able to answer any questions. I had not intended to mention the merits of the bill, but statements have been made here which should be cleared up, to show the fallacy of the claim that this is necessarily self-sustaining. It is possible, but I do not think that fact is established, and in support of my opinion I shall read a statement by Commissioner Page in the hearings, on page 149:

Appropriations for continuation of construction of certain reclamation projects amounting to $10,860,000 were made from the reclamation fund; continuation of construction of the Central Valley project in California, the Grand Coulee Dam project in Washington, and the Boulder Canyon project, including the All-American Canal, was provided for by appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury.

That means that because the reclamation fund had become so reduced they were required on new projects to raise the money by getting it from the Treasury. Commissioner Page also testified that the reclamation fund income was being seriously reduced because of the lack of sale of public lands. There are many other things that he would like to go into. Mr. Page stated:

Salable public lands have been exhausted. The remaining public domain has been withdrawn, and a new policy has been established with regard to it.

The only revenue to the reclamation fund which can be called stable at this time is that received from the repayment of project construction costs by those benefiting.

I want you now to listen to this statement from Mr. Page:

A moratorium granted and extended by Congress has postponed or curtailed these repayments for a space of 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go into that more at length, but it is a fact that no one knows whether or not these projects are going to be good, or whether there will be money enough in the reclamation fund to lend to these projects to carry on with. In fact the statement made by Commissioner Page indicates that there will not be any money in the reclamation fund, and the next thing that will happen will be a request that the Treasury put up the money and they will not take any from the reclamation fund, but from the general fund. My chief objection, Mr. Speaker, to this bill, is one that I think the House should very seriously consider. This same thing came up last year in the Interior appropriation bill. We declined to authorize it. They had their opportunity then to go before the House committee and present the facts and have the House go into it, but they did not go there. They did not go to the Budget. It appeared in the Senate, although we had taken no action on it. Not one word, as far as I can find, was said on the floor of the Senate about this proposition, a project involving $900,000 this year, and $44,000,000 eventually, but it passed without argument, without explanation, without anything except the inferential statement that "I would like to have it." What does this House know about it? What do you know about it? If you were on a board of directors and you were asked to endorse a proposition involving millions and millions of dollars of the money of the company, is there a man here who would consider for one moment putting his o. k. on such a proposal when all he had heard had been statements that are exparte, from people who are interested in the section of the country which is to be benefited? I hope the House will not recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask my colleague from Colorado one question. I have received some protests concerning this proposed project from certain associations, and I want to know whether or not the construction and completion of this project will in any way interfere with or mar or deface or take away from the attractiveness of the park in Colorado?

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. It will not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I am in favor of this amendment for the reason that it is going to create national wealth. It will create that wealth by stimulating agricultural and commercial activity in eastern Colorado. In the second place, I call the attention of my distinguished friend from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] to the fact that the Boulder Dam project is a self-liquidating project, and that, before a spadeful of dirt was turned, the city of Los Angeles, the Metropolitan Water District, and three private power companies had to sign contracts with the Government guaranteeing that every dollar spent on Boulder Dam would be paid back to the Treasury in 50 years. The project under discussion can be made a self-liquidating project in the same manner if given the machinery for power production at the dam to be built. By distributing this power to the people of Colorado who need it, the whole proposition can easily be paid for, dollar for dollar, with interest. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK].

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, two arguments have been made against the bill here today, one by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWOPE], in respect to the money end of it and what it will cost the Government. I will read to you the following part of the amendment, which will prove to you that there will be no cost to the Government:

That no construction thereof shall be commenced until the payment of all the costs of the project shall, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, be assured by appropriate contracts with the water-conservancy districts.

That proves my argument. It will not cost the taxpayers $1. It is a self-liquidating project. The argument presented by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] about the park being damaged is the most ridiculous argument I have ever heard.

The nearest this tunnel will be to the surface of the park will be from 800 to 4,000 feet. Just think of water seeping down 800 or 4,000 feet into a concrete tunnel 9 or 10 feet in diameter! There has been no argument given here today that is substantiated by any kind of facts or reason. My argument today is to give relief to the 175,000 farmers on the east side of the Rockies. This 13-mile tunnel will bring that relief without any financial cost to the Government or any destruction of our national parks.

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The gentleman would not yield to me, but I yield to him.

Mr. RICH. Did you ever hear of this project, as a member of the committee, before it was tacked on over in the Senate?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I told you last Thursday when this bill was before the House that it had been discussed for the last 3 or 4 years. As the previous speaker, who is opposed to the amendment, said, it was in the Interior Department bill last year. It was reported out unanimously by the Senate this year. If the Colorado delegation had been united, they would have had this project years ago. [Applause.] They are united today. I represent an eastern district, but I am in favor of this, in order to bring water to 175,000 distressed farmers whose crops today are being ruined on account of lack of water. [Applause.]

I ask you to vote for this amendment, because it is a real deserving amendment for the benefit of the farmers east of the Rocky Mountains. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma) there were ayes 101 and noes 97.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 174, nays 154, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—174

Allen, La.	Drew, Pa.	Kirwan	Phillips
Allen, Pa.	Drewry, Va.	Kitchens	Pierce
Amlie	Dunn	Kocialkowski	Rabaut
Atkinson	Eckert	Kopplemann	Ramspeck
Barry	Elliott	Kramer	Rankin
Beam	Englebright	Kvale	Reilly
Beiter	Ferguson	Lanzetta	Robinson, Utah
Bigelow	Fitzpatrick	Larrabee	Romjue
Binderup	Flannagan	Lea	Sacks
Bloom	Flannery	Leavy	Sadowski
Boileau	Ford, Calif.	Lesinski	Schulte
Boland, Pa.	Ford, Miss.	Lewis, Colo.	Scott
Boren	Gambrill	Luckey, Nebr.	Scrugham
Brooks	Garrett	Luecke, Mich.	Secrest
Brown	Gearhart	McFarlane	Shanley
Buck	Gildea	McGehee	Smith, Va.
Buckler, Minn.	Green	McGrath	Smith, Wash.
Bulwinkle	Greever	McKeough	Snyder, Pa.
Burdick	Gregory	McLaughlin	South
Carter	Griffith	McReynolds	Sparkman
Cartwright	Hamilton	Magnuson	Spence
Case, S. Dak.	Hart	Mansfield	Stefan
Clark, Idaho	Harter	Martin, Colo.	Sumners, Tex.
Coffee, Nebr.	Havenner	Massingale	Thom
Coffee, Wash.	Hendricks	Maverick	Thomas, Tex.
Colden	Hildebrandt	Mills	Thomason, Tex.
Collins	Hill, Okla.	Moser, Pa.	Thompson, Ill.
Cooper	Hill, Wash.	Mouton	Tolan
Costello	Hobbs	Murdock, Ariz.	Turner
Cox	Honeyman	Murdock, Utah	Voorhis
Crosser	Hook	Nichols	Wallgren
Cummings	Hope	O'Connell, Mont.	Walter
Curley	Houston	O'Connell, R. I.	Wearin
Daly	Izac	O'Connor, Mont.	Weaver
Delaney	Jarman	O'Connor, N. Y.	Welch
Dempsey	Jenckes, Ind.	O'Day	Wene
DeMuth	Johnson, Minn.	O'Leary	West
DeRouen	Johnson, Okla.	O'Toole	White, Idaho
Dies	Johnson, W. Va.	Palmisano	Whittington
Dingell	Jones	Patman	Wilcox
Disney	Kee	Patrick	Wood
Dockweiler	Kennedy, Md.	Patton	Zimmerman
Doughton	Kennedy, N. Y.	Pearson	
Doxey	Keogh	Peterson, Fla.	

NAYS—154

Aleshire	Douglas	McAndrews	Schaefer, Ill.
Allen, Ill.	Dowell	McLean	Schneider, Wis.
Anderson, Mo.	Eberharter	McSweeney	Seger
Andresen, Minn.	Edmiston	Mahon, Tex.	Shannon
Andrews	Engel	Maloney	Simpson
Arends	Evans	Mapes	Smith, Conn.
Arnold	Faddis	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Maine
Ashbrook	Farley	May	Snell
Bacon	Fitzgerald	Michener	Steagall
Bates	Fletcher	Millard	Sutphin
Bell	Forand	Miller	Swope
Biermann	Frey, Pa.	Mitchell, Tenn.	Taber
Bland	Gehrmann	Nelson	Tarver
Boyer	Goldsborough	Norton	Taylor, Tenn.
Bradley	Griswold	O'Brien, Ill.	Terry
Burch	Guyer	O'Brien, Mich.	Thomas, N. J.
Carlson	Gwynne	Oliver	Thurston
Casey, Mass.	Halleck	O'Neal, Ky.	Tinkham
Champion	Hancock, N. C.	O'Neill, N. J.	Tobey
Chapman	Hartley	Pace	Towey
Church	Healey	Patterson	Transue
Citron	Hull	Peterson, Ga.	Treadway
Clark, N. C.	Hunter	Pettengill	Umstead
Clason	Jarrett	Poage	Vincent, B. M.
Claypool	Jenkins, Ohio	Polk	Vinson, Fred M.
Cluett	Jenks, N. H.	Powers	Vinson, Ga.
Cochran	Johnson, Luther A.	Ramsay	Warren
Cole, N. Y.	Kelly, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.	Whelchel
Colmer	Kerr	Reed, Ill.	White, Ohio
Cooley	Kinzer	Rees, Kans.	Wigglesworth
Cravens	Knutson	Rich	Williams
Crawford	Lambertson	Richards	Withrow
Crowe	Lamneck	Rigney	Wolcott
Crowther	Lanham	Robertson	Wolfenden
Deen	Lewis, Md.	Robsion, Ky.	Wolverton
Dirksen	Lord	Rogers, Mass.	Woodruff
Ditter	Lucas	Rogers, Okla.	Woodrum
Dixon	Luce	Rutherford	
Dondero	Ludlow	Sauthoff	

NOT VOTING—103

Allen, Del.	Boykin	Byrne	Celler
Barden	Boylan, N. Y.	Caldwell	Chandler
Bernard	Brewster	Cannon, Mo.	Cole, Md.
Boehne	Buckley, N. Y.	Cannon, Wis.	Creal
Crosby	Gray, Pa.	Long	Randolph
Culkin	Greenwood	McClellan	Rayburn
Cullen	Haines	McCormack	Reed, N. Y.
Dickstein	Hancock, N. Y.	McGranery	Ryan
Dorsey	Harlan	McGroarty	Sabath
Driver	Harrington	McMillan	Sanders
Duncan	Hennings	Maas	Schuetz
Eaton	Higgins	Mahon, S. C.	Shafer, Mich.
Eicher	Hill, Ala.	Mason	Sheppard
Ellenbogen	Hoffman	Mead	Short
Fernandez	Holmes	Meeks	Sirovich
Fish	Imhoff	Merritt	Smith, W. Va.
Fleger	Jacobsen	Mitchell, Ill.	Somers, N. Y.
Fries, Ill.	Johnson, Lyndon	Mosier, Ohio	Stack
Fuller	Keller	Mott	Starnes
Fulmer	Kelly, N. Y.	O'Malley	Sullivan
Gasque	Kenney	Owen	Sweeney
Gavagan	Kleberg	Parsons	Taylor, Colo.
Gifford	Kloeb	Peyser	Taylor, S. C.
Gilchrist	Kniffin	Pfeifer	Teigan
Gingery	Lambeth	Plumley	Wadsworth
Gray, Ind.	Lemke	Quinn	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sullivan (for) with Mr. Short (against).
Mr. Meeks (for) with Mr. Gilchrist (against).
Mr. Pfeifer (for) with Mr. Culkin (against).
Mr. Teigan (for) with Mr. Holmes (against).
Mr. Gavagan (for) with Mr. Taylor of South Carolina (against).
Mr. Lemke (for) with Mr. Plumley (against).
Mr. Sirovich (for) with Mr. Reed of New York (against).
Mr. Bernard (for) with Mr. Mason (against).
Mr. Byrne (for) with Mr. Gifford (against).
Mr. Cullen (for) with Mr. Maas (against).
Mr. Schuetz (for) with Mr. Fish (against).
Mr. Taylor of Colorado (for) with Mr. Eaton (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Parsons with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Brewster.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Hancock of New York.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Mott.
Mr. Hennings with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Owen with Mr. Ellenbogen.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Stack.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Sanders.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Keller.
Mr. Boylan of New York with Mr. Haines.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Eicher.
Mr. Starnes with Mr. Fleger.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Harlan.
Mr. O'Malley with Mr. Higgins.
Mr. Mead with Mr. Crosby.
Mr. Kennedy of New Jersey with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Gasque with Mr. Quinn.
Mr. Hill of Alabama with Mr. Kniffin.
Mr. Driver with Mr. Jacobsen.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Harrington.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Kleberg.
Mr. McClellan with Mr. Fries.
Mr. Lambeth with Mr. Duncan.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Mitchell of Illinois.
Mr. Gray of Indiana with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Kelly of New York with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Long.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Mahon of South Carolina.
Mr. Chandler with Mr. Dorsey.
Mr. Imhoff with Mr. Gingery.
Mr. Mosier of Ohio with Mr. Creal.
Mr. Allen of Delaware with Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Lyndon Johnson with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. McGranery with Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin.

Mr. BEITER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. NICHOLS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 93: Page 88, after line 9, insert:

"For administrative expenses on account of the above projects, including personal services and other expenses in the District of Columbia and in the field $750,000, in addition to and for the same objects of expenditure as are hereinbefore enumerated in paragraphs 2 and 3 under the caption 'Bureau of Reclamation'; in all, $10,535,000: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed $75,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate No. 93 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 6 in said amendment strike out "$10,535,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,150,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this amendment appropriates $750,000 for administrative expenses in connection with the construction of 16 reclamation projects. It is absolutely essential that this sum be provided if the necessary administrative supervision is to be made available. To deny this sum would have the effect of withdrawing engineering and administrative supervision, which might well cause an ultimate loss of millions of dollars, due to the inefficient and faulty construction of reservoirs, power plants, and other reclamation structures.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 94: Page 88, after amendment no. 93, insert: "The unexpended balances of the amounts appropriated from the reclamation fund, special fund, under the caption 'Bureau of Reclamation, construction', in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937, shall remain available for the same purposes for the fiscal year 1938."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. TABER. This is the same item that the House voted down on a roll call?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 95: Page 88, line 24, after the word "fund", strike out "$9,416,600" and insert in lieu thereof "$11,701,600."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:
"In lieu of the sum proposed, insert '$10,316,600.'"

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 97: Page 91, after line 21, insert:
"For general investigations, $300,000 to enable the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to carry on engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects, surveys for reconstruction, rehabilitation, or extension of existing projects and studies of water conservation and development plans, such investigations, surveys, and studies to be carried on by said Bureau either independently, or, if deemed advisable by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with State agencies and other Federal agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, National Resources Committee, and the Federal Power Commission."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 97 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:
"In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert '$2,000.'"

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 98: Page 92, in line 15, strike out "$26,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$26,550,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 98 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$26,450,000."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 121: On page 111, in line 18, insert:
"Fish hatchery for Glacier National Park: For acquisition, by the Secretary of the Interior, of such real property and rights therein in T. 28 N., R. 20 W., Montana meridian, as may be necessary for the establishment and operation of a fish hatchery for Glacier National Park, $16,500."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement for the reason that it has recently developed that the Public Works Administration has made an allocation for this purpose, and this would simply be a duplication. I hold in my hand a letter from the administrative assistant to the Secretary, Mr. Burlew, saying that this appropriation is not now necessary.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 121.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 123: Page 119, after line 21, insert:
"Appropriations herein made for the national parks, national monuments, and other reservations under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, shall be available for the giving of educational lectures therein and for the services of field employees in cooperation with such nonprofit scientific and historical societies engaged in educational work in the various parks and monuments as the Secretary, in his discretion, may designate."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 123 and agree to the same.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Has the gentleman or any member of his committee given thorough study to know what they are going to do through these lectures? Is the gentleman sure that this is not more Government propaganda for the Interior Department, an effort on their part to create sentiment in order to help them build up their organization even larger than it now is? Each year it requires more and more to conduct this Department of Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Answering my distinguished colleague, a member of the committee, I may say that this item has been carried in the bill for several years. This educational program is a very important one. The public appreciates it. It is not a propaganda program but one strictly of education, and I think it is very essential that it be continued.

Mr. RICH. Has the gentleman listened to some of the programs over the radio lately in reference to the national parks and reclamation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not know that I have listened in the last few days but I have listened to some of them, and in my opinion they are very splendid, interesting, and educational programs.

Mr. RICH. Some are, I agree; but a great many seem to me to be building up the Department of the Interior in order to create sympathy for the work they are doing. In other words, propaganda. Some day it is going to cost this country millions of dollars to put through the program they have in mind in the Park Service and in the Interior Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that their program is a very splendid, constructive, and educational program, one that will be for the benefit of the people of the United States who

visit the national parks. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. RICH. I am not going to object, for objection from this side seems futile, but I say to the gentleman that the present administration of the Interior Department seems inclined to want more play and less work. This is a time when we need to get some work done in this country. The time has come when we should stop a lot of this playing. The time is here now when we must teach the people to work more and play less. This administration seems to think that the people should be kept by the Government instead of them supporting the Government. All play and no work will lead to ruin.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I doubt whether we have Federal employees who are more faithful to their work than are the employees of the National Park Service, and if the gentleman will visit the national parks he will see how they work.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman wants me to go out and play in the National Park Service?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is not play. It is work. I went into the national parks, not as a Member of the House, and they did not know who I was for 4 or 5 days. I saw their work going on and it is a credit to the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House consider Senate amendment no. 125 before considering amendment no. 124 for the reason that the vote on amendment no. 125 might affect the amount as carried in amendment no. 124.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this will not interfere with our right to have an hour on the Natchez Trace Parkway?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report Senate amendment no. 125 in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 125: Page 121, line 20, strike out "*Provided*, That not exceeding $500,000 of this appropriation shall be available for construction of the Natchez Parkway", and insert in lieu thereof: "*Provided*, That $2,700,000 and any other sums received from other sources for said Natchez Trace Parkway shall be allotted and expended ratably between the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee according to mileage of said parkway in each respective State."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 125, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert '$1,500,000'."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, may I answer the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and say that not one mile of the Natchez Trace has ever been started. The gentleman says it has been going on for years, but not one mile has been started.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; if the gentleman will tell me of a mile that has been completed.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. The gentleman said none of it had been started. May I correct the gentleman by stating they are working on it right now.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Where?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Between Jackson, Miss., and Kosciusko.

Mr. RANKIN. Between Jackson and Natchez.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Between Jackson and Natchez; yes. The gentleman should take a trip down there and see for himself.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I have information from the Park Service that they did not know of even one mile that has been started. I got it this week from the Park Service. If the gentleman has more information than they have, he is ahead of them.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. I may tell the gentleman positively it has been started.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Several miles have been constructed on the other road, but nothing in the Park Service records shows that even one mile of the Natchez Trace is under construction.

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

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. They told the gentleman they had been getting this right-of-way all this time, did they not?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; but that is your State's concern. All you furnish is this cheap land.

Mr. RANKIN. The right-of-way; they had deeds to it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; but the gentleman from Mississippi said it had been going on for a long while.

Mr. RANKIN. I said getting the right-of-way and getting ready for this highway.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Oh, all right; getting it ready.

Mr. Speaker, the important thing about this matter is that it is an innovation. The $6,000,000 appropriated in this provision is nothing. The important thing is the innovation of having the Government furnish 100 percent of the funds for road construction. The principle is absolutely new. It is the first time in our history this has happened. The Skyline Drive and the Natchez Trace are the first instances of this kind, and they were authorized only last year. Emergency moneys gave birth to both of these propositions. The gentleman speaks about the National Park Service having started them. The Park Service had nothing to do with starting these projects, because they were started with emergency money, and then got their authorization afterward, a year ago. We never gave birth to them. The National Park Service never asked for either one of them. They were handed to the National Park Service and paid for out of emergency funds, which somebody was influential in having allotted.

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

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; briefly.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true the Government has built the highways in all the parks west of the Mississippi?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. In the parks.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; and connected with the parks.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. In the parks. However, here the innovation is in building the highways outside the parks for the first time. While there is some justification under the pretext of connecting the Shenandoah Park with the Big Smoky Park in North Carolina, there is no scintilla of an excuse for building the Natchez Trace, because there is nothing at either end of the Natchez Trace—that is, a national park.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; I will yield briefly.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In all fairness, now, have not the entrances to the national parks been constructed in the West at the expense of the Federal Government, which enables the very thing we are doing here?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Only at entrances in a few instances and for short distances.

It will take $23,000,000 to finish this Trace road, but that is not the half of it. It will be that amount, all right. It will take $34,000,000 to finish this other drive. This highway is 430 miles long and this 490 miles long, or 950 miles altogether, which for the first time will have 100-percent Federal construction. What I am emphasizing is the innovation of putting the Government into the construction of highways on a 100-percent basis on the flimsy excuse of connecting national parks, when the last one does not even connect any two national parks.

Mr. BEVERLY M. VINCENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. BEVERLY M. VINCENT. If this is an innovation, the appropriation to the gentleman's State for relief from grasshoppers is also an innovation.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. That is not only for my State, and it is not new. It is for the Nation. There is nothing in my district or in my State of this kind which I have favored or for which I have ever gone before any committee. I have been on the Committee on Appropriations for 4 years, but I am not here to sell my self-respect or violate my oath for somebody's schemes just because I love him. We love the great chairman of the Ways and Means Committee whose business it is to start to raise the money for this Government, yet he fathers that great scheme, along with a very important member of the Appropriations Committee from Virginia, of putting us into an expenditure of $57,000,000 which this Congress did not authorize in either instance until after the project was started. Both of these projects were started with emergency funds. They are both illegitimate babies.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman know that this Congress, on June 2, 1936——

Mr. LAMBERTSON. 1936; yes.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. By a vote of 238 to 99, authorized this project, and is the gentleman going to set himself up in an arbitrary manner because he is a member of the Appropriations Committee and deny an expenditure which the Congress has authorized?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. If we spent money for all the things that are authorized, we would not be doing our duty over there, and if the gentleman were a member of the Appropriations Committee he would not vote for everything that is authorized.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman realize that an authorization of Congress should mean something to him in connection with these matters?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No one pays much attention to authorizations. If they did, there would be no use for appropriation committees. I want to say to the gentleman that you got your first money from emergency funds before you got the authorization.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Nevertheless, we got the authorization just the same.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. But you got your money from emergency funds before you got the authorization.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no.

Mr. LAMBERTON. Yes; you did. You had your emergency money from the President before you ever had any authorization. Then you came along and got your authorization and now you come back here and ask the Congress to finish this proposition that puts the Government into 100-percent road construction with an expenditure now of $23,000,000, with no parks at either end of the road. This shows how quickly you can forsake the pretense of a parkway, which was put into the Road Act of 1936 that authorized the parkway for the first time. This was put in by the other body, and it is just like a lot of other things started at the other end of the Capitol. This was started over there and the authorization in the Road Act for parkways started over there and came back here for a vote, and it was stated that there had to be a parkway at each end, but on the second jump you leave the parkway clear out of it and build the Natchez Trace without even a skunk run at either end of it.

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

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman states that this was started without any authorization when, as a matter of fact, the bill was passed in 1934 authorizing the original survey.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. What became of that bill?

Mr. RANKIN. The bill passed and the President signed it. They went ahead and made a survey then and since that time, under that representation, these people have been giving deeds to the right-of-way.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The survey did not pledge us. What was the authorization last year?

Mr. RANKIN. The authorization last year was for an appropriation, but the authorization for a survey was passed in 1934.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. FORD] was not talking about an appropriation; he was talking about an authorization; and if you got it before, why did you need a second authorization?

Mr. RANKIN. The authorization and the money appropriated for the survey were in 1934. They made the survey and these people have given title to their land for this right-of-way.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. That was your State's business solely. You got the money from emergency funds, before there was ever any authorization, and so did the Skyline Drive.

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

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I am making my own speech now. The gentleman has made his speech.

Another thing I want to impress upon you is with respect to the approach roads. There is an endless amount of approach roads authorized under these acts that can lead up to this particular road—the Skyline Drive. There is no limit, within 100 miles, with respect to any one of these approach roads. If you can get the money, you can do anything along this line with respect to the Skyline Drive. There is no limit to how many approach roads you can build, and they can all be built with 100 percent Federal money.

I notice this afternoon, and I say this with a kindly feeling, that every man in the South interested in these two propositions voted for the Big Thompson project out West, and everybody out there is going to vote for the Natchez Trace and the Skyline Drive this afternoon. All the Pacific coast boys are for it, and whenever we get into a big pork-barrel proposition like this we might as well throw the door of the Treasury open, kiss economy good-bye, and go home. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I want for the next 5 minutes to discuss this matter in a dispassionate manner and clearly upon its merits. I have the highest regard and greatest respect for my colleague on the other side who has just preceded me, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]. I have worked with him on this subcommittee for a month, and we have learned to know one another and, I think, to respect one another's ideas. I cannot, however, agree with his conclusions.

Naturally, coming from the West, and as far Northwest as I could, from the State of Washington, I see merit in Western projects. Probably I am somewhat prejudiced in favor of them, but I think I can make this assertion: Every man who voted for the Colorado project will have reason to be proud of it 5 or 10 years from now, and not to be ashamed of it. I am supporting the South in this project, and I am proud to support them. It has passed the point where it is a matter of policy with this Congress or with our committee as to whether we are going to proceed. The House expressed itself that it was going to spend $4,500,000 for the Blue Ridge Highway. The House excluded the Natchez Trace, and the Senate wrote in $2,700,000, and in conference we cut it to $1,500,000.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. Yes.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. The House agreed on $500,000 for the Natchez Trace.

Mr. LEAVY. I appreciate the correction. It is asserted that there is no reason to build a parkway in a region where you do not actually have a park, and it is asserted that this is an innovation. Until 1916 we had no National Park Service in this country. We have expanded that Service until now it costs millions of dollars, and most of the money goes to our West. We are glad that you gave the parks to us, but if we were not here to represent the West, and you people knew what we have there, you would still insist on maintaining and preserving our parks just as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] indicated here this afternoon. In the East you do not have the natural scenic beauty that we have, and I mean no disrespect when I say that. You have a historical background that puts our country in the shadow. You have places that are more charming and attractive than those in this city if you will make the most of them. This program is just the beginning of giving to the people of the East, in a smaller way than we have it, the advantage of enjoying the natural beauty of this region and making for better American citizenship.

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

Mr. LEAVY. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true, so far as the national parks and the Grand Canyon are concerned, that for many miles roadways have been built entering them, at the expense of the Federal Government?

Mr. LEAVY. I am not in a position to answer that question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Those facts were developed in the hearings.

Mr. LEAVY. But I know that building this parkway is something that the people in the South and the East want, and to which they are entitled. This undertaking should be placed on a plane higher than the monetary return which it will produce tomorrow or next year or in future years.

This parkway will produce a better citizenship and result in human dividends that cannot be measured in dollars and cents. The crowded East is entitled to have some place to go and enjoy the greatest scenic beauty it affords, particularly the poorer people who cannot afford to travel across this Nation to our beautiful western parks. There is a historical background that goes with the territory traversed by this parkway that should be preserved and made available to all the people. Therefore, as a Representative from the far Northwest, I am glad to join with my friends from the South and the East, and to urge those from the North and the central part of the country to join with us and give the South this highway. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the speech of my genial colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. LEAVY]. I have not known anything that he has started after since he has been a Member of Congress that he did not get. He is the best politician in the House of Representatives. Just watch my colleague from the State of Washington and see if within the next year he is not here trying to get a parkway constructed between some park in the State of Washington or Oregon down into California, 800 feet wide, a beautiful parkway drive.

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

Mr. RICH. I shall have to.

Mr. LEAVY. First I want to ask the gentleman if he will not give me just an iota of credit for having some semblance of a statesman about me as well as a politician.

Mr. RICH. And no better fellow there is in the House of Representatives—a politician and statesman.

Mr. LEAVY. I say to the gentleman that if we were not blessed by Nature with the parks that we have and the roads we have, I would be asking—just as these gentlemen are and as the gentleman ought to in Pennsylvania—for an outlet for my people to enjoy Nature. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. If we had nothing else to consider but to go out and spend public money and run the Treasury further into debt just to do something that the Members of Congress think would be nice, in order to beautify this country, I would say, "Yes; I think that is fine." I would not object to it at all. But I am telling you, you must use a little bit of common sense in our expenditure of Government funds.

DO NOT TRY TO DO EVERYTHING AT ONE TIME

When you remember that we are establishing a precedent in these two projects, of building a parkway from Mississippi up to Virginia that is going to cost over $100,000,000, and you are building this parkway 800 feet wide, you will come in here year after year asking the Federal Government not only to spend money on the upkeep of this parkway, but you will ask them to spend more money to beautify it according to the ideas of the members of the Park Service and Members of Congress. Now, there is nothing wrong about that, but how in the world are you going to finance all this? Where will you get the money?

Not only that, but you will find that the gentleman from Washington and the gentlemen from these other States are going to ask you to put into effect a park system of highways, get it entirely away from the Highway Department in this country, and that is the point I make. If you have a system of highways in this country under supervision of Highway Department and then permit the Park Service to come in and have the highways traverse the other highways, eventually this thing will be so complicated that it will be very difficult to administer. It will be top heavy. It will be hard to administer. You will have too many bureaus, and we should not permit that. You said you would not, so why do it?

That is the most important point about this whole business of national-park highways. We started this Doughton Highway from North Carolina up to Virginia. God bless Mr. DOUGHTON. There is not a finer fellow in the House. [Applause.] If it had not been for him you would not have built that highway. Now come FORD and RANKIN and HARRISON and a few of these men who are trying to run opposition and see who they will name this highway after from North Carolina to Mississippi. You cannot dislike them for that either, but if you start in there you will get the Park Service to construct highways between the different parks, and eventually we are going to be highway top-heavy. We should be careful. I think you should vote down this amendment this year, because you have said you are for economy, and yet are just voting every minute of the day millions of dollars. Here is a million and a half dollars you can save if you will vote right. Will you do it?

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

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I understand this is part of an ultimate highway from Buena Vista to Bennington, Vt.

Mr. RICH. I do not care whether it is from Buena Vista to Bennington or whether it is from Denver, Colo., to San Francisco and then back to New York. That is what I am afraid of. It is all wrong. The principle is wrong.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does not the gentleman think it would be of advantage to the whole Nation to have a good trunk highway built across the State of Pennsylvania so we could go through there without having accidents?

Mr. RICH. Oh, we have got three or four trunk highways now. It would be utter foolishness to build another one. We have good highways and we are building a system of highways by the highway department, but now you are coming in here and trying to take it away from the highway system and put it into the Park Service. It is entirely wrong. I tried to drive that into the gentleman's head awhile ago. I am sorry I could not do it. [Laughter and applause.]

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include some excerpts from the hearing on the bill S. 2681.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE].

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, my good friends from Kansas and Pennsylvania seem very much perturbed about a little appropriation that the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee will participate in, in the event the House sees fit to pass this amendment.

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

Mr. McGEHEE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. I will say that this amount of money we are spending in Mississippi is more than the State of Mississippi pays in Federal taxes.

Mr. McGEHEE. That may be true; but will the gentleman give the House information as to how much money his State of Pennsylvania has received in the past 4 years in proportion to what the State of Mississippi has received?

Mr. RICH. In proportion to population we have not received one-fiftieth as much as the State of Mississippi.

Mr. McGEHEE. I understand that one project in the gentleman's State has cost more than the amount received by two or three Southern States in the past 4 years.

I want to say, however, just what my State has done so far in carrying out the recommendation of this Congress when the authorization was made by it in 1934. It has been stated that this is the first appropriation asked for. In 1803 the Congress of the United States appropriated and spent several thousand dollars on the Natchez Trace. In 1806 they appropriated several thousand dollars more, which was spent in widening and blazing this trail from Nashville to Natchez so as to permit the people from the eastern part of this country to travel overland into the southern part of it. This Congress in 1934, as stated by my colleague from Mississippi, made an appropriation of some $50,000 to make a survey of this trace.

That survey was made, and when it was completed a report made, upon which the Congress, during the past session, authorized this appropriation for 1938–39.

What has my State done under and acting upon the authorization made by Congress? Last year the legislature voted that bonds be issued in the sum of several hundred thousands of dollars. These bonds have been sold and with the proceeds the rights-of-way have been purchased along this trace for several of its units. Some few weeks ago three contracts were let. I do not know that they have actually started work under the contracts as yet, but they have been let and work orders will be released at once by the Bureau of Roads, under whose supervision the trace will be constructed.

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

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Can the gentleman advise the House what proportion of the cost of constructing this highway is borne by the State of Mississippi?

Mr. McGEHEE. Nothing, only the furnishing of the right-of-way, as required by the authorization in the bill providing for the construction of the Natchez Trace Highway.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As a matter of fact, according to the original bill, this appropriation is for the purpose of giving the State of Mississippi this highway free without the State of Mississippi having to put up a cent, which is in contradistinction to the highway system which compels every State in the Union to put up dollar for dollar the money the Federal Government gives.

Mr. McGEHEE. It is not. This is a Federal parkway, established under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. It will be constructed by the Federal Government, as is every other highway between parks.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McGEHEE. I have not the time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I just wanted to find out how long this highway was.

Mr. McGEHEE. Opponents of this plan are trying to prejudice your minds against appropriating this money, saying the road will be 800 feet wide. The right-of-way has been secured for miles and miles already through my State for this parkway. It is true that the deeds call for an 800-foot right-of-way, but the roadway is being constructed only about the same width of other highways throughout this country. The owners of the land through which this parkway traverses reserve the right in their right-of-way conveyances of the use of the lands up to the drainage on each side of the roadbed for pasturing or otherwise. Insofar as the right-of-way proper is concerned, the usual width that is required in the construction of our highways would be all that is necessary, but in the construction of this parkway, the Government desires control and jurisdiction over the 800 feet required in the Department of the Interior for the purpose of keeping signs, advertisements, and other unsightly structures from being placed along it, thereby making the parkway attractive and alluring to the hundreds of thousands of people who will travel over it when completed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that we had a very bitter fight on the floor of this House last year, or year before last, in which we brought out the real purpose of these two parkways. Now, it is just nonsensical to imagine a parkway 977 miles long. That is the aggregate distance of these two parkways, one 500 miles and the other 477 miles. If you can imagine driving along a highway landscaped for 400 feet on either side for a distance of 977 miles, you have some conception of what this parkway is.

I charged at that time and I want to reiterate that the only purpose of establishing this so-called parkway was to get 977 miles of free highway for the States of North Carolina, Virginia, and Mississippi. I said at that time that I would not contribute to it and I did not think that any fair-minded Member of this House should contribute to it. I believe so now.

It has been stated that Pennsylvania has received a great deal of money for relief, but let me tell you this, that under the Highway Act, under which these trunk lines should be built, the State of Pennsylvania, as well as every other State in the Union, has to put up $1 for every dollar which is allocated to it for highway purposes by the Federal Government.

Let us be fair and honest about this situation. This appropriation is not for the creation of a parkway except as a subterfuge to get 977 miles of free highway in these States; and you Members who represent States in which you taxpayers have to put up dollar for dollar to match the Federal contribution cannot go back to your States with clear consciences after giving to the States of Mississippi, North Carolina, and Virginia, not $100,000,000, but an estimated one-third of all the money that was raised under the emergency tax bill of last year, or $200,000,000 to build 977 miles of free highway.

The inconsistency of this thing appeals to you undoubtedly. Last year we desired to raise $600,000,000 to balance the Federal Budget. In the same week that we passed the bill raising $600,000,000 through the corporate surplus tax, if you will remember, we started these two projects, eating up one-third of the money it was designed to raise under the tax bill to balance the Budget. How can you with a clear conscience go back to your taxpayers in Michigan, New York, California, and the other States and tell them we voted to give these States a free highway when your

citizens have to match dollar for dollar the Federal contribution for road construction?

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. It is a fact, is it not, that this highway will cross five States instead of three?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Make it 10 States. Make it any number of States.

Mr. LEAVY. The record of the hearings discloses that instead of being a highway 570 miles long it is a 550-mile highway that will cost a total of $60,000,000 instead of $200,000,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman does not infer, of course, knowing roadbuilding as he does, that we can build 977 miles of highway and parkway for that figure. The figure will be closer to $200,000,000.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. There is no estimate given at all as to the approach roads which may be built without limit. Is it not true that hearings were had by the House committee a year ago and the committee turned this down after full hearing and this was put on over in the Senate?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I hope you will believe me when I say this, because it is the truth: The only justification there is for building this Natchez Trace Highway is to commemorate the march of Andrew Jackson down to New Orleans. If you want to spend $100,000,000 of the people's money building a memorial to Andrew Jackson in this way, that is your responsibility.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think he is entitled to a memorial?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I admire the candor that prevails here this afternoon; in fact, I admire the brazenness with which the cooperation between the South and the West is admitted by the distinguished gentleman from Washington. It is a game of "You pat me and I'll pat you." I think he inquired when he was paid a compliment about the matter of being an adroit politician whether he might not be known also as a statesman. I want to remind him that in another body just recently some one said that a politician was a live one and that they were dead when they became statesmen.

May I say to the gentleman from Washington he is very much alive. He is much alive in the matter of admitting that he wanted that project in the West and by reason of the support that he received for that project in the West he was going to support this project in the South. "You give me and I will give you."

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I referred to the gentleman and must of necessity yield to him.

Mr. LEAVY. I want to take the gentleman at his word in connection with the definition of "politician" and "statesman." May I ask the gentleman if his party does not represent a lot of statesmen at this time?

Mr. DITTER. I answer the gentleman by saying that the reference I just made came from one of the very distinguished, one of the liberal and one of the independent leaders of the gentleman's party, who bewailed the fact that probably there would be some dead statesmen in the offing in another body because of the threat of the present administration to punish those who refused to do its bidding.

Mr. Speaker, I have a distinct admiration for my friend the gentleman from Mississippi, who delights in telling us about electric rates. He always throws in the face of those who represent Pennsylvania the challenge to go back and tell the people how much they are paying for electricity. I want him when he goes into Pennsylvania next time bearing that banner about electricity and cheap power rates to tell the people of Pennsylvania how much they are paying for this free highway down in Mississippi. I want the gentleman to give us credit that while we probably pay some money for electricity we get something for it, and we do not get anything for this contribution, this benefaction, that we Pennsylvanians are giving to Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. In just a moment. I want to cite some figures. Someone said a moment ago, and I believe it was the gentleman's colleague from Mississippi, that we were getting a great deal in Pennsylvania, and that we received a great deal last year from the Federal Government.

Let us look at the figures. Let us look at the record. According to the record, Pennsylvania paid into the Federal Treasury last year $302,376,636.25. Pennsylvania got back $189,492,591.59.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield? He wants to be fair.

Mr. DITTER. I want to give the figures for Mississippi first. You will notice the fine balance in our favor. There is no deficit at all so far as Pennsylvania is concerned.

May I call the gentleman's attention to the condition that prevails, so far as the State of Mississippi is concerned, as shown by the Federal records? Mississippi paid in $2,630,-483.48 and out of this all-bountiful Federal Treasury, out of this more abundant life, out of this combination between the splendid West, with its Rockies and all the other scenic beauties, and the grand and glorious South, you received $18,799,796.84. In other words, we are in the red, so far as Mississippi goes, to the extent of $16,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I will tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania where Pennsylvania got her money. She sold her iron, her steel, her coal, and aluminum to the rest of the country, and the rest of the country paid what the gentleman is claiming Pennsylvania paid into the Treasury.

Mr. DITTER. I did not yield for a speech. The gentleman is too eloquent for me to yield to him for a speech.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman suggested that I go back into Pennsylvania and investigate the power rates later. Thank God, you at last have a utilities commission in Pennsylvania under a Democratic administration that is trying to give the people of that State justice so far as electric-power rates are concerned. [Applause.]

Mr. DITTER. The newly created commission has just been born. It has hardly started to breathe. Many glittering promises have been made of what it will accomplish. We have heard a lot of Democratic promises. You have been long on promises but woefully lacking in performances. This grab which you are making on the Federal Treasury today is just another example of your glittering promises. Do you recall the promise of economy made just a few months ago by your party, a promise with so much supposed reality about it that several of your leaders contended with each as to the character of slashes that should be made in appropriations? I recall one of your distinguished members expressed fear that an economy hysteria might take hold here.

The country need not be alarmed that an economy hysteria will be present in this Congress. You men have the spending habit too well ingrained. You thrive on the philosophy of spendthrifts. It would appear that your chief purpose, your aim in life, is to emulate that prodigal son of the Biblical narrative, to spend your substance—no; not yours, but the taxpayers'—in a wild, riotous orgy of spending. And still you make promises of economy—promises to save.

I fear it will be much the same with this new commission. It can be said with certainty that if the general policies of the administration now in power in Pennsylvania are to be taken as a criterion, then I feel confident the people of Pennsylvania will find a most expensive, a most costly, a most extravagant commission on their hands. One thing can be promised with reasonable certainty: If this commission runs true to form, true to the form of the other agencies operating in Pennsylvania under State and Federal control, there will be plenty of jobs, plenty of sinecures, plenty of "pork" for the faithful.

Suggestion has been made that we enjoy in Pennsylvania the fruits of tariff protection given to the industries of the country in times past. That is a splendid tribute to the philosophy of a protective tariff. It is a rather severe indictment against the free-traders. Mark you, Pennsylvania is able to pay these magnificent sums into the Federal Treasury because of the industries of the Keystone State, which provide not only funds for the Federal Treasury but employment for thousands of workmen. And more important in this present issue these industries, the industries of Pennsylvania provide the funds for this gift which you are seeking for the benefit of Mississippi.

On behalf of the taxpayers of Pennsylvania, on behalf of the workingmen of that State whose taxes come from the sweat of their brow, I voice a vehement objection to this pork-barrel program for the South.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with the question of whether or not the United States Congress will today go on record for the continuation of a program of taking funds out of the Federal Treasury to pay the entire cost of highways in one part of the country and in another part of the country pay at least half the cost.

I know we all like to get things for our part of the country. I know we like to have things in our own part of the country. But let us be fair. Let us be fair with our own taxpayers and let us be fair with the taxpayers of other States, and do to them what we would want to have done to us.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Does the gentleman oppose the $3,000,000 appropriation for the New York World's Fair?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. I did not hear the gentleman on the floor opposing it.

Mr. TABER. Perhaps not; but that does not mean I was not opposed to it. The matter has not gone through. There has been no appropriation, and there has been no estimate from the Budget. If there were to be $3,000,000 appropriated for the New York World's Fair, it would be just the same thing that has been done for Texas, for California, for Philadelphia, and for other parts of the country, and the same thing that has been done with respect to many large items in the State of Mississippi.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. With reference to these parkways, does not the gentleman know many miles of the parkway have been constructed in many other States of the country besides these for which we are now seeking an appropriation?

Mr. TABER. None at all outside the national parks. These two items are the first. They are the trail blazers. We ought to put our stamp of disapproval upon appropriating Federal funds beyond the Budget for this sort of thing. I do not believe it will be possible for this country ever to work out of the present financial situation if we continue to make such appropriations.

Let me give just a figure or two. The expenditures of the Federal Government last year were $9,100,000,000, $200,000,000 more than they were in 1936, when we paid the bonus. Appropriations of money to be spent in 1938, including what is in this bill, already run $9,300,000,000, and before we adjourn this Congress it will be $9,500,000,000. We must stop this policy of paying out money for things which are unusual and on which the Government has not heretofore embarked. I hope the House will today set its face in the right direction and refuse to go ahead and appropriate money beyond and without Budget estimates for items which are of an unusual and unprecedented character. If we do not begin to economize, we shall never get anywhere.

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

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from New York that I voted for his appropriation for the world's fair, and I would do the same thing again under the same circumstances. But now, while the gentleman is making a mountain out of a molehill——

Mr. TABER. Is it a molehill to establish the precedent of appropriating $100,000,000 for something, and starting along a path down which we have never before traveled?

Mr. RANKIN. I was talking about the world's fair.

Mr. TABER. If we get into this sort of thing and go along with it, it is a pretty good-sized molehill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States during the month of June in 1936 authorized the appropriation of $10,000,000 to be used in the construction of the Blue Ridge Parkway in the States of Virginia and North Carolina and the Natchez Trace Parkway in the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee. The House approved the authorization on June 2 by a record vote of 238 to 99. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] at that time opposed it very strenuously. He now would have you say, "Although Congress has heretofore taken favorable action on this proposition, we are going to deny you the sum you seek because he does not believe in it."

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

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee have not had as large a relief load as States like Pennsylvania, Michigan, and many other States have had, and they have not had the benefit of the great amounts which have been poured into such States for that purpose. The Natchez Trace Parkway is worthy of your sympathetic consideration. The Congress believed in it in 1936. The only monument we will have, when this spending spree is over, to show the people of the country that we have something worth while out of the relief appropriations is this one. We secured an allotment of $1,500,000 last year from the relief appropriation. Three contracts have been let to begin the construction work on this great project. When the Committee on Appropriations had this bill under consideration there was testimony before the committee that we actually needed $3,000,000 to go ahead with the construction work. The State of Mississippi is doing its part by furnishing the necessary rights-of-way.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. I am pleased to yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I remind the gentleman that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] made the statement that no Federal highways had been constructed outside of national parks, and he declined to be corrected. I have just called the Assistant Director of the National Park Service, and he has given me the information that the Federal Government has constructed, at Federal expense, approximately 100 miles of highway outside Yellowstone Park, 83 miles outside the Grand Canyon Park, 60 miles between Fresno and the Yosemite National Park, and some 8.72 miles outside of the Wind Cave Park, S. Dak., said roads having been constructed as entrances to said parks. They are outside the parks and do not connect national parks. It is my recollection that other roads as entrances to other parks have been constructed by the Federal Government.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. I thank my colleague.

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

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. May I say to the gentleman that as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which has to do with appropriations for the National Park Service, I have never heard of a mile of such roads.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is not my responsibility. The National Park Service advised the Committee on Roads, of which I am a member, as shown by the published hearings at the time the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace authorizations were passed, that such roads as entrances had been constructed, and then I corrected the gentleman's erroneous statement that no roads outside of parks had been constructed by the Government.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It was absolutely without any authorization.

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

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. Was not the first authorization for a project outside of national parks authorized in 1931?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. The first authorization was in 1934 for a survey.

Mr. HOUSTON. I understand that, but a similar project outside of a national park was authorized first in 1931.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And prior thereto and since then many miles of roads have been built outside of parks.

Mr. HOUSTON. If the gentleman will yield for a further question, I am a little bit bothered and would like to know if the two Senators from Mississippi are together on this proposition.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. I think I can assure the gentleman of that.

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

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] stated that the Park Service has said nothing had been done on this project. I simply want to call the gentleman's attention to the testimony of Mr. Demaray of the National Park Service, given on June 22, before the Senate subcommittee, in which he stated that contracts had been let on two parks, and the third contract was advertised on June 19, and was ready for letting, and that the three contracts amounted to $936,000 in the State of Mississippi.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. And I may say to my colleague from Alabama that the third contract has been let. This contract was let on the 19th day of June, since Mr. Demaray testified before the Senate committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

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

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. I do not have the time.

Mr. Speaker, since the testimony before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House clearly shows that Mississippi had gone forward and secured the necessary rights-of-way for the construction of this highway, and that the State of Alabama and the State of Tennessee have taken proper steps to begin securing the necessary rights-of-way, I hope the membership of this House will vote for this appropriation. There was ample testimony that we could spend much more than $1,500,000 to carry on the construction work for the next fiscal year and this amendment only calls for $1,500,000. Surely, this Congress will not let two or three men who are opposed to this proposition set themselves up higher than the House or the Congress when the project has been authorized and authorized by a record vote of this Congress last year. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time in order to answer as best I may, the repeated assertion, which has been voiced here in this debate by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]. He is a fine Representative, a perfectly honorable man who no doubt has quoted correctly the figures. But the fallacy at the root of his argument completely overturns the honest figures which he gave.

I wonder if the gentleman from the State which "Pittsburgh stogies" have partially made famous, or infamous, realizes that the people of Mississippi smoke those stogies and pay the tax, the stamps for which are bought in Pennsylvania? Pennsylvanians buy those stamps with money furnished in large part by all the rest of us, and yet claim to have paid the total tax into the Federal Treasury. We smoke a darned sight more of them than BILL DITTER ever did!

We folk down our way cannot afford the rich cigars which the gentleman from Pennsylvania or his friends mouth so tastefully.

Similarly, the income-tax payments of Pennsylvania are high because of the iniquitous protective-tariff wall, behind which they do business and prosper. The tariff has always operated like a vacuum cleaner, sucking every dollar we could get down our way out of our pockets and into theirs; and as long as they have that protection and the intelligence to operate the system, God bless them, they will continue to pay a preponderant income tax when compared to Mississippi. [Applause.]

The old "Pittsburgh plus" racket gave Pennsylvania the steel capital of the Nation and levied streams of tribute from every other State to enrich her favored citizens. The unfair preference given "official territory", of which Pennsylvania is a part, has enriched her by millions more.

Illustrations of the fallacious character of any argument based on such figures might be multiplied, but "A word to the wise is sufficient." No one, not even the eloquent and persuasive gentleman from Pennsylvania, can get credit here or elsewhere, if people think, for tax payments made with other people's money. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 117, noes 61.

Mr. TABER. 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 ninety-two Members are present, not a quorum.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 137, not voting 90, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—204

Allen, La.	Crowe	Gingery	Kocialkowski
Allen, Pa.	Cullen	Green	Kramer
Anderson, Mo.	Cummings	Greever	Lanzetta
Arnold	Curley	Gregory	Larrabee
Atkinson	Deen	Griffith	Lea
Barry	Delaney	Hamilton	Leavy
Beam	Dempsey	Hancock, N. C.	Lesinski
Bell	DeMuth	Hart	Lewis, Colo.
Bigelow	DeRouen	Harter	Long
Bland	Dies	Havenner	Luecke, Mich.
Bloom	Dingell	Hendricks	McFarlane
Boland, Pa.	Disney	Hildebrandt	McGehee
Boren	Dockweiler	Hill, Okla.	McGrath
Boykin	Doughton	Hill, Wash.	McReynolds
Brooks	Doxey	Hobbs	McSweeney
Brown	Dunn	Honeyman	Magnuson
Buck	Eckert	Hook	Mahon, S. C.
Bulwinkle	Edmiston	Izac	Mahon, Tex.
Burch	Elliott	Jacobsen	Maloney
Burdick	Englebright	Jarman	Mansfield
Cartwright	Evans	Jenckes, Ind.	Martin, Colo.
Chapman	Faddis	Johnson, Luther A.	Maverick
Clark, Idaho	Ferguson	Johnson, Okla.	Mead
Clark, N. C.	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, W. Va.	Merritt
Claypool	Flannagan	Jones	Miller
Coffee, Wash.	Flannery	Kee	Mills
Colden	Forand	Keller	Mitchell, Tenn.
Cole, Md.	Ford, Calif.	Kelly, Ill.	Moser, Pa.
Collins	Ford, Miss.	Kelly, N. Y.	Mouton
Colmer	Gambrill	Kennedy, Md.	Murdock, Ariz.
Cooper	Garrett	Kennedy, N. Y.	Murdock, Utah
Cox	Gasque	Keogh	Nelson
Cravens	Gavagan	Kerr	Norton
Crosser	Gildea	Kitchens	O'Connell, Mont.

O'Connor, Mont.	Rabaut	Smith, Va.	Umstead
O'Connor, N. Y.	Ramspeck	Smith, Wash.	Vincent, B. M.
O'Day	Randolph	Snyder, Pa.	Vinson, Fred M.
O'Leary	Rankin	Sparkman	Voorhis
O'Toole	Reece, Tenn.	Spence	Wallgren
Owen	Richards	Steagall	Walter
Pace	Robertson	Sutphin	Warren
Palmisano	Robinson, Utah	Swope	Wearin
Patman	Romjue	Taylor, Tenn.	Weaver
Patrick	Sadowski	Terry	Wene
Patton	Sanders	Thom	West
Pearson	Scott	Thomas, Tex.	Whelchel
Peterson, Fla.	Scrugham	Thomason, Tex.	White, Idaho
Peterson, Ga.	Secrest	Thompson, Ill.	Whittington
Phillips	Shanley	Tolan	Wilcox
Pierce	Shannon	Transue	Woodrum
Poage	Sheppard	Turner	Zimmerman

NAYS—137

Aleshire	Dowell	Lord	Rogers, Okla.
Allen, Ill.	Eberharter	Lucas	Rutherford
Amlie	Eicher	Luce	Sacks
Andresen, Minn.	Engel	Luckey, Nebr.	Sauthoff
Andrews	Fitzgerald	Ludlow	Schaefer, Ill.
Arends	Fletcher	McAndrews	Schneider, Wis.
Ashbrook	Frey, Pa.	McCormick	Schulte
Bacon	Gearhart	McKeough	Seger
Barden	Gehrmann	McLean	Simpson
Bates	Goldsborough	Mapes	Smith, Conn.
Beiter	Griswold	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Maine
Biermann	Guyer	Massingale	Snell
Binderup	Gwynne	May	South
Boileau	Halleck	Michener	Stefan
Boyer	Harrington	Millard	Taber
Carlson	Hartley	Mott	Tarver
Carter	Healey	Nichols	Thomas, N. J.
Casey, Mass.	Higgins	O'Brien, Ill.	Thurston
Champion	Hope	O'Brien, Mich.	Tinkham
Church	Houston	O'Connell, R. I.	Tobey
Citron	Hull	O'Neal, Ky.	Towey
Clason	Hunter	O'Neill, N. J.	Treadway
Cluett	Jarrett	Oliver	Vinson, Ga.
Cochran	Jenkins, Ohio	Patterson	Welch
Cole, N. Y.	Jenks, N. H.	Pettengill	White, Ohio
Cooley	Johnson, Minn.	Polk	Wigglesworth
Costello	Kenney	Powers	Williams
Crawford	Kinzer	Ramsay	Withrow
Crowther	Kirwan	Reed, Ill.	Wolcott
Daly	Knutson	Rees, Kans.	Wolfenden
Dirksen	Kvale	Reilly	Wolverton
Ditter	Lambertson	Rich	Woodruff
Dixon	Lamneck	Rigney	
Dondero	Lanham	Robsion, Ky.	
Dorsey	Lewis, Md.	Rogers, Mass.	

NOT VOTING—90

Allen, Del.	Driver	Imhoff	Quinn
Bernard	Duncan	Johnson, Lyndon	Rayburn
Boehne	Eaton	Kleberg	Reed, N. Y.
Boylan, N. Y.	Ellenbogen	Kloeb	Ryan
Bradley	Farley	Kniffin	Sabath
Brewster	Fernandez	Kopplemann	Schuetz
Buckler, Minn.	Fish	Lambeth	Shafer, Mich.
Buckley, N. Y.	Fleger	Lemke	Short
Byrne	Fries, Ill.	McClellan	Sirovich
Caldwell	Fuller	McGranery	Smith, W. Va.
Cannon, Mo.	Fulmer	McGroarty	Somers, N. Y.
Cannon, Wis.	Gifford	McLaughlin	Stack
Case, S. Dak.	Gilchrist	McMillan	Starnes
Celler	Gray, Ind.	Maas	Sullivan
Chandler	Gray, Pa.	Mason	Sumners, Tex.
Coffee, Nebr.	Greenwood	Meeks	Sweeney
Creal	Haines	Mitchell, Ill.	Taylor, Colo.
Crosby	Hancock, N. Y.	Mosier, Ohio	Taylor, S. C.
Culkin	Harlan	O'Malley	Teigan
Dickstein	Hennings	Parsons	Wadsworth
Douglas	Hill, Ala.	Peyser	Wood
Drew, Pa.	Hoffman	Pfeifer	
Drewry, Va.	Holmes	Plumley	

So the motion to recede and concur in the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sullivan (for) with Mr. Short (against).
Mr. Meeks (for) with Mr. Gilchrist (against).
Mr. Pfeifer (for) with Mr. Culkin (against).
Mr. Teigan (for) with Mr. Holmes (against).
Mr. Boylan of New York (for) with Mr. Plumley (against).
Mr. Sirovich (for) with Mr. Reed of New York (against).
Mr. Byrne (for) with Mr. Gifford (against).
Mr. Drewry of Virginia (for) with Mr. Eaton (against).
Mr. Fries of Illinois (for) with Mr. Mason (against).
Mr. Hill of Alabama (for) with Mr. Maas (against).
Mr. Schuetz (for) with Mr. Fish (against).
Mr. Hennings (for) with Mr. Douglas (against).

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Parsons with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Ellenbogen.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Haines.
Mr. Harlan with Mr. O'Malley.
Mr. Driver with Mr. Quinn.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Kniffin.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Gray of Indiana.
Mr. McClellan with Mr. Kelly of New York.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Chandler.
Mr. Imhoff with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Drew of Pennsylvania.
Mr. McLaughlin with Mr. Bradley.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Caldwell.
Mr. Farley with Mr. Wood.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 124: Page 121, line 18, after the word "expended", strike out "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,200,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 124 and concur in the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 129: Page 124, after line 21, insert "per-diem employees at rates of pay approved by the Director not exceeding current rates for similar services in the District of Columbia, the hire of draft animals with or without drivers at local rates approved by the Director, traveling expenses and carfare, and leather and rubber articles for the protection of public property and employees."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 132: Page 135, after line 18, insert:

"For defraying the deficits in the treasuries of the municipal governments because of the excess of current expenses over current revenues for the fiscal year 1938, municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, $60,000, and municipality of St. Croix, $50,000; in all, $110,000, to be paid to the said treasuries in monthly installments."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I recall that when this matter was presented to the House in the House bill, a point of order was sustained to it upon the ground that there is no authority in law for the payment by the Federal Government of the United States of municipal deficits of the cities in the Virgin Islands. What authority is there for such an appropriation and what reason is there for such an appropriation any more than for a Federal appropriation to meet a deficit in a municipality within our own borders?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct in that there is no specific authority for this appropriation, but these islands are our possessions and we are morally responsible for the general welfare of the people who inhabit them. The gentleman, of course, knows their desperate financial situation, and I say to the gentleman that this appropriation is much less than it has been in the past. Mr. Burlew, Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, appeared before the Senate committee and made a very illuminating statement with reference to the matter, which I should be glad to read into the RECORD, if necessary, and he assured the committee that within a reasonably short time, I believe he said a year, it would be possible to eliminate this appropriation.

Mr. LANHAM. Does the gentleman think that by reason of the fact that a municipality either within or without our continental borders is in serious financial straits is any reason for the Congress of the United States, without legislative authority, to appropriate the money of the taxpayers to pay its deficits?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This territorial possession is in a somewhat different status than the average municipality in that its geographical location makes it impossible for the residents to engage in a variety of business activities which would enable them to take care of themselves.

Mr. LANHAM. What is the reason for their financial straits? Of course other cities in the United States proper are in financial straits, and are in receipt of relief appropriations, and they cannot match the money that is furnished by the Federal Government. They are not sui generis in these municipalities in the Virgin Islands from the standpoint of being in sore financial straits; so why should we, without legislative authority, appropriate for deficits for those municipalities any more than we should appropriate for the deficits of municipalities within 1 of the 48 States?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the force of the gentleman's argument. Possibly the acquisition of the islands was not good financial investment for the United States; but we have them, and they are several hundred miles away from any business activity. They do not have the opportunity to engage in business that other cities have, and it is absolutely necessary for us to provide this appropriation for them.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. RICH. I might say to my colleague from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] that we expended from P. W. A. funds in the Virgin Islands last year $562,000, $22.50 per capita. The Federal Government spent for a Federal hotel $91,000—putting the Government into the hotel business.

The Federal Government spent last year for P. W. A. over $2,000,000 for the Virgin Island Co., and it spent under F. E. R. A. over $350,000 for the same company. It loaned to them $170,000 for a rum plant, with the stockholders being the Federal Government. All you have got down there for your money is 200,000 gallons of rum. You have 3,800 tons of sugar. They are spending money down there for these people to manufacture rum, but this is the worst part of it: You are paying the people of the Virgin Islands 60 cents a day for labor during the cultivating season and you are paying the same people 80 cents a day during the grinding season for the manufacture of rum to compete with our distillers, and you expect them to pay four or five dollars a day. Somebody is crazy, who is operating a plant like that. Think of trying to run our own distillers out of business.

Mr. Speaker, I think if we are to get these municipalities on their feet, we should see that they are paying wages that would compare with the wages that are being paid to American laborers, American men who have to pay these taxes. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] is right. It is ridiculous to think that the Federal Government would go down there and pay the deficit. There is no rhyme or reason to that kind of a proposition.

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

Mr. RICH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thought I had the floor.

Mr. LANHAM. Passing aside the rum part of it, because I am also interested in economy in these expenditures——

Mr. RICH. And you are interested in making rum, too. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LANHAM. Then for what purpose was the deficit incurred?

Mr. RICH. That is what I want to know. [Laughter.] I want to know that, too. They ought to have a surplus. They ought to be able to conduct the affairs of their country.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. Can the gentleman from Oklahoma tell the House whether or not the Secretary of the Interior exercises complete control over the municipalities in the Virgin Islands, or is there an element of self-government there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is my understanding that the Secretary of the Interior, through the Governor, has general control over the islands.

Mr. THOMPSON of Illinois. And therefore the indebtedness is chargeable to him, under his supervision?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Of course, they have their own local municipal self-government.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman advise the House why we should appropriate money to pay the deficit of a city in the Virgin Islands?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I attempted to answer that question when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] asked it. The people of the Virgin Islands are not in good financial circumstances. The fact the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] recited that the Federal Government had to spend so much money down there for relief is additional evidence of the poor financial condition of the islands.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is there any reason aside from that? My city has a tax allowance of $38.70.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Congress has been appropriating funds for defraying the deficits in the municipal governments of the Virgin Islands ever since they were taken over by this country in 1917. In 1933 the deficits amounted to $236,000. As the islands have become more prosperous the deficits have decreased and the pending amendment proposes an appropriation of $110,000. The statement is made in the Senate hearings, page 33, by Mr. Burlew that there will be no deficits there in a year or so. I hope that statement is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I would like to know.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. COLLINS. The budget for these municipalities in the Virgin Islands is made up prior to the beginning of the fiscal year. Estimates of expenditures as well as of taxes from all sources are made. After that is completed it is estimated as to what would be necessary for the Federal contribution. In this particular case, as I understand, it is estimated to be at this time about $110,000. If some person dies and leaves a large estate, that tax will be applied and will be taken off of the estimated $110,000 appropriated in this instance. In other words, every penny of taxes that it is possible to collect will be collected and applied upon the administration of the municipalities. Whatever deficit there is, and it is usually small and it is going down all the time, is made up by the Federal Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has this been the general practice?

Mr. COLLINS. This has been the practice ever since we have been in possession of the Virgin Islands. The municipalities cannot operate unless the Federal Government contributes a small amount.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, what we are doing is not establishing a precedent?

Mr. COLLINS. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have great respect for the views of the gentleman from Mississippi on matters of this kind by reason of his many years on the Appropriations Committee. The gentleman from Mississippi is satisfied that this is all right?

Mr. COLLINS. Absolutely. These islands cannot operate unless the municipalities of St. Thomas and St. Croix have the right to expend a certain amount of Federal funds to supplement the funds which they receive by taxation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I might also add that the deficit is gradually being diminished. As I have said, in 1933 it was $236,000.

Mr. COLLINS. Now it is around $110,000.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SNELL) there were—ayes 101, noes 21.

So the motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 133: Page 142, after line 3, insert:

"SEC. 3. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1937, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between July 1, 1937, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 133 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of said amendment, strike out the date "July 1" and insert "June 30."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is obvious. As is very well known, this bill should have been passed and signed before July 1, but because of some unfortunate circumstances we were unable to do so. This simply makes it retroactive to July 1.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 134: Page 142, line 12, change the section figure "3" to figure "4."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 134 and agree to the same.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which action was taken on the several amendments in disagreement and lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House request a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H. R. 6958, the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1938.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, SCRUGHAM, O'NEAL of Kentucky, FITZPATRICK, LEAVY, RICH, and LAMBERTSON.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill, H. R. 6763, "An act to extend for 1 additional year the 3½-percent interest rate on certain Federal land-bank loans, to provide a 4-percent interest rate on such loans for the period July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939, and to provide for a 4-percent interest rate on land-bank commissioner's loans for a period of 2 years", returned by the President of the United States to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, with his objections, and passed by the House on a reconsideration of the same, it was,

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 455) entitled "An act for the relief of J. R. Collie and Eleanor Y. Collie."

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

S. 1067. An act for the relief of Asa J. Hunter; and

S. 1284. An act to change the name of the Chemical Warfare Service.

CIVIL WAR PENSIONS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7896) granting pensions to certain soldiers of the Civil War.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of William H. Jones, late of Capt. John R. Curry's Company D, South Cumberland Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Alfred Daugherty, late of Capt. Richard F. Taylor's Company C, Middle Green River Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Milton McNabb, alias Milton McNab, late of Capt. Henry Bucksath's Company G, Thirty-fifth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Joseph Thompson, late of Capt. Isaac D. Hon's Company K, Sixty-ninth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Jesse E. Lampkin, late of Capt. James M. Dennis' company of Osage and Maries Counties Volunteer Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The name of Andrew J. White, late of Capt. Richard F. Taylor's company, Middle Green River Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

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.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS TO CERTAIN WIDOWS AND FORMER WIDOWS OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS OF THE CIVIL WAR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7897) granting increase of pensions to certain widows and former widows of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Mary A. Warman, former widow of Alvin V. Reynolds, late of Company C, Seventy-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Blacketer, widow of George H. Blacketer, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy A. Scott, widow of Henry W. Scott, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mildred C. Sexton, widow of John F. Sexton, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sallie Miller, widow of Nathan Miller, late of Company E, One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cora A. Townsend, widow of Hiram L. Townsend, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Vandresar, widow of Richard B. Vandresar, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Etta L. Tifft, widow of James H. Tifft, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella E. Terryll, widow of John C. Terryll, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Starkweather, widow of Warren H. Starkweather, late of Company H, Ninety-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate Riker, widow of Charles E. Riker, late of Company D, One Hundred and Ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henrietta M. Peavey, widow of George S. Peavey, late of Company B, One Hundred and Eighty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Pickard, former widow of Frederick Wieber, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret J. Merrill, widow of George Merrill, late of Company A, Fiftieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary H. Ackley, widow of William P. Ackley, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emogene Allen, widow of Alonzo Allen, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice W. Butts, widow of Daniel D. Butts, late of Company D, One Hundred and Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ida Bloss, widow of Jotham Bloss, late of Company K, One Hundred and Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eunice A. Collins, widow of Franklin A. Collins, late of Company M, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Selena M. Combs, widow of John Combs, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. Curtis, widow of Horatio O. Curtis, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Delane, widow of David Delane, late of Company F, Ninety-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. Dennison, widow of Edward Dennison, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Addie M. Eggleston, widow of Charles Eggleston, late of Company M, Eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy Fish, widow of Orville Fish, late unassigned, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jane M. French, widow of Edwin Y. French, late of Company C, Sixty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and hospital steward, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Grunert, widow of Henry C. Grunert, late a second lieutenant, Company F, One Hundred and Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ann J. Gregg, widow of Daniel Gregg, late of Company B, Thirty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella A. Hart, widow of Charles H. Hart, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary W. Hannaford, widow of Lyman B. Hannaford, late of Company D, One Hundred and Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Etta A. Johnson, widow of Myron Johnson, late of Company L, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura Joles, widow of William A. Joles, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Erzelia A. Lackey, widow of Moses H. Lackey, late of Company E, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. McNeil, widow of Robert McNeil, late of Company C, One Hundred and Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Miranda C. Thompson, widow of William W. Thompson, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie E. Fuller, widow of Adelbert H. Fuller, late of Company E, Second Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret V. Besa, widow of Alexander Besa, late of Company F, One Hundred and Ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susie Coffle, former widow of James Hendrake, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria Loran, widow of Peter Loran, late of Company G, Sixth and Ninth Regiments New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara F. Tower, widow of Almon Tower, late of Company G, Ninety-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ida M. Lent, widow of George W. Lent, late of Company D, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Agnes C. Johnson, widow of Nelson W. Johnson, late of Companies H and F, Ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Bulluck, widow of Warren Bulluck, late of Company D, Ninety-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jane Currier, widow of Hugh Currier, late of Company K, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie G. Dyer, widow of James W. Dyer, late of Company A, One Hundred and Eighteenth Regiment; and Company E, Ninety-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Catherine Green, former widow of Irwin H. Rose, late musician, band, Third Brigade, Second Division, Twentieth Army Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kathryn Bruce, widow of John W. Bruce, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Deborah Pond, widow of Joseph W. Pond, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rose Ann Richards, widow of David Richards, late of Company H, One Hundred and Sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Lucella McEwen, widow of William W. McEwen, late of Company I, One Hundred and Seventy-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Miriam A. Williams, former widow of David N. Sayrs, late of Company F, Thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret A. Bradshaw, widow of John B. Bradshaw, late of Company B, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mathilda Danielson, widow of Daniel Danielson, late of Company D, Fifty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Hawk, widow of Emanuel Hawk, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Robinson, widow of William A. Robinson, late of Company K, Seventieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Snyder, widow of John Snyder, late of Company G, Eighty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah D. Stauffer, widow of William D. Stauffer, late captain, Company H, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Barnholt, widow of Edward Barnholt, late of Company H, Two Hundred and Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Minnie B. Bell, former widow of Augustus C. Bell, late of Company D, One Hundred and Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Helen Gallagher, widow of William G. Gallagher, late of Company I, One Hundred and Ninty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate C. George, widow of David George, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catharine E. Hinkle, widow of Samuel A. Hinkle, late second lieutenant, Company D, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Lafferty, widow of Jacob P. Lafferty, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma J. Miller, widow of Oliver P. Miller, late of Company E, One Hundred and Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hettie A. Miller, widow of John Miller, late of Company D, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma V. Morton, widow of Peter Morton, late of Company D, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company D, First Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Bowman, widow of Francis M. Bowman, late of Company L, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Wick, widow of Henry Wick, late of Company H, Twenty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Teague, widow of William W. Teague, late of Company I, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet Reynolds, widow of Hayden Reynolds, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Phoebe A. Jennings, widow of George C. Jennings, late of Company M, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances C. Gaskill, widow of Harvey Gaskill, late of Company L, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cordelia Hiatt, widow of Joseph O. Hiatt, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza C. Dunlap, widow of William Dunlap, late of Company C, Seventy-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth A. Crum, widow of Jacob Crum, late of Company C, One Hundred and Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Abrams, widow of Daniel W. Abrams, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lillie A. Athey, widow of John W. Athey, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia Woods, widow of Thomas Woods, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hester A. Walmer, widow of John Walmer, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elmira J. Douglass, widow of William H. H. Douglass, late of Company G, Fortieth Regiment, and Company K, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Chapman, widow of Cary D. Chapman, late of Company L, Second Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura E. Boze, widow of William Boze, late of Company E, Forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet S. Garbison, widow of Daniel Garbison, late of Company H, Forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances Eggleston, former widow of Edward J. Keegan, late of Company L, Seventeenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet E. Miller, widow of John Miller, late of Company K, Seventy-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie V. Myers, widow of Peter J. Myers, late of Company A, One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Seward, widow of Christian Seward, late of Company I, Forty-eight Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Matilda A. Button, former widow of John Hoil, late of Company D, Second Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Appelt, widow of Gottlieb Appelt, late of Company H, One Hundred and First and Thirty-seventh Regiments New York Volunteer Infantry; and Battery K, Third Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine B. McCarthy, widow of Lawrence D. McCarthy, late of Company F, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Stout, widow of Martin Stout, late of Company F, One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Regiment, and Company A, Sixtieth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances A. Carter, widow of Theodore B. Carter, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry; and One Hundred and Second Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy A. Russell, widow of Cornelius Russell, late of Company H, One Hundred and Ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eva A. Holter, widow of Alfred H. P. Holter, late of Company K, One Hundred and Fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Carrie F. Bloom, widow of Jesse H. Bloom, late of Company F, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Tharp, widow of Isaac Tharp, late of Company C, Seventy-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Clemons, widow of Robert T. Clemons, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Agnes Bentley, widow of Sampson Bentley, late of Company L, Eleventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Dougherty, widow of Ezra Dougherty, late of Company I, One Hundred and Seventy-second Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Arthur, widow of Azariah Arthur, late of Company D, Fifty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eva Barlow, widow of Marion S. Barlow, late of Company B, Ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Phebe J. Bell, widow of John Bell, late of Company F, One Hundred and Seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julina Crabtree, widow of Jeremiah Crabtree, late of Company H, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Conaway, widow of George Conaway, late of Battery B, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Collins, widow of William C. Collins, late of Company B, First Regiment West Virginia Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. DeWitt, widow of Philip DeWitt, late of Company B, One Hundred and Ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Derry, widow of John H. Derry, late of Company B, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Melissa Endicott, former widow of Henry C. Grant, late of Company B, Ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henrietta H. Eator, widow of Ira Eator, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Effie C. Greene, widow of Alonzo J. Greene, late of the Thirteenth Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery; and Company A, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Kaneff, widow of George W. Kaneff, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Martin, widow of John W. Martin, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth S. Primm, widow of David Primm, late of Company H, Ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Ridgway, widow of Augustus W. Ridgway, late second lieutenant, Company H, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Ribel, widow of Peter Ribel, late of Company K, One Hundred and Eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Russell, widow of Timothy Russell, late first lieutenant, Company F, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Rupe, widow of Jonathan Rupe, late of Company H, Fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rachel Smith, widow of James E. Smith, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Violet S. Woodward, widow of Ward N. Woodward, late of Company E, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Webb, widow of Elias Webb, Jr., late of Company B, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adabelle Brown, widow of Anderson Brown, late of Company E, One Hundred and Seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Board, widow of Daniel A. Board, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Grange, widow of Charles E. Grange, late of Company F, Eighty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia Poust, widow of Henry Poust, late of Company F, One Hundred and Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Sturm, former widow of Anthony Loudenburg, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Wilcox, widow of Henry Wilcox, late of Company E, One Hundred and Forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Magdalene Emrich, widow of William F. Emrich, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ida H. Rupert, widow of John Rupert, late of Company F, Ninetieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rose K. Cox, former widow of Francis M. Morgan, late of Company C, Ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura E. Hancock, widow of Ephraim H. Hancock, late of Company D, Twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rebeca Hankinson, widow of Samuel Hankinson, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy McClay, widow of William McClay, late of Company E, One Hundred and Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret V. Myers, widow of Jacob H. Myers, late of Company C, One Hundred and Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Secrist, widow of Alexander W. Secrist, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ida M. Stough, widow of Michael Stough, late of Company G, One Hundred and Ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Viola S. Whitten, widow of James C. Whitten, late captain, Company A, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellie M. Young, widow of Thomas A. Young, late of Company F, One Hundred and Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucretia Beer, widow of William A. Beer, late first lieutenant, Company K, and captain, Company B, One Hundred and Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ruth A. Schooley, widow of Thomas O. Schooley, late of Company G, One Hundred Forty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria J. Anderson, former widow of William H. Provin, late of Battery I, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliar Bales, widow of Stephen Bales, late of Company A, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Reynolds, widow of Henry E. Reynolds, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clementine Young, widow of John J. Young, late of Company D, One Hundred and Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Gwinn, widow of William M. Gwinn, late of Company F, Forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry (Third Cavalry), and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Swing, widow of Marcus A. Swing, late of Company A, One Hundred and Thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth J. Cunningham, widow of John W. Cunningham, late of Company B, Twenty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Whitlock, widow of James W. Whitlock, late of the Eighteenth and Twenty-fifth Independent Batteries, New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Kendall, widow of Joseph T. Kendall, late of Company H, Fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha M. Brown, widow of Francis M. Brown, late of Company I, Eighty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucy E. Blevins, former widow of Allen Blevins, late of Company E, First Regiment East Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emeline Kinnaman, widow of William H. Kinnaman, late of Company F, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catharine Myers, widow of David Myers, late of Company H, Seventy-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Belle Armel, widow of William Armel, late of Company K, One Hundred and Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Gibson, widow of Alexander Gibson, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Cole, widow of Samuel T. Cole, late of Company G, One Hundred and Twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Princess May Stone, widow of Joseph Stone, late of Company C, One Hundred and Thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Jane Plummer, former widow of Harrison B. Hubbell, late of Company B, Forty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate Rogers, former widow of David R. Jones, late of Company D, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Cooley, widow of Dawson Cooley, late of the Twenty-sixth Independent Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Johanna Phelan, widow of Michael Phelan, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Addie T. Sloan, widow of William E. Sloan, late of Company D, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Davis, widow of John R. Davis, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Malisa Morris, widow of Daniel B. Morris, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Victoria Gould, former widow of Russell M. Smith, late of Company G, Eighty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura A. Smith, widow of Jedediah Smith, late of Company D, Eighty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Stone, widow of James R. Stone, late of Companies H and K, Forty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Christena M. Sharp, widow of Samuel Sharp, late of Company D, One Hundred and Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan C. Nobles, widow of Harmon D. Nobles, late of Company G, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lydia E. Laton, former widow of Samuel H. Harrison, late second lieutenant, Company D, first lieutenant, Company G, Sixty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry; and private, Company B, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara W. Barrett, widow of Nathan F. Barrett, late sergeant major, One Hundred and Fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of L. Belle Bailey, widow of George M. Bailey, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Decimay Ely, former widow of Washington Ely, late of the Seventh Independent Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jemima Bason, widow of Thomas Bason, late of Company D, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca Berry, former widow of Paul Tislow, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lyda Powell, widow of Louis Powell, late of Company C, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate Harris, widow of Charles M. Harris, alias Charles M. Jordan, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Brown, widow of James L. Brown, alias Lemon Stiles, late of Company H, One Hundred and Eighteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda A. Sibrel, widow of Thomas P. Sibrel, late of Company C, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary B. Beckett, widow of William H. Beckett, late of Company D, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie I. Lusk, widow of Absalom A. Lusk, late of Company K, One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda E. Waldron, former widow of James M. Kenyon, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Bloom, widow of Louis Bloom, late of Company H, One Hundred and Forty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Buchanan, widow of James A. Buchanan, alias James A. Buck, late of Company I, Forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ruth A. Smith, widow of Richard Smith, alias Diedrich Smith, late of Company C, One Hundred and Fifty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth J. Winklepleck, widow of Samuel Winklepleck, late of Companies A and B, Second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella Adams, widow of Elijah Adams, late of Company A, Fifty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jenettie E. Evans, widow of Daniel B. Evans, late of Battery K, First Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella G. Millspaugh, widow of Pathuel Millspaugh, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lorena M. Haskins, former widow of Byron A. Straight, late of Company B, One Hundred and Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Betsy A. Noble, widow of Bartlett A. Noble, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice M. Price, widow of Dorr Price, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Pierce, widow of Lyman Pierce, late of Company M, Twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna Ryan, widow of Jeremiah Ryan, late of Company F, First Battalion, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha F. Reynolds, widow of Norman Reynolds, late of Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan C. Stanley, widow of Luther Stanley, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-fourth Regiment New York

Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Estella D. Smith, widow of David Smith, late of Company B, Fifty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emily Turner, widow of Myron Turner, late of Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry; and Twenty-second Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Evelyn C. Devereaux, widow of William H. Devereaux, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lizzie D. Rodman, widow of Alp J. Rodman, late of Company A, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kittie G. Bozard, widow of Ashbel L. Bozard, late of Company C, One Hundred and Fifty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Miriam E. Crampton, widow of John H. Crampton, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry (subsequently Third New York Calvalry); and Company K, Fifty-fourth Regiment New York National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Addie J. Wheeler, widow of Solomon Wheeler, late of Company C, Second Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Wetmiller, former widow of Samuel Hummel, late of Companies E and F, Fifty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret A. Inks, widow of Adolphus J. Inks, late of Company E, Eighty-fifth Regiment, and Company E, One Hundred and Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Georgianna K. Griest, widow of William P. Griest, late of Company I, Two Hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret J. Hicks, widow of William B. Hicks, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Brittie Ann Gault, widow of John T. Gault, late first lieutenant, Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate P. Shannon, widow of James W. Shannon, late second lieutenant, Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lovena Triplett, widow of Calvin Triplett, late of Company C, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Cooksey, widow of Montivill Cooksey, late of Company G, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Leonice T. Holmes, widow of Thomas J. Holmes, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara B. Kirkendall, widow of Lyman F. Kirkendall, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice J. Robinson, widow of Henry H. Robinson, 2d, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie E. Robinson, widow of William Robinson, late of Company K, Twenty-ninth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret J. Miller, widow of Nicholas D. Miller, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. King, widow of Howard King, late of Company H, Two Hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Stagg, widow of Alfred G. Stagg, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice A. Ellis, widow of William H. Ellis, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lizzie D. McFarlan, widow of James E. McFarlan, late major, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Warthen, widow of Alban Warthen, late of Company C, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Graves, widow of Chauncey H. Graves, late of Company A, Sixty-eighth Regiment, and first lieutenant, Company K, One Hundred and Fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria A. Houston, widow of Samuel E. Houston, late of Company K, One Hundred and Thirty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Snyder, widow of John W. Snyder, late of Company I, One Hundred and Forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ernestine Singer, widow of Simon Singer, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Florence A. Clarkson, widow of Abraham Clarkson, late of Company C, One Hundred and Eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha C. Howe, widow of John Howe, late of Company B, Ninety-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Diehl, widow of Abraham Diehl, late of Company E, Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna Flint, widow of Myron L. Flint, late of Company F, Fortieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Thompson, widow of Martin V. Thompson, late of Company H, Seventy-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry: and Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lida A. Beverly, widow of Jacob Beverly, late of Company L, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Matilda M. Fleming, widow of Thomas J. Fleming, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rose A. Pettigrew, former widow of John P. Pettigrew, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Smith, widow of George W. Smith, late of Company I, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria Berghoff, widow of John T. Berghoff, late surgeon, Twenty-fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Mearkle, widow of David S. Mearkle, late of Company G, Ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Columbia Hankins, widow of Alexander Hankins, late of Company E, One Hundred and Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charity West, widow of Charles L. West, late of Company G, Fifty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. West, widow of Albert H. West, late of Henshaw's Battery, Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Borts, widow of Jacob Borts, late of Company M, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samantha Midgett, former widow of William F. Taylor, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry; and Company I, One Hundred and Forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary F. Hudgens, widow of James M. Hudgens, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha E. Humphreys, former widow of Elias Templeton, late of Company F, One Hundred and Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Dora B. Reynolds, widow of James T. Reynolds, late of Company E, Forty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maime F. Presley, widow of Henry A. Presley, alias Henry A. Piesley, late of Company G, One Hundred and Ninety-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie M. Warner, widow of Benjamin W. Warner, late of Company C, Eighteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannah Casler, widow of Henry Casler, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna N. Osterhout, widow of Abraham Osterhout, late of Company K, Fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sophie M. Swigert, widow of Marcus V. Swigert, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lillie E. Wells, widow of Everett R. Wells, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice Dunfee, widow of Thomas Dunfee, late of Company G, Thirty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances M. Small, widow of William H. H. Small, late of Company C, Twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Morris, widow of William S. Morris, late of Company C, Thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan B. Hill, widow of Silas P. Hill, late of Company G, Thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret I. Maiden, widow of Jasper N. Maiden, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy C. Austin, widow of Pleasant Austin, late of Company M, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria O. Fowler, widow of George Fowler, late of Company K, One Hundred and Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Josephine Dolen, widow of Henry Dolen, late of Company A, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rhoda A. Ellis, widow of Calvin H. Ellis, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Van Tuyl, widow of John R. Van Tuyl, late of Battery A, First Battalion New York National Guard Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha E. H. Fisher, former widow of John A. Fisher, late first lieutenant, Company D, Twenty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice Chapman, widow of Samuel R. Chapman, late of Company C, One Hundred and Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma E. King, widow of Merritt King, late second lieutenant, Company K, One Hundred and Thirty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Arzilla A. Bailey, widow of Gould S. Bailey, late of Company B, One Hundred and Forty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella M. Tansey, widow of Anthony Tansey, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Isabell Postlethwait, widow of John N. Postlethwait, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza M. Matthews, widow of Joseph F. Matthews, late of Company L, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry; and Twenty-first Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lovina Baumgardner, widow of John Baumgardner, late of Company E, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hulda Bennett, widow of James Bennett, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sophia Rawlins, widow of Richard N. Rawlins, late of Company H, One Hundred and Forty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella S. T. Witbeck, widow of C. William Witbeck, late a principal musician, Ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Georgiana P. Nichols, former widow of Henry C. Packard, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Devine, widow of John Devine, late of Company B, One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nora White, widow of John White, late of Company B, Thirty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. Parish, widow of Oris Parish, late first lieutenant, Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisiana Cabe, widow of Lucius H. Cabe, late of Company C, Third Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rachel M. Kuhn, widow of George Kuhn, late of Company C, Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ida Nagel, widow of William H. Nagel, late of Company I, Thirty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 a month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Hart, widow of Orvis Y. Hart, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Buhrer, widow of Martin Buhrer, late of Company C, Sixty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Brown, widow of Martin Brown, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catharine Brown, widow of William Brown, late of Company K, One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Regiment, and Company I, One Hundred and Eighty-ninth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Abbie Davison, widow of Lewellyn C. Davison, late of Company I, One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet Deamer, widow of Solomon Deamer, late of Company D, One Hundredth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Celestia A. Finks, widow of Thomas M. Finks, late of Company M, First Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Phebe L. Alspaugh, widow of James Alspaugh, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen A. Stevens, widow of Merari B. Stevens, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Marks, widow of Alonzo Marks, late of Company A, Sixty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret I. Reider, widow of Emanuel Reider, late of Company C, Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving and continue the $20 per month

additional pension now being paid for the relief and benefit of Joseph Reider, helpless and dependent son of Emanuel Reider, under the provisions of a special act of Congress approved June 4, 1928.

The name of Catherine J. Cupp, widow of Samuel Cupp, late of Company I, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances A. Kuder, widow of Albert D. Kuder, late of Company G, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Hill, widow of William Hill, late of Company K, One Hundred and Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Christena Huffman, widow of Christian Huffman, late of Company E, Eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eunice N. Palmer, widow of William H. Palmer, late of Company B, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Agness B. Smith, widow of Daniel B. Smith, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Leah Jones, widow of James Jones, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susanna Calhoun, widow of Samuel Calhoun, late of Company H, Two Hundred and Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Drusilla Sherlock, widow of John Sherlock, late of Company G, One Hundred and Fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Deborah Hunter, widow of Sullivan Hunter, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lena Campbell, widow of Thomas W. Campbell, late of the First Company Sharpshooters attached to the Twenty-seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen Cora Smith, widow of David Smith, late of Company G, Ninety-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret E. Huffines, widow of Philo Huffines, late of Company B, Twenty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate M. Farrell, widow of John Farrell, late of Company H, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Alice Brokaw, widow of William B. Brokaw, late of Company F, Ninety-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie E. Chappell, widow of Charles L. Chappell, late of Company B, Twenty-sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Georgianna Barker, widow of Edward Barker, late of Company H, One Hundred and Forty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna Keener, widow of Edward Keener, alias Edward Corney, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Phenia E. Howard, widow of Stephan D. Howard, late of Company G, Eightieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha M. Tryon, widow of Henry W. Tryon, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Augusta E. Cutler, widow of Alvin Cutler, late of Company C, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Reichard, widow of William A. Reichard, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara Rabe, widow of Henry Rabe, late of Company G, Thirty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna Daul, widow of Bernhard Daul, late of Company G, Twenty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mariam Story, widow of Van Buren Story, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy A. Bortner, widow of Henry S. Bortner, late of Company B, One Hundred and Fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Swander, widow of John J. Swander, late of Company A, One Hundredth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ida Davey, widow of Malcomb Davey, late of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Florence E. Southwick, widow of George W. Southwick, late of the First Battery, Vermont Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Quirk, widow of Thomas Quirk, late of the detachment, unassigned, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Addie Allen, widow of Stockton Allen, late of Company H, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Constant, widow of John C. Constant, late acting masters' mate, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elmira M. Webb, widow of Leroy J. Webb, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma S. Dolaway, widow of George Dolaway, late of Company I, Fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of C. Cordelia Strong, widow of Hermon A. Strong, late of Company B, One Hundred and Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Huldah Pedrick, widow of Hiram Pedrick, late of Company F, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary G. Van Brunt, widow of Henry Van Brunt, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and One Hundred and Thirty-eighth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary B. Norwood, widow of William Norwood, late of Company G, Fiftieth Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Green, widow of Francillo A. Green, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella J. Winegar, widow of William W. Winegar, late of Company B, One Hundred and Thirtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry (Nineteenth Cavalry), and Company B, First Regiment New York Dragoons, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of California Farmer, widow of Robert L. Farmer, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Cook, widow of John Cook, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Shelton, widow of Joseph Shelton, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment, and Company C, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jeannette Wallace, widow of William Wallace, late of Company B, One Hundred and Sixtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Baker, widow of John A. Baker, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Buckingham, widow of John Buckingham, late of Company L, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Noble, widow of Henry S. L. Noble, late of Company D, Seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and

pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Foughty, widow of Samuel Foughty, late of Company A, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and Company A, Seventy-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Orndurf, widow of William M. Orndurf, late of Company F, One Hundred and Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Birdie L. Santee, widow of Joseph W. Santee, late of Company H, One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alwilda Ray, widow of Sylvester Ray, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Turner, widow of James Turner, late of Company A, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara Collins, widow of Thomas Collins, late of Company A, Seventy-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha McGraw, widow of Wesley McGraw, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary M. Devol, widow of Allen Devol, late of Company G, One Hundred and Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia A. Hull, widow of David Hull, late of Company G, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria Graves, widow of William Graves, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet E. Schram, widow of William H. Schram, late of Company B, Eighty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth M. Scott, widow of Byron Scott, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Lockwood, widow of Oscar Lockwood, late of Company D, One Hundred and Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cornelia Farr Percy, widow of Robert H. Percy, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Appleby, widow of Silas Appleby, late of Company E, One Hundred and Forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Cahoone, widow of Gideon A. Cahoone, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment, and Company G, Seventh Regiment, Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Saxton, widow of Burton Saxton, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary B. Kaiser, former widow of William Bohne, late a musician, Band, Seventy-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Friederica Louise Gross, widow of Otto Gross, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances M. Cooley, widow of Alphonso E. Cooley, late captain, Company K, Ninety-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Gage, widow of Augustus M. Gage, late of Company H, One Hundred and Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and One Hundred and Thirty-first Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice Paul, widow of David Paul, late of Company F, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma C. Andrews, widow of James M. Andrews, late of Company D, Thirty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sophia M. Webster, former widow of Eleazer B. Howard, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah C. Wythe, widow of James Wythe, late of Company A, One Hundred and Twenty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catharine A. Page, widow of George W. Page, late of Company A, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret C. Lee, widow of William W. Lee, late third-class musician, band, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Weiser, widow of George Weiser, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna J. Flick, widow of Benjamin Flick, late unassigned, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. W. Diggles, widow of John P. Diggles, late of Company M, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lydia R. DuBois, widow of John T. DuBois, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Carrie H. Wood, widow of Gilbert E. Wood, late of Company I, Thirty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lydia J. Allard, widow of Jonathan Allard, late of Company E, Seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edith Pullen, widow of Disbrow Pullen, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda B. Thomas, widow of Jacob B. Thomas, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Marietta Burger, widow of Charles A. Burger, alias Charles Burke, late of Company G, Forty-eighth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine E. Hannen, widow of Henry H. Hannen, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company G, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Magilton, widow of Joseph Magilton, late of Company F, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Carrie L. Fay, widow of Albert R. Fay, late of Company A, Hoffman's battalion, One Hundred and Twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Paddock, widow of Peter Paddock, late of Company B, One Hundred and Forty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. K. White, former widow of Alexander M. Kennedy, late of Company A, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Johanna Wettengel, widow of John Wettengel, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment, and Company K, Eighth Regiment, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha M. Bryant, widow of Benjamin F. Bryant, late of Company M, First Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha A. Vroman, widow of Cornelius Vroman, late of Company H, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Blair, widow of Joseph F. Blair, late of Battery A, First Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma R. Pettie, widow of Harrison Pettie, late of Company K, Seventy-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Dorothea M. Brown, widow of Lyman L. Brown, late a landsman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Judah A. Stewart, widow of John Stewart, late of Company E, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Belrose, widow of Charles H. Belrose, late of Company C, Forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lizzie Boehm, widow of Frederick Boehm, late of Company H, One Hundred and Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah C. Kerr, widow of William H. Kerr, late of Company E, Seventieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret C. Mills, widow of Franklin G. Mills, late of Company D, One Hundred and First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza A. Washington, widow of Charles Washington, late of Company K, One Hundred and Sixteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Florence S. McGinnis, widow of Archibald McGinnis, late of Company A, Ninety-first and One Hundred and Twentieth Regiments Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Pierce, widow of John E. Pierce, late of the Eighth Independent Battery Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy Catherine Fry, widow of Henry Fry, late of Company I, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet Brownrigg, widow of George Brownrigg, late of Company G, One Hundred and Seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha E. Watts, widow of Joseph E. Watts, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Melisa Alexander, widow of Albert Alexander, late of Company G, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie Everson, widow of George J. Everson, late of Company H, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nora D. Neal, widow of James H. Neal, late of Company B, One Hundred and Thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Fannie Davis, widow of John E. Davis, late of Company G, Second Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia A. Dunaway, widow of Thomas Dunaway, late of Company F, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara J. Lay, widow of William H. Lay, late of Company D, Twenty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannah L. Lester, widow of George H. Lester, late of Company I, One Hundred and Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna Lowell, widow of Edwin B. Lowell, late of Company E, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margrett B. Adair, widow of James D. Adair, late of Company C, Second Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Miller, widow of John H. Miller, late of Company F, Sixty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Matilda Tarno, widow of Henry L. Tarno, late of Company K, One Hundred and Forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucy A. Beckwith, widow of Daniel W. Beckwith, late a coal heaver, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Parsons, widow of Elias H. Parsons, late second lieutenant, Company F, and captain, Company I, Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Katie Wykoff, widow of John A. Wykoff, late of Company G, Fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Turner, widow of Cyrus H. Turner, late of Company H, One Hundred and Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Pennington, widow of Robert Pennington, late of Company K, One Hundred and Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Bettie J. Williams, widow of Thomas E. Williams, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anzina L. Harper, widow of Henry B. Harper, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Florence Uplinger, widow of Amos Uplinger, late of Company B, Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie M. Evans, widow of Lewis Evans, late of Company I, One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Hockley, former widow of Matthias Coombs, late of Company D, Twenty-second Regiment, and Company C, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Christine Hounshell, widow of Augustus Hounshell, late of Company D, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lydia Todhunter, widow of Charles L. Todhunter, late of Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Briggs, widow of Samuel J. Briggs, late of Company K, One Hundred and Ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Libbie Van Deusen, widow of Cornelius Van Deusen, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Esther J. Kimberly, widow of James Kimberly, late of Company G, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie C. Knox, widow of William C. Knox, late of the Signal Corps, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Jacob, widow of William C. Jacob, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth A. Markham, widow of Alford P. Markham, late of Company H, Thirty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Pheoba C. Huffman, widow of John Huffman, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emily L. Watkins, widow of John J. Watkins, late of Company H, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ada F. O'Loughlin, widow of Lawrence O'Laughlin, late of Company K, One Hundred and Fortieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Fifty-fourth Regiment New York National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Helen J. Lanning, widow of David B. Lanning, late of Company I, One Hundred and Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and landsman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna E. Van Alstyne, widow of Thomas Van Alstyne, late of Company I, Twenty-fifth Regiment; Company A, ——— Battalion, Forty-fourth Regiment; and Company I, One Hundred and Forty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth H. Nichols, widow of Parker P. Nichols, late of Companies D and L, Seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary O'Flaherty, widow of Edward O'Flaherty, late of Company I, Ninth and Second Regiments New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice A. Proctor, widow of Oscar V. Proctor, late of Company E, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cathrine Logsdon, widow of Frank Logsdon, late of Company K, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Hood, widow of Charles F. Hood, late of Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment, and Company C, One Hundred and Ninety-first Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mariette A. Hale, widow of David B. Hale, late of Company G, Ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Katharina Reis, widow of Robert Reis, late of Company C, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna E. Crawford, former widow of William D. Crawford, late of Company F, Twenty-fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen M. Ensworth, widow of Horace B. Ensworth, late of Company B, Eighty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nancy V. Hazell, widow of Joshua B. Hazell, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. McDivitt, widow of James H. McDivitt, late captain of Company F, Seventy-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Fanny Cunningham, widow of Josephus Cunningham, late of Company H, Seventy-third Regiment, and captain, Company D, One Hundred and Eighty-eighth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Effie Washington, widow of William Washington, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Simpson, widow of George Simpson, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah W. Fairchild, widow of Henry C. Fairchild, late of Company B, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rachel A. Norris, widow of Thomas L. Norris, late of Company D, Two Hundred and Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rose Hazlett, widow of William C. Hazlett, late of Company B, One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Harer, widow of Henry Harer, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lulu H. Powers, widow of Rodney M. Powers, late of Troop H, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Helen A. Halsted, widow of Charles F. Halsted, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susie F. Rowe, widow of Erherd S. Rowe, late of Company E, One Hundred and Eighty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eva E. Franklin, widow of Ashley M. Franklin, late of Company A, Third Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lena Margraffe, widow of Louis Margraffe, late of Company E, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Rifles, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie McClean, widow of Joseph McClean, alias William Smith, late of Company G, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline A. Morgan, widow of Miner C. Morgan, late of Company A, Fiftieth Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie Kelly, widow of James A. Kelly, late of Company F, One Hundred and Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie Bean, widow of James Bean, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and commissary sergeant, Twenty-first Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Shultz, widow of Henry Shultz, late of Company K, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Melissa D. Smith, widow of John Mc. Smith, late Unassigned, Ringgold Battalion, and Company A, Twenty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma J. Deo, widow of Henry Deo, alias Henry Kimball, late of Company F, First Battalion, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine A. Wheeler, widow of Andrew L. Wheeler, late of Company K, Ninety-second Regiment and Company I, Sixty-fifth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Georgiana M. DeGroff, widow of Burritt M. DeGroff, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Beard, widow of Jacob Beard, late of Company L, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Matilda E. Richards, widow of John Richards, late of Company A, Thirty-third and Thirty-fourth Regiments Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lelia M. Marple, widow of John M. Marple, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Judd, widow of Philip Judd, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan Lambert, widow of John Lambert, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elmira E. Ballinger, widow of William Ballinger, late of Company C, Forty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Etta Bloomer, widow of Jesse M. Bloomer, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara B. Teegarden, widow of Aaron Teegarden, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura S. Gage, widow of Richard J. Gage, late of Company D, One Hundred and Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jane F. Hope, widow of Henry D. Hope, late of Company C, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ora E. Houser, widow of Dillen Houser, late of Company C, Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Hall, widow of Benjamin Hall, late of Company K, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Manerva Collins, widow of James Collins, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Alcorn, widow of John H. Alcorn, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Simpson, widow of Aurelius Simpson, late of Company A, One Hundred and Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannah A. Brittain, widow of Frank Brittain, late of Company A, Seventy-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Weltner, widow of Joseph C. Weltner, late of Company E, Fifty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry,

and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Corcoran, widow of Thomas Corcoran, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Wilson, widow of David Wilson, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Gorsuch, widow of Richard M. Gorsuch, late of Company H, First Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella N. Herwick, widow of Thomas G. Herwick, late of Company G, One Hundred and Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Hochstetler, widow of William Hochstetler, late of Company H, First Battalion, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry; Company K, Twentieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry; and Company D, First Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Burley Van Fleet, former widow of Ideral K. Van Fleet, late of Company C, Thirty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah M. Beaumont, widow of Lucien Beaumont, late of Company C, Eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca H. Dunkelbarger, widow of Jacob Dunkelbarger, late of Company C, Eighty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Melissa A. Haskell, former widow of Abner Haskell, late of Company G, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriett M. Chamberlin, widow of Francis A. Chamberlin, late of Company F, Coast Guard, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Duncan, widow of Alexander Duncan, alias Albert Duncan, late of Company B, One Hundred and Ninety-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Evans, widow of David W. Evans, late of Company E, One Hundred and Seventy-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Francena Brokaw, widow of Henry Brokaw, late of Company C, Sixty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa E. Ludwig, widow of Emanuel Ludwig, late of Company D, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary O. Settle, widow of Henry C. Settle, late seaman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charlotte Buckmaster, widow of Eli Buckmaster, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria S. Everest, widow of Charles H. Everest, late of Company F, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rosannah Davis, widow of William W. Davis, late of Company D, One Hundred and Seventy-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Barbara Wiley, widow of James P. Wiley, late of Company D, Second Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie F. Van Bramer, widow of Julius Van Bramer, late of Company I, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha E. Imbler, widow of William B. Imbler, late of Company F, Second Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucy Killinger, widow of Jacob Killinger, late of Company D, Forty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nellie Pettengill, widow of Manford A. Pettengill, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah L. Skates, widow of Zachariah T. Skates, late of Company E, First Battalion, Tennessee Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Teresa V. Millward, former widow of Dewitt B. Waldo, late of Company B, Eighty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Florence A. Suess, widow of George Suess, late of Company G, First Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Lewis, widow of Louis L. Lewis, late of Company G, Nineteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza V. Duggan, widow of William Duggan, late of Company M, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannah Christen, widow of Jacob Christen, late of Company H, Twenty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Katie A. Reynolds, widow of George Reynolds, Jr., late second lieutenant, Company D, Third Regiment Massachusetts Militia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma R. Steel, widow of Count S. Steel, late of the Second Battery Kansas Volunteer Light Artillery, and first lieutenant, Company G, and first lieutenant and commissary, Fourteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Stevens, widow of Henry Stevens, late of Company F, One Hundred and Fortieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Frost, widow of Leonard F. Frost, late of Company B, One Hundred and Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eleanor Ady, widow of William D. Ady, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Hall, widow of Wilson Hall, late of Company K, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Virginia B. Schenck, widow of Johnson Schenck, late of Company I, Eighty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Katherine M. Heath, widow of Wilbur F. Heath, late of Company D, One Hundred and Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Scarritt, widow of Erasmus B. Scarritt, late first lieutenant and quartermaster, One Hundred and Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Dodge, widow of John W. Dodge, late of Company C, Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Dubbs, former widow of Moses Dubbs, late second lieutenant, Company B, One Hundred and Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah S. Zufelt, widow of Jefferson Zufelt, alias Jefferson Shoefeldt, late of Company K, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nellie Flynn, widow of John Flynn, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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.

PENSIONS TO CERTAIN WIDOWS AND FORMER WIDOWS OF CIVIL WAR SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7898) granting pensions to certain widows and former widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Mary Miller, widow of Winston Miller, late of Company K, One Hundred and Twenty-Fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louisa F. Mansfield, widow of James W. Mansfield, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Julia Lyon, widow of James B. Lyon, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Logsdon, widow of Harrison Logsdon, late of Company H, Twenty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha Kasinger, widow of Nicholas C. Kasinger, late of Capt. Richard F. Taylor's Company C, Middle Green River Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Gorda James, widow of Thomas F. James, late of Capt. Richard F. Taylor's Company C, Middle Green River Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alwilda Brooks, widow of Calvin W. Brooks, alias C. W. Brooks, late of Lt. Jesse B. Taggart's Company D, Middle Green River Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mattie Bumgardner, widow of Emmett Bumgardner, late of Company F, Thirty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Frances Vaughn, widow of Woodson Vaughn, late of Company F, One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mattie L. Stults, widow of John S. Stults, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Sutherland, widow of Robert A. Sutherland, late of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Agnes Crawford, widow of Edward Crawford, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella Chapman, former widow of Charles H. Halsey, late of Company G, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Cora Dawson, widow of Samuel Dawson, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary P. Smith, widow of Ellis Z. Smith, late of Company G, Seventy-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth H. Camp, widow of William H. Camp, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Fannie J. Mann, widow of William J. Mann, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ellogene M. Raymond, widow of Leverett Raymond, late of Company C, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Sutton, widow of Albert Sutton, late of Company G, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sidney A. Hodges, widow of George W. Hodges, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hulda S. Dick, widow of Samuel M. Dick, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha Ella Downing, former widow of George W. Friend, late of Company E, One Hundred and Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jessie M. Warner, widow of William C. Warner, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Carroll, former widow of William C. Guyer, late of Company E, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Frances C. Strickler, widow of William J. Strickler, late of Companies G and C, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Agnes G. Smith, widow of Dayton Smith, late of Company D, One Hundred and Thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna Angelow, widow of William J. Angelow, late unassigned, One Hundred and First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Pauline Fallahee, widow of Thomas Fallahee, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company G, Third Regiment New York Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary H. Auch, widow of Andrew Auch, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary F. Shields, widow of Meedy W. Shields, late of Companies H and E, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Waltenbaugh, widow of Jacob Waltenbaugh, late of Company H, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of H. Emma Streepy, widow of Isaac Streepy, late of Company I, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella Orr, widow of James Orr, late of Company C, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nora B. Dunlavy, widow of Henry F. Dunlavy, late of Company G, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna M. Delay, widow of George W. Delay, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary L. Head, widow of Theophilus Head, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Morehead, widow of Franklin Morehead, late of Company B, Thirtieth Regiment, and Company G, Fifty-third Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mira W. Miller, widow of Henry A. Miller, late of Company E, Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maggie A. Bernethy, widow of Robert P. Bernethy, late of Company F, One Hundred and Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nettie J. Brown, widow of Jesse Brown, alias Jesse Brown Buck, late of Company K, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rose Milliman, widow of John Milliman, late of Company A, One Hundred and Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Minnie Smith, widow of Emerson Smith, late of Company H, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alvesta Otto, widow of Charles A. Otto, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rosa M. Green, widow of Solomon J. Green, late of Company B, Forty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lizzie E. Brown, widow of Martin J. Brown, late of Company D, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha Buffington, widow of Samuel Buffington, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Myra E. E. Krauskopf, widow of John Krauskopf, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary G. Sherwood, widow of Smith J. Sherwood, late of Captain Smith's Battery A, Chicago Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maryette Sweet, former widow of Delavan Devoe, late of Company F, Fourteenth and One Hundred and Eighty-sixth Regiments New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Bertha T. Hastings, widow of John K. Hastings, late of Company K, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Ferris, widow of Robert R. Ferris, late of Company G, One Hundred and Seventy-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Harriett A. Litten, widow of Silas N. Litten, late of Company F, Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucy C. Montgomery, widow of Alexander H. Montgomery, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Ann Melvin, widow of James M. Melvin, late of Company G, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary V. Sailesbury, widow of James Sailesbury, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fortieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie Tewksbury, widow of Aaron Tewksbury, late of Company C, One Hundred and Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna L. Harman, widow of Benjamin F. Harman, late of Company B, One Hundred and Thirty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Leona J. Strickland, widow of Theodore Strickland, late of Company B, One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maggie Berry, widow of Samuel Berry, alias Samuel Cynthiana, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Dona Samples, former widow of William Conkin, late of Company E, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have obtained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Sarah L. Ellison, widow of Berry Ellison, late of Company C, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Cinda Forbes, widow of William Forbes, late of Company E, Third Regiment North Carolina Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hattie Harvey, widow of James J. Harvey, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment, and Company K, Ninth Regiment, Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucy E. Huff, widow of Jonas Huff, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie E. Jackson, widow of William H. Jackson, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Johnson, widow of Francis M. Johnson, late of Companies D and B, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Lake, widow of John C. Lake, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Venia Moody, widow of Francis M. Moody, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Nora Pierce, widow of David E. Pierce, late of Company A, Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Battery E, Kentucky Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Ringer, widow of George A. Ringer, late of Company C, Sixty-first Regiment, and Company I, Twenty-third Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Martha Story, widow of Thomas Story, late of Company M, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Herthe L. R. Whitney, widow of William W. Whitney, late Acting Assistant Surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lenora B. Easterday, widow of Simon P. Easterday, late of Company D, Ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Agnes Metcalf, widow of Allen Metcalf, late of Company I, Thirty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret E. Pryce, former widow of Jacob A. Thuma, late of Company C, Sixty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Parmelia J. Woodward, widow of Stephen P. Woodward, late of Company E, One Hundred and Forty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lena L. Evans, widow of Isaac T. Evans, late of Company D, One Hundred and Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Seventh Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lou A. Strother, widow of George W. Strother, late of Company K, First Regiment Capitol Guards, Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mariah M. Johnson, widow of Greenville Johnson, late of Capt. William D. Cardwell's Company G, Three Forks Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Newton, widow of William B. Newton, late of the Kentucky State Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Amy N. Robertson, widow of George W. Robertson, late of Company F, Ninety-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nancy Jane Dyer, widow of King S. Dyer, late of Company C, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna Fletcher, widow of John R. Fletcher, late of Company D, One Hundred and Forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hattie McIntosh, widow of Perry C. McIntosh, late of Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Roberta Davis, widow of Thomas F. Davis, late of Company I, Forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alice Chumbley, widow of John J. Chumbley, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Amanda C. Bodenhamer, former widow of Charles McClung, late of Company E, One Hundred and Forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lydia A. Havens, widow of Benjamin Havens, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Ledgerwood, widow of Samuel Ledgerwood, late of Company E, Fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Belle Harmon, widow of James A. Harmon, late of Company A, Thirty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Long, widow of John C. Long, late of Company H, Thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna H. Brock, widow of Allen Brock, late of Company D, Nineteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Julia A. Taylor, former widow of William T. Wray, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Juvenile, widow of Thomas B. Juvenile, late of Company G, Seventy-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Phina McCrary, widow of Ira McCrary, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Lucy Jones, widow of John L. Jones, late of Company F, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mollie Sigman, widow of John Sigman, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Frances Collins, widow of Levi Collins, late of Company D, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella Taylor, widow of James H. Taylor, late of Company I, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mumzell Woldredge, widow of John Woldredge, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Sarah Nance, widow of John Nance, late of Captain Shadrach Combs' Company D, Three Forks Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louvisa Brewer, widow of Valentine S. Brewer, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nancy M. Pierce, widow of Franklin D. Pierce, late of Captain Walter P. Ingram's Company D, Hall's Gap Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ada Simpson, widow of Simuel Simpson, late of Company G, Thirty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rachel Fuson, widow of Thomas Fuson, late of Companies B and I, Seventh Regiment, and Company E, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Bolton, widow of Alexander Bolton, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Orvilla Finton, widow of James Finton, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Pearl Brentlinger, widow of Levi Brentlinger, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Eleanor R. Gage, widow of William G. Gage, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 a month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary E. Adams, widow of William H. Adams, late second lieutenant of Capt. William Miller's Company G, Sixtieth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and Capt. William E. McGinnis' Company H, Eleventh Regiment Kansas State Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Davis, widow of Ruben, or Reuben Davis, late of Company D, Eighty-second Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ruth P. Kerns, widow of John W. Kerns, late of Lieutenant W. A. Cornelius' detachment of Company H, Eighty-first Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Laura E. Rowell, widow of John M. Rowell, late of Company H, One Hundred and Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Effie Wilson, widow of Nathan Wilson, late of Company E, Forty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Katie A. Smith, widow of Richard G. Smith, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alice L. Stemmons, widow of Thomas J. Stemmons, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Catherine Orender, widow of William Orender, late of Capt. Thomas K. Paul's company of Wright County Volunteer Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary B. Morris, widow of William F. Morris, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rachel Nash, widow of Thomas J. Nash, late of Capt. H. C. Donnohue's company of Pettis County Volunteers, Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Mitchell, widow of Thomas J. Mitchell, alias T. J. Mitchell, late of Company M, Seventy-third Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and Capt. William L. Fenix's company of Taney County, Volunteer Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Agnes P. Miller, widow of James A. Miller, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Marietta Cannon, former widow of Joseph Carver, late of Company B, One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Angeline Hart, former widow of James M. Hart, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment, and Company D, Eleventh Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Ruth Ann Breedlove, widow of Thomas D. Breedlove, late of Company B, Forty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie E. Key, widow of John H. Key, late of Company H, One Hundred and Thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna E. Routson, widow of Albert M. Routson, late of Company G, One Hundred and Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lenace Marlin, widow of Oliver Marlin, late of Company F, One Hundred and Forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years which fact shall be determined by submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Della Leach, widow of William N. Leach, late of Company B, One Hundred and Seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alfrettia Smith, widow of Marion B. Smith, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Matilda E. A. Hornback, widow of John Hornback, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rhoda H. Lozier, widow of Alexander H. Lozier, late of Company B, Second Regiment and Company A, Fifteenth Regiment, New Jersey Volunteer Infantry; and Company A, Second Veteran Battalion New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Kate F. Alderson, widow of John T. Alderson, late of Company K, One Hundred and Nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hattie B. Roberts, widow of Daniel M. Roberts, late of Company G, Ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ida A. Borthwick, widow of Charles F. Borthwick, alias Franklin Brown, late of Company I, Fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Fosket, widow of William M. Fosket, late of Company B, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella B. Kinnamon, widow of Harrison Kinnamon, late of Company I, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rachel A. Updegraff, widow of Uriah H. Updegraff, late of Company B, Fifty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Carrie M. Poole, widow of Charles H. Poole, late of Company G, Thirty-ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Fannie L. Leonard, widow of George B. Leonard, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Banks Fuller, widow of Thomas G. Fuller, late of the Twentieth Unattached Company Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Quirk, widow of John Quirk, late of Company H, Twenty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rosanna Jarvis, former widow of Frank Monosmith, late of Company B, One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Fishinger, widow of Frederick Fishinger, late of Company A, Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Idella Waid, former widow of Samuel Waid, late of Company A, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Minnie A. Lacy, widow of Miles H. Lacy, late of Company D, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Nancy S. Oldham, widow of William P. Oldham, late of Company F, One Hundred and Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Carrie Stidham, widow of Samuel Stidham, late of Capt. William Strong's Company E, Three Forks Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Dicey Terry, widow of William Terry, late of Capt. William D. Cardwell's Company G, Three Forks Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mima Turner, widow of Jesse Turner, late of Capt. William Strong's Company E, Three Forks Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lavina Watts, widow of John Watts, late of Capt. William Strong's Company E, Three Forks Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louise Workman, widow of Thomas Workman, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment, and Company D, First Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nancy Jane Branham, widow of Joseph Branham, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and Company G, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha J. Lawson, widow of David Lawson, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah M. H. Nickerson, widow of Henry O. Nickerson, late of Company A, Third Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Bertha L. Wade, widow of Samuel J. Wade, late of Company C, Sixtieth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Spear, widow of Albert A. Spear, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Dora B. Mann, widow of John E. Mann, late of Company G, Nineteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Esther Critchell, widow of William Critchell, late of Companies E and C, Forty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Tabitha Biglow, widow of Mason W. Biglow, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maria B. Thompson, widow of William J. Thompson, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie S. Nealley, widow of Meldon A. Nealley, late of Company B, Maine State Guards, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month .

The name of Neley Keller, widow of William Keller, late of Company D, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Margaret E. Stephens, widow of John E. A. Stephens, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella A. Reese, widow of Frank Norris Reese, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and Company K, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Josephine Black, widow of Levi M. Black, late of Company F, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jeanette Nelson, widow of Milton Nelson, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Carrie Thompson, widow of Joseph D. Thompson, late of Company B, Twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Second Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Susan Wells, widow of Marcus Wells, late of Company K, Fifty-fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hulda J. Sanders, widow of Henry Sanders, late of Company E, Fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Daisy Vredenbergh, widow of Samuel F. Vredenbergh, late of Company K, Fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Irene C. Flack, widow of William A. Flack, late of the United States Marine Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of May Barnes, widow of Alanson J. Barnes, late of Company C, One Hundred and Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Della Bond, widow of Jesse H. Bond, late of Company F, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Olivia Stebbins, widow of Austin E. Stebbins, late of Company C, Eighty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lura H. P. Markley, widow of Henry H. Markley, late regimental commissary sergeant, Second Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ida M. Miller, widow of Alfred F. Miller, late of Company E, One Hundred and Forty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elise M. Lum, widow of Cyrill A. Lum, late of Company H, One Hundred and Eighty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lu M. Linscott, widow of John F. Linscott, late of Company A, First Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Haskin, former widow of Andrew J. Fisher, late of Company F, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Kathryn E. Fraley, widow of William G. Fraley, late of Company A, Two Hundred and Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Clara L. Owens, widow of Thomas M. Owens, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Agnes M. Jackman, widow of George C. Jackman, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna E. Eldridge, widow of William H. Eldridge, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary A. C. Scales, widow of Henry Scales, late of Company E, Twenty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ada Plattenberger, widow of Jacob P. Plattenberger, late of Company G, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ethel S. Ferguson, widow of Samuel Ferguson, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and per her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Wood, widow of Lewis Wood, late of Company H, One Hundred and Fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah A. King, widow of John W. King, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lizzie M. Schaber, widow of Louis Schaber, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret M. Crane, widow of Daniel E. Crane, late of Company D, One Hundred and Fifty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary C. McKarnin, widow of Charles McKarnin, alias Charles McCarnin, late of Capt. John W. Younger's company, Clay County Battalion, Enrolled Missouri Militia, and Capt. John W. Younger's company, Clay and Clinton Counties, Missouri Volunteer Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jane S. Murphy, widow of George W. Murphy, or G. W. Murphy, late of Capt. Jacob B. Cox's Company C, Eighty-first Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and Capt. James H. Davis' Company K, Eighty-first Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah C. Burnett, widow of George W. Burnett, late of Company C, Fifth Battalion Missouri Volunteer State Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary F. Williams, widow of John Williams, late of Capt. John W. Younger's company of the Clay County Battalion, Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary C. Wilkerson, former widow of James W. or Wallas Wilkerson, late of Company E, Eighty-seventh Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nannie Blades, former widow of George Blades, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sylvia I. Whiteman, widow of John A. Whiteman, late of Company M, Nineteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Lucretia E. Barton, widow of Morgan Barton, late of Company M, Twenty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Clara S. Hopple, widow of William H. Hopple, late unassigned, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Olive H. Entrekin, widow of Taylor Entrekin, late of Capt. H. C. Donnuhue's company of Pettis County, Volunteer Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rebecca Leonhardt, widow of Frederick W. Leonhardt, late of Company A, Forty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Belle Hockensmith, widow of Thomas L. Hockensmith, late of Company K, Seventy-seventh Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Bettie C. Cunningham, widow of Israel D. Cunningham, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Wallace, widow of John K. C. Wallace, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer State Militia Cavalry, and Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma J. Rose, widow of Irvin R. Rose, late of Capt. William Forbe's company, Howard County Missouri Volunteer Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hattie Wilson, widow of Robert F. Wilson, late of Capt. William H. Liggett's Company C, Sixtieth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louisa M. Alcorn, widow of William W. Alcorn, late of Company A, Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Amanda Napier, widow of Francis M. Napier, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Schofield, widow of Daniel H. Schofield, who served under the name of Daniel H. Cofield, late of Company D, Twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry; Battery L, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lillian La Motte, widow of William O. La Motte, late of Company H, Forty-sixth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mattie Mayo, widow of John A. Mayo, late of Company C, Forty-sixth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ethel Kapp, widow of Andrew W. Kapp, late of Captain Tanner's Independent Company, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Fifty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Clara L. Garvin, widow of Evelyn F. Garvin, late of Company H, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Salina J. Slaughter, widow of Elijah T. Slaughter, late of Company K, Seventy-seventh Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Clara Dempsey, widow of James Dempsey, late of Company B, Nineteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Clara Dempsey, widow of James Dempsey, late of Company D, One Hundred and Twenty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Lizzie Lawson, widow of George N. Lawson, late of Company G, Nineteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Goine, widow of William H. Goine, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Susan Eudora Gwinn, widow of Richard P. Gwinn, late of Capt. George Bingham's Company H, Seventy-first Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and Capt. John S. Crain's company, Saline County Volunteer Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary C. Severs, widow of Azaria Severs, late of Company B, Green River Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Josie Greathouse, widow of William Greathouse, late unassigned, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Ellen Edwards, widow of James Edwards, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Agnes E. Kimmel, widow of David F. Kimmel, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Flavia F. Kile, widow of Ransome Kile, late of Company A, Seventy-third Regiment, and Company I, Thirty-eighth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna L. Rumsey, widow of Horace N. Rumsey, late first lieutenant, Company A, One Hundred and Forty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lydia E. Perkins, widow of Charles Z. Perkins, late of Company E, Seventy-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Pearl F. Warren, widow of Valentine F. Warren, late of Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Amanda Riddell, widow of Levi Riddell, late of Company G, One Hundred and Fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie Schonacker, widow of John E. Schonacker, late of Company C, One Hundred and Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella Pierce, widow of Joseph H. Pierce, late of Company I, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Clara E. Huffman, former widow of Sylvester T. Bryan, late of Company G, and principal musician, One Hundred and Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Charlotte M. Spaulding, widow of Franklin M. Spaulding, late first lieutenant and regimental commissary, Second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Helen R. Pitney, widow of Orville L. Pitney, late of Company A, Seventy-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lester N. Hays, widow of William Hays, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nellie M. Benjamin, widow of William H. Benjamin, late of Company D, One Hundred and Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Laura Alice Hammaker, widow of Adam Hammaker, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hattie E. A. Norris, former widow of John Alexander, late of Company B, Thirty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maggie Allen, widow of Calvin Allen, late of Company G, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Luticia C. Anderson, widow of King D. Anderson, late of Company A, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Betsy Ann Boles, widow of William M. Boles, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Phoeba Fite, widow of Nathaniel M. Fite, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Sarah J. Green, widow of Robert Green, late of Companies H and E, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hannah L. Heaton, widow of Murphy Heaton, late of Company M, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Susan E. Jeffres, widow of William Jeffres, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment, and Company I, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Zubie Owens, widow of William Owens, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha Wyatt, widow of James E. Wyatt, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Allie M. Walker, widow of Marshal A. Walker, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louisa Weaver, widow of Gordon Weaver, late of Companies H and E, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Nancy V. Mosher, former widow of Jonathan Rains, late of Capt. Henry G. Bollinger's company of Camden County Volunteer Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie E. McKown, widow of William H. McKown, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-Fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Mecomber, widow of Joseph Mecomber, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Frances E. Newton, former widow of Israel Newton, alias John Scott, late of Company C, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie Rhodes, widow of Jacob Rhodes, late of Company B, Third Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Malisa Maze, widow of William Maze, late of Lieutenant Dietrich's company, Cooper County Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret F. Wilson, widow of James H. Wilson, late of Companies D and G, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie C. Linthicum, former widow of Christian A. Witt, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ruah L. Martin, widow of William T. Martin, late of Capt. Richard Murphy's company of Pulaski and Texas Counties, Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Nan Benson, widow of McCloud Benson, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eddie Bassett, widow of Richard R. Bassett, late of Company B, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah K. Copeland, widow of Joseph T. Copeland, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Knight, widow of Moses Knight, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth and Twenty-first Regiments Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Issadorah T. Wilson, widow of James Brooks, known as "James W. Wilson", late of Company B, Eighty-third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Minnie F. R. Leach, widow of Charles Leach, late of Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna Milholland, widow of Amos Milholland, late of Company E, One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Carrie M. Schriver, widow of Benjamin F. Schriver, late of Company B, Fiftieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary H. Perkins, widow of Stephen Perkins, late of Company K, Nineteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lana Miller, widow of William H. Miller, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jeannette C. Rutherford, widow of Alonzo P. Rutherford, late of Hastings Keystone Battery, Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Editha Smith, widow of John C. Smith, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Henrietta Zeno, widow of Pierre Zeno, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Bertha M. Lewis, widow of Samuel E. Lewis, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Hilliker, widow of John Hilliker, late of Company F, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lottie Smith, widow of James W. Smith, late of Company D, Eightieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Annie M. Swingle, widow of Calvin F. Swingle, late of Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella F. Stewart, former widow of William Stewart, late of Company M, Second Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Delia Porter, widow of Luke Porter, late of Company D, Ninety-eighth Regiment, and Company F, Seventy-eighth Regiment, United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lena K. Wagner, widow of Phillip H. Wagner, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Olive M. Hunt, widow of Robert R. Hunt, late of Company F, One Hundred and Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie I. Ritz, widow of John Ritz, alias Daniel Dreibelbies, late of Company C, Sixty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ellen F. Colt, widow of Edwin N. Colt, late Acting Assistant Surgeon (contract surgeon), United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Flora Duckett, widow of James B. Duckett, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Eliza James, widow of Calvin James, late of Troop G, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Hays, widow of William R. Hays, late of Company D, Ninety-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jessie B. McElroy, widow of Samuel McElroy, late of Company B, One Hundred and Eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Michaud, widow of Henry Michaud, late of Company D, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eliza J. Wilkinson, widow of Thomas A. Wilkinson, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Grace V. Lawrence, widow of Isaiah E. Lawrence, late of Company E, One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah Ukele, widow of Frederick Ukele, late of Company I, One Hundred and Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie M. Oliver, widow of John F. Oliver, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Tuttle, former widow of Horatio J. Tuttle, late of Company B, First Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Wagner, widow of Charles Wagner, late of Company E, First Regiment Maryland Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucy Pierce, widow of Samuel W. Pierce, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Bettie L. Lomax, widow of Henry C. Lomax, late of Captain Robert W. Holland's Linn County Provisional Company of the Sixty-second Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Clutter, former widow of Absalom Hunsaker, alias Abosolm, or Absolom Hunsaker, late of Company I, Fiftieth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary L. Bruner, widow of James P. Bruner, late of Captain Isaac D. Hon's Company K, Sixty-ninth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Brewer, widow of Francis M. Brewer, late of Captain Jacob Bane's Cavalry, Company E, Mercer County Battalion Missouri State Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Susan Van Pelt, former widow of William Allerton, late of Company B, Sixty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Fifth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Campbell, widow of Alexander J. Campbell, late of Company K, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month as the widow of the above-named veteran in lieu of the pension she is now receiving as the dependent mother of Roy D. Miller, late of the United States Navy.

The name of Sarah J. Clarkson, widow of Thaddeus Clarkson, late of Company K, Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ruth I. G. Pridham, former widow of Joseph L. Goulette, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary J. Whistler, widow of Thomas Whistler, late of Company G, Second Regiment Eastern Shore Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Eleventh Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eliza Cupp, widow of Lemon V. Cupp, late of Company I, One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie D. Billingsley, widow of Samuel Mc. Billingsley, who was pensioned as Samuel McBillingsley, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Bussard, widow of Salem Bussard, late of Company I, One Hundred and Fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Debbie Klingler, widow of Isaac Klingler, late of Companies G and F, One Hundred and Fourteenth Regiment Ohio

Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Norma Roush, widow of Eli Roush, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Julia C. Messamore, widow of Thomas Messamore, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary A. McCullough, widow of George McCullough, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Matie Patrey, widow of Asa H. Patrey, late of Company E, Ninety-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of sixty years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Susan McKay Young, widow of Marcus Young, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of sixty years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary J. Edwards, widow of Robert C. Edwards, late of Tanner's Independent Company, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Joanna Gray, widow of David Gray, late of Company G, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Grace E. Fairchild, widow of William Fairchild, late of Company B, Nineteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of sixty years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Cora J. Lowell, widow of Edwin A. Lowell, late of Company D, Fifty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer National Guard, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Tompkins, widow of William Tompkins, late of Company F, Forty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary C. Miller, widow of Samuel R. Miller, late of Company C, One Hundredth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Catherine C. West, widow of Handy West, late of Company A, One Hundred and Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Edna P. Welsh, widow of Edward A. Welsh, late of Company G, Second Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary E. O'Keefe, widow of Daniel H. O'Keefe, alias Daniel Hennessy, late of Company F, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Cora Cate, widow of Henry Cate, late of Company E, Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Susie E. Payne, widow of Arthur B. Payne, late of Company L, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Laura A. Donnelly, widow of James C. Donnelly, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Narcissa Walter, widow of Israel Walter, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Florence Bonnell, widow of George W. Bonnell, late of Company I, One Hundred and Seventy-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lena P. Riddick, widow of Isaac H. Riddick, late of Company A, One Hundred and Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maude Campbell, widow of John P. Campbell, late of Company B, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Arbelle Dooley, widow of George W. Dooley, late of Capt. Daniel Hoover's company, Carroll County Regiment Provisional Militia of Missouri, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Salyards, widow of Edward M. Salyards, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Flora B. Thomas, widow of Luther B. Thomas, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Teed, widow of Edward Teed, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Della R. Birney, widow of Nelson L. Birney, late of Company F, Ninety-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary H. Roberts, widow of Francis M. Roberts, late of Company D, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret E. Duckworth, widow of William A. Duckworth, late of Company G, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and second lieutenant, Company K, One Hundred and Tenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louise O. Bowman, widow of William H. Bowman, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sophia Finley, widow of Robert Finley, late of Company G, One Hundred and Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, One Hundred and Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Julie A. Allen, widow of James Allen, late of Company K, First Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah M. Swafford, widow of George W. Swafford, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Miller, widow of Christopher Miller, late of Company I, Third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Laura A. Garrison, widow of Lewis W. Garrison, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lillie M. Scott, widow of Asa W. Scott, late of Company F, First Battalion Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lillie E. Brinkerhoff, widow of Leland Brinkerhoff, alias Levi Brown, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery; Companies G and A, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry; and Company F, Fourth Regiment New York Provisional Volunteer Cavalry (formerly First Regiment New York Mounted Rifles), and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hortense Van Horn, widow of William H. Van Horn, late of Company D, Ninety-third Regiment New York National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Anna V. Peck, widow of John L. Peck, late of Company C, One Hundred and Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Laura A. Gundlach, widow of Louis Gundlach, late of Company H, Twenty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Second Independent Battery, New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rebecca Jenkins, widow of Duggan Jenkins, late of Company I, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Katrine Rautman, widow of Henry F. Rautman, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Nichols, widow of Albert Nichols, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha J. Rhodes, widow of Milton W. Rhodes, late of Company H, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth W. Ravenburg, widow of Rudolph Ravenburg, late hospital steward, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Flora E. Bailey, widow of Lewis J. Bailey, late of Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lottie Denny, widow of Samuel T. Denny, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry; Company H, One Hundred and Seventeenth Regiment; and Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Pearl Thomas, widow of John N. Thomas, late of Company F, Fifty-fifth Regiment, and Company G, One Hundred and Fifteenth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Louise Eberle, widow of Joseph Eberle, late of Company H, One Hundred and Fiftieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Florence I. Steele, widow of George W. Steele, late of Company I, Sixty-first Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Henrietta F. Lowry, widow of Walter Lowry, late of Company K, One Hundred and Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Gussie Dawson, widow of Phil Dawson, late of Company A, One Hundred and Twenty-second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hattie House, widow of Draper F. House, late of Capt. William F. Pell's company of Independent Scouts for Wirt County, West Virginia State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Hoffman, former widow of John R. Hoffman, late of Company E, Twenty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Temple, former widow of Joseph Cavins, late of Company C, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma K. Clark, widow of William F. Clark, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lizzie Davis, widow of Simel Davis, late of Company C, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sallie Jordan, widow of William A. Jordan, late of Capt. John Bridgewater's Company A, Hall's Gap Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Marilla A. Buchwalter, widow of Edward L. Buchwalter, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Simmons, widow of William Simmons, late of Company E, Thirty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Evelyn M. Phelps, widow of Charles A. Phelps, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma Caroline Washburn, widow of Nelson Washburn, late second lieutenant, Company L, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah M. Waugh, widow of Enoch L. Waugh, late of Battery E, West Virginia Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary R. Currier, widow of Reuben B. Currier, late of Company A, Forty-sixth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ethelyn Palmer, former widow of Theodore H. Ingersoll, late of Company C, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Belle R. Taylor, widow of Richard Taylor, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Glennie Edwinson, widow of Christopher Edwinson, late of Company G, Sixty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Ozetta M. Taylor, widow of David Taylor, Jr., late of Company B, One Hundred and Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Catherine Keyser, widow of Jacob Keyser, late ordinary seaman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Marie Brown, widow of William R. Brown, late of Company H, One Hundred and Thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Evangeline R. Butler, widow of William Henry H. Butler, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alta Manypenny, widow of Albert Manypenny, late of Company I, Twenty-second and Twenty-ninth Regiments Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie Smith, widow of Francis M. Smith, late of the Eighteenth Independent Battery, New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Ramer, widow of James Ramer, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ellen Crouse, widow of Benjamin A. Crouse, late of Company G, Forty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Harriett G. Flynn, widow of Simon Flynn, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Clarissa M. Eck, widow of Alvin Eck, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Antonia Kuehn, widow of Otto Kuehn, late acting assistant surgeon (contract surgeon), United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Belle Robinson, widow of Charles H. Robinson, alias Archibald Bush, late of Company L, Twelfth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ida Lane, widow of Franklin Lane, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and the Forty-eighth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Rosa Anderson, widow of John Anderson, late of Company H, Ninety-third and Eighty-first Regiments United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maude Holmes, widow of John J. Holmes, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Alice B. Mitchell, widow of Thomas F. Mitchell, late of Company A, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Florence I. Christie, widow of Joseph B. Christie, late of Company E, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Carrie M. Kelley, widow of Nelson Kelley, alias Henry Mapes, late of Company B, Eighty-third Regiment, and Company A, Ninety-seventh Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary Alice Pease, widow of Joseph Pease, late landsman and carpenter's mate, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Allen, widow of Henry Allen, late captain, Company A, One Hundred and Fortieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hannah Smith, widow of Alexander Smith, late of Company D, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Neville S. Tout, widow of Henry C. Tout, late of Company B, One Hundred and Seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Della Means, widow of Jacob A. Means, late of Company K, One Hundred and Twenty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah Hammons, widow of Alvin W. Hammons or Hamon, late of Capt. Hiram Minor's Perry County company of volunteers, Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary W. Leslie, widow of John M. Leslie, late of Capt. Warren W. Harris' company of Howard County Volunteer Militia of Missouri, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Cooper, widow of George T. Cooper, late of Company I, Second Regiment West Virginia Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Susanna Pearce, widow of Lewis S. Pearce, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Missouri P. Benton, widow of William D. Benton, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Laura C. Clark, widow of Walter S. Clark, late of Company C, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sarah Ann B. Emry, widow of William M. Emry, late of Capt. Richard F. Taylor's Company C, Middle Green River Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jamaica Taylor, widow of Charles D. Taylor, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Belle B. Hood, widow of Andrew J. Hood, late of Company E, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jennie Welborn, widow of William T. Welborn, late of Company E, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Sylvia Abner, widow of Isaac N. Abner, late of Capt. Richard F. Taylor's Company C, Middle Green River Battalion Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lee Rigsby, widow of James E. Rigsby, late of Company C, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Annie Lewis, widow of Taylor Lewis, late of Company B, One Hundred and Twenty-third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lillie Daley, widow of Palan R. Daley, late of Company H, Second Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Bettie Dick, widow of Thomas D. Dick, late of Battery A, Kentucky Volunteer Light Artillery, and Company C, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Flora Turner, widow of George W. Turner, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Laura C. Hobbs, widow of Andrew J. Hobbs, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Josephine Gardner, widow of Joseph P. Gardner, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery and the One Hundredth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary H. Nash, widow of George S. Nash, late second and first lieutenant, Company D, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maud Lucas, widow of Charles L. Lucas, late of Company G, Thirty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Elizabeth Fields, widow of Linsy H. Fields, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Lucinda J. Miller, widow of Henry S. Miller, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary H. Milburn, widow of William Elbert Franklin Milburn, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha E. Irvin, widow of Jerret Irvin, late of Company C, One Hundred and Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Catherine White, widow of John B. White, late of Company C, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Tuttle Buttram, former widow of George P. Tuttle, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment and Company B, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Ferguson, widow of Archey C. Ferguson, late of Company D, Twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eleanor A. Warren, widow of William M. Warren, late of Company B, Fifty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella M. Rea, widow of George W. Rea, late of Company I, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Grace Gerecke, widow of Herman Gerecke, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Hannah Koontz, widow of James E. Koontz, late of Company F, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Johanna Kuester, widow of John H. Kuester, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ida B. Wooldridge, widow of John Wooldridge, late of Company F, Thirtieth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Maximillia Cowan, widow of William L. Cowan, late of Company B, South Cumberland Battalion Kentucky State Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella E. McMichael, widow of John R. McMichael, late of Company C, Ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Twelfth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Frederika Bushong, widow of Milton Bushong, late of Company B, One Hundred and Seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Myrtle Payne, widow of John M. Payne, late commissary sergeant, Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Clara T. W. Simmons, widow of Harry Simmons, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Smith, widow of James W. Smith, late of Company H, Ninety-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Ella E. Huffman, widow of William H. Huffman, late of Company D, One Hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Eudora M. Elkins, widow of Calvin P. Elkins, late of Company F, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Clarinda E. Kenyon, widow of Charles E. Kenyon, late of Company E, Seventy-sixth Regiment, and Company F, Sixty-third Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

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.

PENSIONS TO CERTAIN HELPLESS AND DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS OF THE CIVIL WAR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7899) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain helpless and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of George Meredith, helpless and dependent son of Alexander Meredith, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Jim Meredith, helpless and dependent son of Alexander Meredith, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Nancy Ann Laird, helpless and dependent daughter of James C. Laird, late of Company H, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Simpson Pennington, helpless and dependent son of Thompson Pennington, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Katie Rock, helpless and dependent daughter of John Rock, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Rosylena Wood, helpless and dependent daughter of David F. Wood, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Frances Engler, helpless and dependent daughter of George W. Engler, late of Company A, One Hundred and Forty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Fifty-first Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of George N. Groff, helpless and dependent son of John Groff, late of Company D, One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of John W. Lutz, Jr., helpless and dependent son of John W. Lutz, late of Company G, Seventy-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Maude Isabel Schuler, helpless and dependent daughter of Taylor L. Schuler, late of Company C, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James Edwards, helpless and dependent son of Stephen F. Edwards, late of Company G, Fifty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Nola Forrester, helpless and dependent daughter of James F. Forrester, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Alberta B. Newman, helpless and dependent daughter of David Newman, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Viola Shively, helpless and dependent daughter of William Shively, late of Company A, One Hundred and Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary Metzger, helpless and dependent daughter of August Metzger, late of Company H, One Hundred and First Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ivy Pitzer, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel J. Pitzer, alias Samuel E. Pitt, late of Company I, Forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Hester A. Bradford, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry Bradford, late of Company G, One Hundred and Eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Levi Copas, helpless and dependent son of Jackson Copas, late of Company K, One Hundred and Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sarah Stephenson, helpless and dependent daughter of John Stephenson, late of Company M, Third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Lewis Congrove, helpless and dependent son of Amos Congrove, late of Company I, One Hundred and Eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Jennie Hopkins, helpless and dependent daughter of William Hopkins, late of Company D, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Leslie D. Hood, helpless and dependent son of John D. Hood, late of Company A, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Everett Horton, helpless and dependent son of James S. Horton, late of Company H, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Minnie B. Leonard, helpless and dependent daughter of Andrew J. Leonard, late of Company H, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Otto Nance, helpless and dependent son of David Nance, late of Company E, One Hundred and Seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Samuel Warner, helpless and dependent son of John Warner, late of Company F, One Hundred and Fortieth Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Michael T. Tippie, helpless and dependent son of John M. Tippie, late of Company E, One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charles Younger, helpless and dependent son of Charles Younger, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, First Regiment West Virginia Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ella Carl, helpless and dependent daughter of Nathan Carl, late of Company K, One Hundred and Eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Lulu M. Williams, helpless and dependent daughter of Edward Williams, late of Company D, Forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Marion M. Luther, helpless and dependent daughter of Aldrich S. Luther, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charlie Campbell, helpless and dependent son of William A. Campbell, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Joke Campbell, helpless and dependent son of William A. Campbell, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Hattie Campbell, helpless and dependent daughter of William A. Campbell, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Francis A. Sipe, helpless and dependent son of Archibald Sipe, late of Company C, Sixty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Alice R. Smith, helpless and dependent daughter of William Smith, late of Company F, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Nannie B. Floyd, helpless and dependent daughter of Aaron Floyd, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Frank Burcham, helpless and dependent son of James Burcham, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Edward Butler, helpless and dependent son of Tobias D. Butler, late of Company B, First Regiment Indiana Volunteer Heavy Artillery (Twenty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry), and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charles W. Ringer, helpless and dependent son of Melancthon Ringer, late of Company C, One Hundred and Twenty-first Regiment, and Company F, Sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Albert Braun, helpless and dependent son of John Braun, late of the First Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James B. Long, helpless and dependent son of John W. Long, late of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Edward Armel, helpless and dependent son of William Armel, late of Company K, One Hundred and Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Harry C. B. Frets, helpless and dependent son of George Frets, late of Company E, Eighty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Luther Hudson, helpless and dependent son of Jeremiah Hudson, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Katie Glenn, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas Glenn, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Twenty-third Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Jessie Myrtle Bennett, helpless and dependent daughter of Jonathan Bennett, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Hettie Bagby, helpless and dependent daughter of George W. Bagby, late of Companies B and L, Fifteenth Regiment, and Company K, Tenth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Alice L. Calderhead, helpless and dependent daughter of William A. Calderhead, late of Company H, One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Ninth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Margaret Ann Canatsey, helpless and dependent daughter of William S. Canatsey, late of Company D, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Frances Edna Morrow, helpless and dependent daughter of Alexander Morrow, late first lieutenant, Company B, Thirty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Isabelle Scott, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry B. Scott, late of Companies D and H, Fifth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Elmer B. Williams, helpless and dependent son of Andrew Williams, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Bert Milburn, helpless and dependent son of Jesse S. Milburn, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary Jane Patterson, helpless and dependent daughter of Hiram L. Patterson, late of Company K, Sixty-eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Jesse Mills, helpless and dependent son of Cornelius Mills, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Frank A. Boster, helpless and dependent son of James A. Boster, late of Company A, Eighty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Effie P. Chiles, helpless and dependent daughter of George W. Chiles, late of Company C, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Marion Van Natta, helpless and dependent son of George O. Van Natta, late of Company E, Ninety-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Josie Siessly, helpless and dependent daughter of John Siessly, late of Company B, Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sallie Hutchens, helpless and dependent daughter of Arthur Hutchens, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Hubert L. Anderson, helpless and dependent son of Robert L. Anderson, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Albert S. Miller, helpless and dependent son of Aaron J. Miller, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Milton Warner, helpless and dependent son of Casper Warner, late of Company C, Fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Dora McCallister, helpless and dependent daughter of George W. McCallister, late of Company A, Fifty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ned Johnston, helpless and dependent son of Samuel Johnston, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Lewis Stamper, helpless and dependent son of Wesley Stamper, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Walter D. Cropper, helpless and dependent son of Wheetley D. Cropper, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and Company C, Fifty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Henry Patrick Dyer, helpless and dependent son of John F. Dyer, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ollie Hamilton, helpless and dependent son of William H. Hamilton, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of William Gage, helpless and dependent son of Daniel H. Gage, late of Company B, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Daniel F. Glenn, helpless and dependent son of James Glenn, late of Company E, Fifth Battalion, and Company E, Sixth Regiment, Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Elizabeth A. C. Bigham, helpless and dependent daughter of James Bigham, late of Company K, One Hundred and Eighty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of William P. Cope, helpless and dependent son of Emmor B. Cope, late captain and aide-de-camp, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charles W. Smith, helpless and dependent son of Henry Smith, late of Company F, One Hundred and Sixty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Hattie R. Wierman, helpless and dependent daughter of Eliakim Wierman, late of Warren's Independent Company, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary Jane McGlaughlin, helpless and dependent daughter of John McGlaughlin, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Lizzie A. Colwell, helpless and dependent daughter of George E. Colwell, late of Company A, Eighty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Clara L. Dolman, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles M. Dolman, late of Company I, Seventy-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Hallie V. Weeks, helpless and dependent daughter of George Weeks, late captain, Company B, Thirty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Henry Friedrich, helpless and dependent son of Conrad Friedrich, late of Company E, Forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bertha E. Haroff, helpless and dependent daughter of William T. Haroff, late of Company K, One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sadie E. Goshorn, helpless and dependent daughter of George Goshorn, late of Company I, One Hundred and Forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Lillie Haupt, helpless and dependent daughter of Edward Haupt, late of Company D, Two Hundred and Eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of William C. Fisher, helpless and dependent son of William H. Fisher, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Edna B. Hartley, helpless and dependent daughter of William Hartley, late of Company D, Fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry and first lieutenant, Company F, Thirty-fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Minnie G. Jones, helpless and dependent daughter of Alonzo W. Jones, late of Company G, One Hundred and Forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Eva Case, helpless and dependent daughter of Malon Case, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment Illinois Voluntary Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Myra Struchen, helpless and dependent daughter of Abraham Struchen, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ella May Faris, helpless and dependent daughter of Finley Faris, late of Company H, One Hundred and Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Hannah D. Warren, helpless and dependent daughter of Andrew J. Warren, late of Company C, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Claude Stine, helpless and dependent son of Abraham Stine, late of Company K, One Hundred and Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary A. Proudfit, helpless and dependent daughter of James B. Proudfit, late of Company H, One Hundred and Seventy-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Flossie M. Ramsey, helpless and dependent daughter of James A. Ramsey, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James Edward Miller, helpless and dependent son of Andrew J. Miller, late of Company I, Forty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Chester D. Green, helpless and dependent son of Elisha W. Green, late of Company K, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Schott, helpless and dependent daughter of Abram M. Schott, late of Company H, One Hundred and Forty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ida Jones, helpless and dependent daughter of William D. Jones, late of Company C, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charlie J. Dupree, helpless and dependent son of George Dupree, late of Company E, Ninety-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Louise E. Stockwell, helpless and dependent daughter of David Stockwell, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Adam Anderson, helpless and dependent son of George B. Anderson, late of Company C, East Tennessee Volunteer National Guard, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary M. Norris, helpless and dependent daughter of Wisner Norris, late of Companies D and F, Thirty-second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ella Strutton, helpless and dependent daughter of Elisha S. Strutton, late of Company M, Third Regiment, and Company C, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charles F. Boroff, helpless and dependent son of Daniel Boroff, late of Company A, Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Myrtle B. Oldfield, helpless and dependent daughter of James R. Oldfield, late of Company C, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mettie Grace Cameron, helpless and dependent daughter of John S. Cameron, late first lieutenant, Company G, and adjutant, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Martha Weiss, helpless and dependent daughter of Emanuel Weiss, late of Company D, ——— Battalion, Forty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Arthur C. Isenberg, helpless and dependent son of Peter S. Isenberg, late of Company C, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Rachel A. Bosworth, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles W. Bosworth, late of Company I, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sarah H. Allison, helpless and dependent daughter of Jacob Allison, late of Company F, First Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of John Schoonmaker, Jr., helpless and dependent son of John Schoonmaker, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment, and Company K, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James Hord, helpless and dependent son of Hugh Hord, late of Company B, Forty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sherman King, helpless and dependent son of Benton K. P. King, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James C. Riley, helpless and dependent son of John D. Riley, late of Company H, Seventy-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Adele Evans, helpless and dependent daughter of James B. Evans, late of Company C, One Hundred and Twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary Tiger, helpless and dependent daughter of Nathan L. Tiger, late of Battery D, First Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Harry E. Duffield, helpless and dependent son of Henry D. Duffield, late of Company F, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Amanda M. Evert, helpless and dependent daughter of Frederick Evert, late of Company E, Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Thomas M. Teeters, helpless and dependent son of Josiah Teeters, late of Company B, One Hundred and Twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Clara Fowler, helpless and dependent daughter of Francis A. Fowler, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Stella Littlejohn, helpless and dependent daughter of William Littlejohn, late of Company H, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Emma Blosser, helpless and dependent daughter of William H. Blosser, late of Company F, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Edith Pyle, helpless and dependent daughter of James W. Pyle, late of Company G, One Hundred and Ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Amanda Hart, helpless and dependent daughter of Absolom Hart, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of John Claud McCoy, helpless and dependent son of Thomas W. McCoy, late of Company H, One Hundred and Fifty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charles Hovermale, helpless and dependent son of John A. Hovermale, late of Company D, One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Stella M. Webster, helpless and dependent daughter of Noah Webster, late first lieutenant, Company K, Forty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Fannie Stults, helpless and dependent daughter of Jacob Stults, late of Company K, One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Josephine Campbell, helpless and dependent daughter of Lewis Campbell, late of Company C, One Hundred and Seventy-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Jackson, helpless and dependent daughter of Cyrus A. Jackson, late of Company H, Thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cora S. Day, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas G. Day, late of Company E, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Julian A. Myers, helpless and dependent son of Hiram A. Myers, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Lydia Frances Nyman, helpless and dependent daughter of William Nyman, late of Company E, One Hundred and Forty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of John Patrick Nolan, helpless and dependent son of Michael Nolan, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Marion Gregory, helpless and dependent son of William Gregory, late of Company F, One Hundred and Seventy-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Louisa J. Humphrey, helpless and dependent daughter of Benjamin Humphrey, late of Company B, One Hundred and Sixty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Maretta A. Booher, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel A. Booher, late of Company H, One Hundred and Sixty-first Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Julia A. Silva, helpless and dependent daughter of Isaac Silva, late of Company C, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Nellie M. Taylor, helpless and dependent daughter of Corwin M. Taylor, late of Company G, One Hundred and Twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mary C. Sheaffer, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry Sheaffer, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Grace A. Walker, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles B. Walker, late of Company E, Eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Laura Dively, helpless and dependent daughter of Morgan Dively, late of Company F, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mabel Forrer, helpless and dependent daughter of John Forrer, late of Company I, Twenty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of George E. Ryan, helpless and dependent son of Francis M. Ryan, late of Company B, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Fred L. Lindsey, helpless and dependent son of William B. Lindsey, late of Company A, One Hundred and Thirty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Zack Pool, helpless and dependent son of Jeremiah Pool, late of Company D, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James Combs, helpless and dependent son of Squire Combs, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Willie D. Nelson, helpless and dependent son of Horatio Nelson, late of Company G, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Mabel McBratney, helpless and dependent daughter of Andrew C. McBratney, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Leah Kesterson, helpless and dependent daughter of Hugh Kesterson, late of Capt. Isaiah Guymon's Company A, Mercer County Battalion Missouri State Militia, and Company D, Forty-fourth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Dessie Priest, helpless and dependent daughter of Ezra Priest, late of Company L, First Regiment United States Veteran Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Susan J. Raab, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry Raab, late of Company F, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Neri Otis Porter, helpless and dependent son of Henry W. Porter, late of Company H, One Hundred and Forty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Augusta Lambert, helpless and dependent daughter of Andrew Lambert, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio

Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Effie M. Anderson, helpless and dependent daughter of Robert Anderson, late of Company B, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Julia Reeves, helpless and dependent daughter of Eventine Reeves, late of Company I, Fifty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James L. Roberts, helpless and dependent son of John H. Roberts, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charles E. Curl, helpless and dependent son of Peter Curl, late of Company K, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Jud James Tripp, helpless and dependent son of Benjamin Tripp, late of Company H, Twenty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James D. Shelters, helpless and dependent son of Edward Shelters, late of Company F, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Excelia Lague-Leyo, helpless and dependent daughter of Joseph Leyo, alias Joseph Lejane, late of Company E, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charles Alcorn, helpless and dependent son of John H. Alcorn, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Adelia T. Hoover, helpless and dependent daughter of James Hoover, late of Company I, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Bettie Dillard, helpless and dependent daughter of James W. Dillard, late of Company E, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Maggie Sanders, helpless and dependent daughter of James W. Sanders, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment, and Company H, Fifty-second Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Virgie Belle McKee, helpless and dependent daughter of William T. McKee, late of Company M, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Francis V. Guy, helpless and dependent son of Daniel Guy, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Kathryn Smith, helpless and dependent daughter of Mahlon P. Smith, late of Battery C, Third Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Stella Meadows, helpless and dependent daughter of Joseph S. Meadows, late of Company F, Ninety-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Everett P. Collins, helpless and dependent son of Theadric Collins, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James M. Bush, helpless and dependent son of William A. Bush, late of Company C, One Hundred and Fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oscar J. Callier, helpless and dependent son of Arsan Callier, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Charles Smith, helpless and dependent son of John Fletcher Smith, late of Company E, One Hundred and Twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Caleb Osier Brown, helpless and dependent son of Francis M. Brown, late of Company I, Eighty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Emma Hinton, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry V. Hinton, late of Company F, Ninety-ninth Regiment, Company C, Fiftieth Regiment, and Company B, One Hundred and Eighty-third Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

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.

PENSIONS TO CERTAIN WIDOWS, FORMER WIDOWS, AND DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF SOLDIERS OF THE CIVIL WAR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7905) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain widows, former widows, and dependent children of soldiers of the Civil War.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Margaret D. Fonda, widow of Wesley H. Fonda, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Hannah Gibbs, widow of Michael Gibbs, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lavinia McDonald Beard, widow of Andrew J. Beard, late of Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Theresa Donaldson, widow of William Donaldson, late of Company E, One Hundred and Fortieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Mabel S. Pickup, widow of George Pickup, late of Company C, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Eighth Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha J. Brownell, widow of Danford Brownell, late of Company C, One Hundred and Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth J. Lloyd, widow of William E. Lloyd, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Eva P. Black, widow of Erastus F. Black, late of Company F, Sixty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret H. Jones, former widow of Henry J. Port, late of Company M, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Fronia L. B. Norwood, widow of Thomas W. Norwood, late of Company F, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Gabriel Patrick, helpless and dependent son of Meridith Patrick, late of Company I, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Ada A. Bevers, widow of Joseph D. Bevers, late of Company A, Fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lillie Siemiller, widow of Israel Siemiller, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and second lieutenant, Company C, Fifty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Bettie A. Reese, widow of Sherwood R. Reese, late of Company K, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Jemima Reeves, widow of Francis M. Reeves, late of Company B, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Margaret Officer, widow of Robert Officer, late of Company L, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Martha J. Hopper, widow of Robert B. Hopper, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Lue Jones, widow of Francis M. Jones, late of Company K, Third Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month and increase the rate to $30 per month from and after the date she shall have attained the age of 60 years, which fact shall be determined by the submission of satisfactory evidence by the beneficiary to the Veterans' Administration.

The name of Mary E. Miller, former widow of John W. Fry, late of Company G, One Hundred and Twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Hoyt, widow of William L. Hoyt, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cyrena Reed, widow of Henry C. Reed, late of Company M, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie Watson, widow of James M. Watson, late of Company A, Fifty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alice M. Spaulding, widow of Nathan F. Spaulding, late of Company B, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise the remarks I made today and to extend the same by including two letters.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech which I recently delivered in Philadelphia.

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

There was no objection.

(Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend her own remarks in the RECORD.)

WIDOW OF THE LATE WILLIAM J. COCKE

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committe on Claims be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 931) for the relief of the widow of the late William J. Cocke and that the bill be referred to the Committee on War Claims.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a special order, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

UTILITY TAXES AND UTILITY RATES IN WASHINGTON, D. C.—SOURCES OF POSSIBLE REVENUE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, Congress has just refused to pass a bill providing for a loan to the District. It is freely prophesied that the local tax bill will fail. A morning paper calls upon Congress to save "the helpless Capital City from bankruptcy" and speaks of a real crisis which impends. Recently we have read press headlines telling of the aged and destitute facing privation in the District because of delayed appropriations. The local Real Estate Board circulated a letter voicing its objections to any increase in real-estate tax in the District, stating that real-estate owners now produce approximately 60 percent of the total tax funds. Members have also received a circular letter from the Federation of Citizens' Associations setting forth the present dilemma of the District and urging passage of a tax bill which will distribute the tax burden equitably. I am heartened to learn of such an organization, and of a desire to distribute the tax burden equitably in the District. Those who think the District is oppressed because it must pay 3-percent interest on funds borrowed from the Federal Government air their grievances in the local papers. Rents and hotel rates are sky high and mounting to the stratosphere. This is a serious condition and I, for one, am willing to accept some responsibility as a Member of Congress. I therefore propose to point out a neglected source of revenue and a method of saving large sums to the people of the District which should be effective in stopping the picking of pockets.

I do believe that Congress should help the District and I am convinced that the most effective way of giving help at this time is to point out to the responsible officials of the District and to the District Committee in Congress some of my findings in a brief excursion into the facts concerning the electric power situation in Washington, D. C. I stumbled on these facts when I was studying electric power rates throughout the country in connection with the Bonneville power project which has so absorbed my attention. I am amazed that no association and no newspaper has pointed out one simple and obvious solution of the District tax problem. I am convinced that this set-up will not be tolerated when the facts are made public. It will be like the story of the old women and the pig, in the nursery rhyme, "butcher will begin to kill cow, cow will begin to drink water, water will begin to quench fire"—all my colleagues have recited this nursery rhyme—and so on, until the objective is accomplished. Utilities will begin to pay just taxes, taxes will encourage citizens, citizens will see potentialities of electric system, electric system will become public property, and then District tax troubles, high electric-light rates, slums, a measure of the profiteering and corruption will vanish in the night; District of Columbia will be clean and free—only the best-dressed woman and her maneuvering provider will feel the pinch as plunder is forbidden.

The story I have to tell is not quite so simple as a nursery rhyme, but it has elements of interest and surprise. I feel sure you will be startled when the giant Greed appears in full array. The good fairy will enter later in the person of someone with patience, capacity for research, and a sense of justice, preferably someone on the District Committee. Someone can secure a monument here in Washington for services to our Capital City. I know that it will take some study to arrive at the actual situation in regard to District utilities. I offer this material for one of the sources of information for those who desire to become conversant with the history and present status of the matter. It is my sincere belief that some action can be taken based on the information presented herewith, but I know full well that further investigation must be made.

SOME QUESTIONS

Certain questions occur to me immediately and I propound them in the hope that Congress will demand full answers:

Have the District utilities paid all their taxes to date, including their personal taxes?

Why is the District Committee silent in the face of such an obstacle to orderly government as threatened bankruptcy?

Why does the District Utilities Commission continue to consent that the District shall be looted and its residents penalized by a private utility which is guaranteed 60½ percent interest on its real stock investment, rain or shine, good times or depressions, and has profited in the past 11 years to the extent of $60,000,000 from the funds of the people of the District?

Why is this utility, as well as other utilities in the District, practically free from just taxation, in spite of the rich pickings in which it is protected by some united action, official or unofficial?

Why is the private power utility not compelled to pay taxes approximating those paid by real estate?

My brief review of this situation seems to indicate that the District is about $2,000,000 shy each year in taxes which ought to be paid by the utilities, over $800,000 of which should justly come from the electric power company which furnishes the current. What has lulled the District Committee and the Utility Commission into acquiescence in this obvious fraud?

Who is responsible for the victimizing of these voteless people?

Who allows our Government to create here a city of slums paying tribute to a holding company, the chief beneficiary of which is Mr. Harrison Williams, lately before the Securi-

ties and Exchange Commission, fully written up in the press of the country?

Why does the District tax holders of real estate to the exclusion of holders of valuable rights which are equivalent to franchise gifts granted by Congress?

One more question, and that is, why should people in such obvious financial distress overlook a source of income which has given one man such tremendous returns, and continues to pour money into his coffers, while the District goes begging to Congress for loans freed from interest?

Why, indeed? Is it ignorance, helplessness, indifference, or some other cause?

SOME ANSWERS

I can tell you enough about this situation, and answer enough of the questions to awaken you to the fact that someone in this Congress should learn the whole story. Some committee should ferret out all the facts and should follow the trail until he finds a reason for the congressional apathy and public indifference. Any investigator will stumble upon almost unbelievable tales of the efficacy of the social lobby in promoting opportunities for vast accumulations of money and capital at the expense of the helpless people of this District. What should be the best governed city in the world will be found, upon examination, to be far from an ideal example, so far as the utility racket is concerned.

I proceed to share with my colleague the first fruits of my brief investigation in the hope that the full harvest may be garnered by the District Committee. I have taken the utmost care in this work in order to avoid error in statements of fact, nor do I make any statement which I am not satisfied is completely justified by facts easily obtainable to those who will inspect the records to which I have referred.

My first care is to point out a source of revenue for the District; second, a source of saving to the people; and third, the fallacies of the so-called Washington sliding-scale electric rate plan. The Rau report, made in 1932, provided by congressional resolution, suggested $4,000,000 a year as a possible savings to the people of the Government and the District. This amount may now be increased to $4,800,000 because of the additional use of electric current. Now, that is a very close approach to the five millions which now keeps the District from balancing its budget. Since the District is now in such a quandary over the possibility of raising the money for actual municipal expenses, it seems the most opportune time for setting forth the facts about taxes which are elsewhere paid by utilities and should be paid in Washington.

DISTRICT REVENUE FROM UTILITY TAXES

There has been a great deal said both in and out of Congress regarding the tax situation of the District of Columbia. Proposals have been made to add an additional tax load to real estate, or to legislate a sales tax which will fall on the little fellow. In my opinion, immediate attention should be given to the taxation of the utilities, more specifically to the taxation of the Potomac Electric Power Co., which earns such enormous returns on a relatively small investment. In estimating the taxes which should be paid, as well as the electric rates which should be charged, I have made the comparison between the privately owned company which operates in the District and the publicly owned power plant of Tacoma, Wash. This comparison comes naturally just at this time, as I have recently made it in connection with the rates to be charged at Bonneville, and Tacoma has one of the most successfully operated public power plants in the country. A comparison with Canadian rates would have been much more striking, but not so suited to the purpose.

The local taxes paid by the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the calendar year 1936 amounted to $597,613 according to the report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to the House District Committee. This is 4.26 percent of the Company's gross earnings for the year, $14,093,989. Tacoma's public power plant pays 10.35 percent of its gross earnings for local and State taxes. If the private District company paid local taxes at the same rate paid by the Tacoma public plant, it would have paid $1,458,000 in 1936, or $860,000 more than it actually did pay. The propagandists for private power tell us that the reason Tacoma's rates are so low is that the Tacoma plant pays no taxes and has been subsidized by the taxpayer. Both of these allegations are untrue. The cited facts show that the District electric utility is not doing half as much as the Tacoma plant for State and city governmental purposes, such as schools, police, fire protection, and so forth, and has been subsidized by the people entirely for the personal gain of a Wall Street manipulator.

This is a situation Congress cannot afford to neglect after the facts have been pointed out. These facts and figures are an effective challenge to those who raise the tax and subsidy cry against the Tacoma electric plant. It should be fairly stated that the District local utility pays 2.18 percent of its gross income in Federal excise tax, and 6.23 in income, undistributed profits, and other minor, miscellaneous Federal taxes. This latter percentage is abnormally high because of the great excess profits of the company. Furthermore, the Government itself is taxed by the local utility and it contributes about 20 percent of the company's earnings. Somewhere in this discussion it should be pointed out that the Government, as a customer offers very great advantages. The Government consumes enormous and increasing quantities of power, and always pays its bills, there are no bad accounts, bookkeeping is reduced to a minimum. The addition of air-conditioning and of huge Government buildings means a gold mine to the local operating company.

Now, let the District immediately set about putting its house in order, and proceed to proper taxation of utilities, and it will find more sympathetic hearing in Congress.

THE WASHINGTON PLAN

Before entering into a discussion of electric rates charged in Washington it becomes necessary to set forth some information about the so-called Washington plan, or the "Washington sliding scale electric rate plan." There is a widespread and persistent propaganda to the effect that the Washington plan affords an ideal solution of the power question. Just now it is most unfortunately being copied elsewhere, and proposed for other cities, notably New York. It is not native to Washington, but English born, in connection with gas rates. It has been the target for many claims, most of which are false so far as the public is concerned; it is indeed a great success from the viewpoint of the private power company. Since it has produced rates somewhat lower than the American average, the claims made for it have led even well-meaning progressives mistakenly to call it a yardstick. It is assumed that it yields satisfactorily low rates and yet avoids the pitfalls of public ownership. The fact that the Power Trust everywhere is proclaiming the virtues of this plan and that it has the endorsement of certain Government officials is not without significance. I have already stated that under this plan the Pepco is not paying its just proportion of local taxes.

I propose to demonstrate from the official records and the history of the Potomac Electric Power Co., which serves the National Capital, that it is not giving true yardstick rates; that, since the inauguration of this famous plan some 10 years ago, it has extracted unconscionable profits from the consumers, and that it is no solution of the power question except from the viewpoint of utility exploiters. I propose to present comparative tables similar to those given in my speech of June 24, this session, when I compared bills paid by consumers to the private company operating in Portland, Oreg., with those paid by consumers served by the public plant at Tacoma, Wash. This time I am comparing Washington, D. C., and Tacoma in respect to costs of residential, commercial, and industrial power. The data were furnished me at my request by the Federal Power Commission, and, it will be remembered, the figures presented by the Commission in its national rate survey have not been challenged by the Power Trust, nor can they be successfully challenged. The evolution of the "Washington plan" and its

jokers are fully described in a following section on the "consent decree."

COMPARATIVE ELECTRIC BILLS

I present, as an index, comparative bills between Washington, D. C., and Tacoma, Wash., for all classes of electric service directly affecting the public. In my speech of June 24 I have fully described rate classes, consumption, and the Tacoma public power plant. With this brief explanation, the bill comparisons will be self-explanatory. I urge all students of the power problem to study these tables.

Comparison of residential bills of the District of Columbia and Tacoma

City	Lighting and small appliances				Large appliances		
	Minimum bill	15 kilowatt-hours	25 kilowatt-hours	40 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours
Washington	$0.75	$0.75	$0.98	$1.56	$3.10	$5.65	$9.40
Tacoma	$0.50	$0.68	$1.13	$1.52	$2.12	$3.62	$6.12
Percentage above Tacoma	50	10	−15	3	46	56	54

The annual kilowatt-hour per meter consumption in the District was 965; in Tacoma, 1,560 for the year 1935. The average residential rate in cents per kilowatt-hour in the District was 3.24 cents; in Tacoma, 1.68 cents.

For purposes of further comparison, I am now using 100 kilowatt-hours a month as a base. For the range between 15 and 40 kilowatt-hours per month, District rates are reasonable. This low consumption is possible only when no appliances are used. For other parts of the residential schedule they are high. The District subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, in 1937, published a table showing comparative domestic electric bills in cities of 500,000 or more population. This table showed that for 100 kilowatt-hours domestic use per month, the bill would be $3.90 for the average of 17 large private utility plants. The billing range in the table was from $2.82 to $5.50 per month, and for the District $3.10; for Tacoma, Wash., $2.12. This shows that, based on this record of comparison, the domestic electric rates in the large cities of the country are 84 percent higher than a fair yardstick, and in the District, 46½ percent higher.

It is interesting to note that in this table fairly low rates exist in cities close to T. V. A. or subject to competition from public power plants. The lowest tabulated bill, $2.82, was in Cincinnati, showing that rates can be reduced without destroying the solvency of the private power companies.

Comparison of commercial light bills of the District and Tacoma

City	Billing demands (kilowatt demand) and monthly consumption (kilowatt-hours)				
	0.75 kilowatt demand, 50 kilowatt-hours	1.50 kilowatt demand, 150 kilowatt-hours	3.0 kilowatt demand, 375 kilowatt-hours	6.0 kilowatt demand, 750 kilowatt-hours	12.0 kilowattt demand, 1,500 kilowatt-hours
Washington	$1.90	$5.20	$11.12	$20.50	$39.25
Tacoma	$1.75	$5.25	$11.25	$22.50	$42.00
Percentage above Tacoma	9	−1	−1	−10	−7

Both Washington and Tacoma commercial light rates are slightly higher, approximately 15 to 20 percent, than a fair yardstick for this class of service. On a strictly comparative basis, District rates are better for this class of service than Tacoma. District bills are based on Company schedule D, which gives a lower bill than their schedule E. This schedule D is evidently a "leader." This more advantageous rate for the smallest commercial consumers of light favors the owners of small stores, for their light only, not for current used for power.

Comparison of commercial power bills of the District and Tacoma

City	Billing demands (kilowatt demand) and monthly consumption kilowatt-hours				
	1.5 kilowatt demand, 150 kilowatt-hours	3.0 kilowatt demand, 375 kilowatt-hours	6.0 kilowatt demand, 750 kilowatt-hours	12.0 kilowatt demand, 1,500 kilowatt-hours	30.0 kilowatt demand, 6,000 kilowatt hours
Washington	$5.20	$11.12	$20.50	$39.25	$144.50
Tacoma	$2.33	$5.03	$10.05	$20.10	$61.50
Percentage above Tacoma	123	121	104	95	136

This Washington schedule D is abnormally high for power service. This, and the industrial rate, applies for use of current for power purposes including building elevators, air-conditioning, garages, filling stations, and, in fact, all power used in the District, including the Government use.

Comparison of industrial power bills of the District and Tacoma (bills expressed to nearest dollar)

City	Schedule	Billing demands (kilowatt demand) and monthly consumption (kilowatt-hours)									
		75 kilowatt demand		150 kilowatt demand		300 kilowatt demand		500 kilowatt demand		1,000 kilowatt demand	
		15,000 kilowatt-hours	30,000 kilowatt-hours	30,000 kilowatt-hours	60,000 kilowatt-hours	60,000 kilowatt-hours	120,000 kilowatt-hours	100,000 kilowatt-hours	200,000 kilowatt-hours	200,000 kilowatt-hours	400,000 kilowatt-hours
Washington	E	$356	$504	$608	$828	$1,004	$1,382	$1,490	$2,110	$2,695	$3,775
Washington	L	$324	$459	$554	$760	$925	$1,285	$1,385	$1,974	$2,524	$3,524
Tacoma	E2	$151	$217	$253	$344	$417	$597	$635	$935	$1,180	$1,780
Percentage above Tacoma		125	122	130	131	132	124	127	118	122	105

Twenty-seven percent of all current used in the District comes under the power schedules, all of which are high.

The exclusive-dealing perpetual contract between the Potomac Electric Power Co. and the Capital Transit Co. was set out in the statement filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on October 31, 1935, complying with the Securities Act of 1933. This filing was made by the Washington Railway & Electric Co., the parent or second-degree holding company of the local utility. This contract, amongst other things, provides for the sale of 75,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually for the flat sum of $445,000, subject to consumption and coal-cost corrections, based on $4.40 per long ton for coal. In addition, the local electric company maintains at its own expense the generating, transmission, and distribution, including substations, property of the Transit Co. The gross sale price of this current, sold to the Transit Co., is 5.94 mills per kilowatt-hour. This net contract price constitutes a burden on the other rate payers, possibly to the extent of $100,000 per year, and the net rate is practically one-half of what all other power consumers pay. This constitutes a discrimination against other power users, including the Government.

The contract with Stone & Webster should also be opened up as a possible source of burden on the rate payer.

The local utility in the year 1935 used 197,315,800 kilowatt-hours through its interchange contract with Baltimore and Safe Harbor companies, at a cost of $398,542—page 46, Public Utilities Commission, 1935—which represents a unit cost

to the company of 2.02 mills per kilowatt-hour. This represents 34.5 percent of the company's steam generation at the two steam plants. It shows a sizable amount of low-priced hydropower from Safe Harbor consumed in Washington.

THE WASHINGTON RATE CONTROVERSY

In order to deal intelligently with the utility problem in the District it is necessary to survey the history of the rate controversy and the plan resulting from it.

Shortly after the passage by Congress, in 1913, of the District Utility Commission Act, the Commission was created, and it proceeded to set up an organization to carry out the rate provisions of the act. The first requisite was the determination of the rate base.

In this period the law controlling the rate base was in a state of evolution. The law then rested on the Supreme Court opinion in the Smythe-Ames decision rendered in 1898. In this decision the issue was straddled, the decree allowing the rate base value to be determined from a consideration both of historical cost and cost of reproduction. Historical cost represents the actual investment dollars going into the plant, as nearly as can be determined from the historical records of the company. The reproduction cost is a hypothetical cost of a hypethetical identical plant assumed to be built as a continuous operation and excluding the existing plant.

In the practical determination of a rate base the reproduction cost gives a padded value, as I will demonstrate later by actual results in its application to the Washington rate base. The reproduction-cost doctrine also makes what is, practically, an inflated rate. It is unsound as a matter of economics, is unfair to the interests of both investors and rate payers, and promotes horse-trading tactics, jockeying, and manipulations.

ATTEMPT AT VALUATION VIA THE COURTS

The District Utility Commission commenced valuation of Potomac Electric Power Co. July 1, 1914, and completed the same in May 1916. Hearings were held by the Commission and a valuation order finally issued. The company took exception to this order and filed an injunction suit in the District Supreme Court. The Commission then proceeded with hearings on the rate of return and followed with an order, July 1917, setting the rate of return at 7 percent and rates corresponding thereto were allowed. The company then filed another injunction in the same court against placing the rates into effect. On August 20, 1917, the court granted the injunction but required the company to impound the difference between the rates in effect and those ordered effective August 1, 1917. In March 1920, the District Supreme Court decided the valuation case, sustaining the Commission's valuation. The company then appealed to the court of appeals, being successful in an opinion rendered in November 1921, 7 years after the initiation of the valuation survey. The Commission then took an appeal to the United States Supreme Court, and the high Court refused to take jurisdiction, in an opinion rendered in April 1923. This decision threw the base and rate determination into a confused state, as the court of appeals set no formula for determining the rate base. It was then necessary for the Commission to confer with the company to reach an agreement, by negotiation, as to rate base, rate of return, electric schedules, and handling the impounded fund. The negotiations continued through 1923 and the full year of 1924. Through these processes the company succeeded in delaying the rate determination for 10 years after Congress had acted, much to the disgust of the people of Washington. It is just such delays, resulting from legal legerdemain, that have caused the people of the Nation to prefer the yardstick as the birch rod for an instrument of effective regulation.

GREAT FALLS OF THE POTOMAC

Fifteen miles above Washington, on the Potomac, is a power site of substantial possibilities. Question has been raised as to the water title at this point, and it appears that there are three claimants. The first claim descends from the Potomack Co., incorporated in 1784, George Washington being one of the organizers of this company and its president. Title of this claim passed to the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co. The second claim is that of the Federal Government, owner of land at the dam site. The third claimant is the Great Falls Power Co., owner of about 1,000 acres of reservoir property. The Federal Government should have no difficulty in perfecting title, if desired. The Great Falls Power Co. never developed power at this site. The Washington Railway & Electric Co., the holding company of the Potomac Electric Power Co., purchased two-thirds of the stock of the water-power company in 1902 for $425,000 and contracted to transfer these shares to the Potomac Electric Power Co. for $1,000,000 of stock of the latter company. This contract has been continued, as evidenced by the holding company's declaration filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. These facts can be substantiated from the Securities and Exchange Commission declarations, which I advise all Members of Congress to read closely.

The Federal Government now has a dam above the Great Falls site used to furnish water to the water-supply system of the District. Further development will be necessary to protect the water supply of Washington. Evidently the Potomac Electric Power Co. contracted to give up $1,000,000 worth of stock for rate protection for the purpose of preventing the development at Great Falls.

The Federal Water Power Act was passed in 1920 during the height of this rate litigation. This act required the new Federal Power Commission to report on the practicability of power development at the Great Falls site. As a result, a report was submitted to Congress in 1920, often referred to as "the Tyler report", and printed as Senate Document No. 403. The Tyler report set out that this project was both feasible and desirable. It indicated the kilowatt-hour output capacity about equal to the present kilowatt-hour use in the District.

The Army Appropriation Act of 1921 contained a Senate amendment appropriating $200,000 for a dam at Great Falls. This amendment was stricken from the bill in the House. In 1923 Senator NORRIS offered Senate bill 746, to provide a Government-owned hydro plant at Great Falls. This bill passed the Senate, but slumbered in the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

The trend of those times was favorable to big business, as judged by the water-power licenses granted to monopoly and the lobbying methods and activities of the holding-company representatives. Nevertheless this water-power site was a potential birch rod for rate regulation. I have been told that the Norris bill, Senate bill 746, had no effect on the settlement of the Washington rate controversy. This may be correct, but it is reported to have cost $80,000 for lobbying expenses by the holding company. They did not spend this money in vain. The record shows that the House District subcommittee adjourned after an 11-day hearing until December 5, 1924. The consent decree embodying the settlement of the Washington rate controversy and setting up the "Boston sliding scale rate plan", since referred to as the "Washington plan", was handed down by the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia on December 31, 1924. The sequence of these dates is significant. Also pertinent to this situation was the passage of the amendment to the La Follette Act permitting holding companies to enter the District.

THE CONSENT DECREE

This decree, accepted by a Federal judge, was the legal basis of the settlement of the rate litigation and was the authority for the Washington plan. This decree provided the following points, which are the essentials of the so-called rate sliding-scale plan: (1) Effective date, January 1, 1925; (2) rate base; (3) depreciation reserve; (4) return and rates; (5) disposition of impounded funds.

I shall discuss each of the four latter items under a separate heading. In this study I have consulted the fundamental-source documents, reference to which is given herein. I have also had the study of the sliding-scale-rate plan by Irvin Bussing, published by the Columbia University Press. This work contains complete reference to the basic data and tabular compilations from the reports of the Public Utility Commission of the District of Columbia. This study fails to get at the meat of the problem because it ignores the increase in plant investment from public contributions.

Figures cited throughout my discussion have been given in round numbers for convenience in presentation, but they should not be construed as approximations because so presented. They are accurate.

THE RATE BASE ALLOWED MILLIONS OF WATER

The rate base set out in the consent decree, representing the court's determination of fair value, was $32,500,000. This was as of January 1, 1925, and includes the Maryland property. This was a compromise value and represents no judicial formula for rate-base determination. (See Decree Sup. Ct. D. C., Equity 35336.)

The Commission's historical value, or original cost-rate base, as of this date, was $24,400,000. This figure included all additions since 1917, and adjustments for working capital, materials, and supplies. Their similar reproduction-cost figure was $25,300,000. On this decree date the company's book balance sheet shows the following (see Public Utilities Commission of District of Columbia, 1924, p. 142):

Long-term funded debt	$15,320,000
Capital stock	6,000,000
Free surplus balance	2,125,000
Total	23,445,000

To remove any question, I have assumed that the above free surplus balance represented an obligation from the company to the common-share holder on the date of the initiation of the plan.

The valuation urged by the company throughout this controversy, as shown in the hearings, was $44,000,000. The difference between this rate base and the estimates set forth above forcibly points out how a private utility can take advantage of the chaotic law to inflate the rate base, and follow the advantage of such inflation by increasing the rates to the public. Right here it should be pointed out that the actual investment figures and the Commission's historical value are in close agreement. I have checked this again by calculating the actual cost per meter for extension in the period from 1925 to 1935, which information is available in the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia reports, 1924 to 1935. The evidence shows that the Commission's historical value adjusted to January 1, 1925, was close to a true value. To be fair and to allow for imperfections in the company's early book accounts, I have concluded that a debt-redeeming plant would have started this period with a prudent investment value of about $25,000,000. This can be substantiated from records of hearings before the Commission.

PADDED FIGURES GIVEN IMMORTAL LIFE

From the facts cited it is clearly apparent that the Washington plan started out with a padded value of $7,500,000, or an increase of 30 percent over the prudent value of the plant. This has been perpetuated.

The decree provides for an undepreciated rate base in spite of the fact that the universal rule of nature has shown that nothing is endowed with perpetual life. The rate base is never a decreasing amount. For example, this padded value is continued in the base perpetually. Fundamentally, this is the major difference between the sliding-scale plan and the debt-redeeming, publicly owned power plan.

In the period from January 1, 1925, to December 31, 1935, the number of meters in service increased from 77,100 to 182,700, or 137 percent (P. U. C., D. C., 1924, p. 154; 1935, p. 46). This is distinctly an abnormal increase, being about six times the national average. This increase was not the result of management, but resulted from the expanding activities of the Federal Government. Washington and its private utility were, therefore, immune from the depression.

CONSUMERS CONTRIBUTE TO NEW CAPITAL

It is evident that the public has contributed $34,000,000 to new capital for this utility, but it has acquired no ownership. It has been a generous banker, willing to furnish money, pay the interest on its own money, and expect no repayment. In 1926 the annual residential consumption per customer in the District was 470 kilowatt-hours. In 1935 it was 965 kilowatt-hours. The national average figures are, respectively, 414 kilowatt-hours and 660 kilowatt-hours. Again this is an abnormal increase, resulting from lowering rates, advent of electric refrigeration, and the high average income of the Washington people.

Here are the figures for the 1935 capitalization—Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, 1935, page 39:

Dec. 31, 1935

Common stock	$6,000,000
Preferred stock	7,000,000
Long-term debt	12,934,000
Total	25,934,000

Increase over 1925, $2,489,000. The rate base January 1, 1925, was $32,500,000. As of December 31, 1935, the rate base was $68,898,000, or an increase of $36,398,000. Deducting from this latter figure the increase in capitalization of $2,489,000, we secure a net increase of $33,909,000 in cash input into the plant. From what source did this net increase come? Obviously, from the rate payer. What does this mean? It means that the public had been made the banker of the company. The public has advanced this money, which will never be repaid under the plan. In addition, the public now pays to the company in its rates over 7-percent interest, subject to depreciation-fund credit, on his own money. This is reverse banking. Ponzi, compared to this, was simple.

In this same 11-year period the company disbursed, including its share of the impounded fund, to the common-share holder $18,125,000, or 302 percent on this stock, an average of 27½-percent dividends per year—Bussing, page 155, and 1935 report, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, page 40.

In the Sheffield, England, plan, where the sliding scale originated, the maximum allowable dividend was 10 percent. Fairly, this amount should be deducted from the disbursed dividend to secure the excess distribution. This excess-dividend disbursement then amounts to $11,525,000.

88 PERCENT OF PRESENT RATE BASE TAKEN FROM CONSUMER

Summing up the items of (1) original rate-base padding; (2) net cash input into plant by rate payer, plus depreciation charged to operation; (3) excess dividends paid out over 10 percent on common stock, we arrive at a figure of practically $60,900,000, or 88 percent of the rate base, paid for by the public. In addition there is the net value of the reserve fund to be added. The Commission's reports do not segregate this in detail.

All this means, plainly, that in the period from 1925 to 1935, the District rate payer, under the Washington plan, contributed over 88 percent of present value of the Pepco plant, and is required to pay in his rates today, over 7 percent interest on the large sum he contributed. Thus does the District public make social royalty of its utility barons. In a debt-redeeming public plant, these sums would be used to lower the rate base. At the end of the redemption period, the public plant rate payer would have his capital rate base eliminated, and his rates would be based only on operation and depreciation costs, which, under Pepco's 1935 values, would mean a further rate reduction of at least 40 percent. If the Government operated this plant, further economies would be made, and a greater rate reduction possible.

NET PROFITS OF 60½ PERCENT ANNUALLY

The net earnings in the 11-year period, and including the impounded fund contribution, after all deductions through preferred dividends, amounted to $39,800,000 or 665 percent of the outstanding common shares, or 60½ percent per year. This can be easily verified in the balance sheets given in the reports of the Commission.

All of this shows that, under the Washington plan, the profits have been enormous, even under comparatively low rates. This is another demonstration of the cheapness of electrical manufacture and distribution. This Washington plan financial set-up points out forcibly the enormous accretion of funds, actually belonging to the people, which gravitates toward Wall Street. In 50 years the accretions of the people's money siphoned off to Wall Street will inevitably set up a financial power which will enslave our people.

The beginning was perfectly apparent during the holding-company fight in the last Congress. No wonder that the Consolidated Edison Co. recently suggested to the mayor of New York the adoption of the Washington plan, when he advocated a municipal plant for New York. I wonder what will be the result of the Massachusetts experiment under this plan, and why they have adopted it.

ENORMOUS DEPRECIATION RESERVE

The consent decree required the setting up each year of a depreciation charge which would be added to a fund to be retained and used by the company which would increase until it reached 20 percent of the rate base. At that point, the annual payments into this fund would be stopped and held in abeyance as long as the fund remained over 20 percent of the rate base. (See Equity 35336, Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.) All property retirements would be charged to this fund. The annual depreciation appropriation was set at 2.3 percent of the rate base as long as the depreciation-reserve fund was 15 percent or less of the base, and scaled down to 1.3 percent when the fund was 19 percent of the base. When the fund reached over 20 percent of the base, there would be no annual appropriation. This annual depreciation appropriation, less 4 percent interest on the accumulated fund, was charged to operation and paid for by the rate payers. The 4-percent credit represented interest on the existing fund, on the assumption that the company would invest the funds so as to yield this interest rate. If invested so as to earn in excess of 4 percent, the difference belonged to the company.

The fund, at the beginning of the plan, was close to $4,000,000 which had come from the rate payers before the decree. On December 31, 1935, it amounted to $11,458,000, of which $7,960,000 was a direct charge to operation since 1925, and thereby paid by the people. The interest accumulation amounted to $3,500,000. The part of this fund contributed by the rate payer and invested in additional plant, would yield a 7½-percent return to the company, which in turn was also paid for by rate payers, less the 4 percent normal interest deduction.

Here again we have a fund created by the rate payer on which the rate payer is charged interest if invested in plant. Naturally, part of this fund is, and should be, kept liquid by investing in bonds. For the part invested in plant, the public is again banker for the company, paying interest to the company on its own money. The decree provides for an undepreciated rate base. Any retired property, plus cost of removal and less salvage, is charged to this fund.

REDUCED RATES AND MOUNTING PROFITS

The cause of the second injunction against the commission, in 1917, was their order no. 223, setting the rate of return at 7 percent on the rate base. There are two factors which promote net earnings for the company, namely, the rate base and the rate of return. In the consent decree of 1924, the company's lawyers upped the return from 7 to 7½ percent. They did not secure all they went after in the rate base, as evidenced by the commission and court records, so the rate of return had to be raised in order to increase earnings. It is at this point that the so-called sliding scale comes in, which is theoretical sop only.

The original decree provides that "if the rates yield more than 7½-percent return, one-half of said excess shall be used in the reduction of rates thereafter, thereby providing a sliding scale." The insertion of the word "thereafter" in the decree is another joker which operates to give the company all the excess earnings in the year they accrue, say, for example, 1925. Thereafter, theoretically, the division of this excess is 50 percent to the company and 50 percent for reduction of rates. Now, the first year, 1925, assuming stationary earnings, the company keeps 100 percent of excess, the next year 50 percent, the third year 25 percent, the fourth year 12½ percent, and so on, for 20 years until the 1925 excess is completely absorbed. The accumulations of each succeeding year are added, so that in the period from 1925 to 1935 the accumulation of excess earnings over the consent decree return amounted to $10,498,700. Of this amount, $6,261,000, theoretically, went to reducing rates, and $4,237,420 was retained by the company.

Now, practically, the plan has operated to allow the company to retain all of this $10,498,700, which it did. There was no actual cash distribution to the rate payer. The amount set out for rate reductions as listed on page 32 of Public Utilities Commission, 1935, is a theoretical figure, and therefore a misnomer. The facts are that in each of the years in the period of study the actual earnings were higher than allowable under the decree, being $1,538,000 excess in 1930, resulting in a return of 10.7 percent on an investment largely paid for by consumers. This theoretical reduction became a joker due to two facts: First, the ever-increasing company's gross earnings (see p. 32, report Public Utilities Commission of District of Columbia, 1935); and, secondly, the consumer data which controls this allocation is in the hands of the company and not in the files of the Commission.

In 1925, the rate of return on the rate base was 9.59 percent and in 1930 was 10.7 percent. Remember, the rate base was largely contributed by the rate payer. In this period, the average rate charged for current dropped from 4.115 cents per kilowatt-hour to 3.312 cents per kilowatt-hour, or a reduction of about 20 percent. Herein lies a proof of the proposition that cheaper rates make for larger earnings. This proposition applied to the automobile industry was the basis of the Ford fortune. The automatic excessive accumulations of these various funds resulted in the Commission's order, no. 919, reducing the base return to 7 percent. The company again went to court, and in July 1932, Congress passed, and President Hoover approved, the bill authorizing the Rau report on a proposed municipal plant, hereinafter covered.

Another joker is what constitutes "the used and useful property account." I am firmly convinced that a thoroughgoing investigation will disclose large sums representing deadwood or unused property, not retired, on which the rate payer is assessed.

The birch rod in the shape of a threat had its effect, and a new consent decree was entered, February 8, 1933, setting the rate of return at 7 percent and retaining the old theoretical sliding scale up to an 8¼-percent return. For a return in excess of 8¼ percent, theoretically, 60 percent went to the public in rate reductions. Then, until the return exceeded 9 percent, 75 percent was to be used for rate reduction. This was only a tranquilizer.

THE PEOPLE MAKE THE GUARANTEE

In the 1924 and 1933 consent decrees, the Company is guaranteed a return. If the return drops below 6¾ percent for 2 consecutive years, the Commission is required to raise rates to restore the revenue. Therefore, the Company by legal process, has a guaranteed income. The farmers of the country would like to have the Government guarantee a fixed return to them. They would be satisfied with the 60½ percent guaranteed earnings of the Pepco on the company's actual stock investment. To allow such a set-up to continue is a rank discrimination in favor of a private utility as against the public.

The rate of return was again reduced in 1936, this time to 6½ percent. The workings of this plan have produced 60½ percent of stock earnings on an average allowable rate of return of 7.36 percent between 1925 and 1935. The rate of return should, in the mind of the public, be dissociated from the concept of dividend rate or actual earnings. This decreed rate of return is nearly double the current interest rate. The courts have established a much higher rate of return than the current pure interest rate on the theory that this extra compensation was to cover capital risk. There is no such risk under the Washington plan, as there is a guarantee on the return and the capital invested should be rightfully the property of the people.

When the decree went into operation in 1925 the electric rates in Washington were among the highest in the country with a top residential rate of 10 cents. Today the top residential rate is 3.9 cents. In spite of this reduction, the public has paid for 88 percent of the plant of this company,

Again, this shows the enormous profits in the manufacture and sale of electricity.

I will not take time to repeat the rate history under the consent decrees. Anyone interested can find this information in the reports of the Public Utility Commission of the District of Columbia. However, there have been very substantial rate reductions. The 1935 average rate for all classes of service was 47½ percent of the 1924 average rate. In spite of this sizeable reduction in rates, the gross revenue of the company increased 110 percent. In 1924 the gross annual revenue of the company was $6,236,000; in 1935 it was $13,154,000; in 1936 it was $14,093,989.

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE PEOPLE'S FUND?

It has been noted that the Commission ordered a rate reduction in 1917, which the company enjoined. Briefly, to describe this reduction order, it is sufficient to state that the top block residential price was dropped from 10 to 7.6 cents per kilowatt-hour. There was also a shortening of the top block and a reduction of the lower block. On granting the temporary injunction the court required the impounding of the difference between the billed and ordered rates. During the 8 years of litigation this impounded fund, plus interest, accumulated to $6,401,000.

Under the consent decree the rate was dropped to 7.5 cents, which was less than the ordered rate, though the top block was lengthened. This was a virtual admission of the correctness of the ordered rate. Nevertheless, the company in the consent decree secured better than 50 percent of this impounded fund, all of which rightfully belonged to the people from whom it was collected under the court's order to impound for refund.

Now, let us look at the disposition of this fund. First, $500,000 was set aside to pay the company's franchise and Federal income taxes. The balance was divided equally between the people and company, and the unclaimed refunds amounting to about $300,000 went to the company to be distributed over a 20-year period. The company, shortly thereafter, paid out practically all the amount it received. ($2,880,000) as a 48-percent dividend to the common shareholder, which is entirely the holding company. Here again, it is "heads, the company wins; tails, the people lose."

PUBLIC PLANT WOULD SAVE $4,800,000 ANNUALLY

The Rau report was the birch-rod used by Congress in the last year of the Hoover administration. It covered a survey as to the feasibility of municipal operation in the District of Columbia. This report, dated December 1932, concluded: (1) Ownership and operation of the street light and signal system, now partially owned by the Government, would save $200,000 annually.

(2) A municipal plant to satisfy all the District requirements would save the Government and people of the District around $4,000,000 per year.

(3) A limited system supplying the concentrated governmental area would save the people of the District around $1,000,000 per year.

Today these savings would amount, in round numbers, respectively, to $240,000, $4,800,000, and $1,200,000.

THE CHOSEN BENEFICIARY OF THE DISTRICT

Let us now look at the principal beneficiary of this reverse banking plan. The Potomac & Electric Power Co. is controlled through 100-percent stock voting power ownership by the Washington Railway & Electric Co., which is a device to circumvent the La Follette Act. This latter company is controlled by the North American Co. through 50.02-percent voting power. (See registration certificate with Securities and Exchange Commission of W. R. & E. Co., Oct. 31, 1935.) On top of the North American is the Central States Electric Corporation, and on top of the pyramid sits a Mr. Harrison Williams. Who is Mr. Williams? The Nation and Time magazines incidentally described him during the S. E. C. investigations as the "husband of the world's best-dressed woman." To an ordinary Congressman he is the apex of the pyramid whose base consists of seven separate utility companies controlling about one-fifth of the total public-utility business of the country. His personal control is exercised through ownership of 51 percent of the stock of the Central States Electric Corporation. The latter, and Mr. Williams, were investigated by the Securities and Exchange Commission last spring.

Let us now see what this testimony brought out. Mr. Williams' original investment in Central States was $2,072,000, of which $500,000 was borrowed money. This original investment was run up to a value of $612,000,000 in 1929. During this process the North American Securities Corporation stimulated the market of the North American stock by purchase of $131,000,000 of stock, 18 percent of all its stock. The market value of the Central States stock September 30, 1929, was $680,000,000, with a stated asset value of $260,000,000. From 1922 to 1929 a share of this stock advanced from $10.50 to $5,600 per share. Before the great break of 1929, Mr. Williams had recovered his initial investment of $2,072,000 and later disposed of sufficient stock to meet the panic with $27,200,000 cash and 51 percent stock control remaining. The investing public came out differently—losing two-thirds of their cash investment. The Van Sweringen pyramid, now under investigation by Senator WHEELER'S Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, was a pigmy in comparison with this. Through this stock control, Mr. Williams influences the management of companies worth nearly three thousand million dollars (Nation, vol. 144, no. 10).

FRANCHISE OF PEPCO

Moody's Manual of Public Utilities (1935 ed., p. 671) states that the franchise of the company is perpetual. This is not the fact. The right of the company to use the boulevards, avenues, streets, and public places in the District is authorized in part or recognized by certain acts of Congress numbering 16 in all, commencing with the act of March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 935), and ending with the act of June 26, 1912 (37 Stat. 181). Such rights are not exclusive, nor are they limited as to time. The acts recognizing certain rights of use are subject to alteration, amendment, or repeal by further acts of Congress. All the activities of the company are subject to regulation of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia (37 Stat. 974). Because of interstate business, it is also brought under the Federal Power Act of 1920. The complete control rests with Congress.

The District officials are appealing to Congress for tax legislation and for a loan of money, even suggesting that there should be no interest. Congress should refuse financial help until the District comes before it with clean hands, offering an immediate practical solution of its utility tax and rate problems. When the District has collected proper taxes from its utilities, and has set its utility house in order, then Congress should consider its financial program. Members should inform themselves and should protect these voteless people. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I waive my time and ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, as well as disposition of legislative matters in order for the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the reading of the Journal, the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, and at the conclusion of legislative matters in order for the day and after the gentleman from Massachusetts has addressed the House, I may be permitted to speak for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have asked the indulgence of the House to make a short announcement and also some brief observations. The Democratic steering committee of the House had a rather extended meeting this week. The committee discussed informally several matters of legislation pending and proposed of vital importance to the welfare of the entire country. After considerable discussion, a motion was made and unanimously carried in the committee that it is the conviction of the Democratic steering committee of the House that it strongly favored the passage of a farm-relief program during the present session, and that it is unalterably opposed to the adjournment of this session of Congress until an adequate and practical farm bill is passed.

The steering committee did not endorse any particular farm bill pending or proposed, but it recognized the fact that prices of everything that the farmer must buy have been rising for the past several months, and that the prices of the things that the farmer has to sell have not kept pace with the things he is compelled to purchase. Members of our committee recognized, as do other Members of Congress, especially from farm sections, that if this Congress adjourns and Members return to their respective districts without passing any kind of farm legislation save a farm-tenant bill, that, I regret, was nothing more than a gesture for the first year at least, and then in case the prices of farm commodities—wheat, cotton, corn, and other farm commodities—should go down, the farmers are going to ask Members of this Congress what they did, or attempted to do, to stabilize the prices of farm commodities throughout the country.

Personally, I am not inclined to support the measure said to be prepared and sponsored by the Secretary of Agriculture, which places an unreasonable burden upon the major farm commodities. I cannot in good conscience support a bill, for example, that would penalize cotton $40 per bale, and I predict in case this Congress or any other Congress should pass such foolish and impracticable legislation that it would necessitate the Government filing almost innumerable lawsuits against the cotton farmers who, in my judgment, would refuse to cooperate with any such unreasonable program. That bill also proposes a penalty on wheat.

May I at this time call attention of Members that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, has introduced a bill that appears to be a comprehensive, reasonable, progressive, and practical farm-relief measure. It is now before the Committee on Agriculture, where I assume hearings will be held, and the committee will no doubt give very careful and intelligent consideration to the matter. It is to be hoped that the House Committee on Agriculture will be able to report out a practical, safe, and sane farm bill within the next few weeks and that Members of this House will stand by the action of the steering committee yesterday not to adjourn until action is taken upon a measure of such vital importance to the millions of worthy citizens of our Nation who till the soil.

Of course, several other farm bills have been introduced in this session that are worthy of every possible consideration. My colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MASSINGALE] has presented what is known as the cost-of-production measure, which the Farmers Union of the Nation is loyally supporting. It occurs to me that a bill of so vital importance, that has the approval of a great farm organization, certainly should have received more consideration than this Congress has given to the cost-of-production farm measure.

Over at the other end of the Capitol a measure was recently introduced, known as the Pope-McGill farm bill, that is now pending before the Agriculture Committee of the United States Senate. It is to be hoped that that body will finally quit arguing over other matters and enact a farm bill before this session shall come to an end.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. It is not much more than 48 hours since a farm bill was introduced in this House. Personally I have voted for all farm legislation But I would like to hear what excuse there is for not offering farm legislation 6 or 7 months ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that I deeply regret that this House has not already passed a comprehensive and adequate farm bill. As stated before, several measures have been introduced. There has been considerable discussion on this and similar legislation in the committee. They have, in fact, been discussing farm legislation all spring.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. We are all for farm legislation, but we have been in session 7 months and for the first time this bill is introduced. I understand the hearings would take 3 or 4 weeks. I cannot feel that there is any excuse for this delay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say to the gentleman that I also feel there is no excuse for this House adjourning and going home without passing a farm bill. The farmer is going to ask those of us who represent rural districts why we adjourned without passing any legislation to protect agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the action of the Democratic steering committee in unanimously and enthusiastically going on record favoring the enactment of farm legislation at this session of Congress and opposing any effort of adjournment without the consideration or passage of a farm-relief program is significant. Members of the steering committee represent every section of the United States. These members have discussed this all-absorbing question in their own zone meetings and I am advised that sentiment is overwhelmingly in favor of the action by the Democratic steering committee of the House.

It will be recalled that the steering committee took similar action on farm-tenant legislation at a time when it seemed hopeless. At that time the word had gone out over the country that there was not the remotest possibility of a farm-tenant bill being passed during the present session. Our committee, however, managed to get several of the farm leaders together in the Congress, including the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. JONES, and the Senator from Alabama, Mr. BANKHEAD, at which time an agreement was reached that Congress would not adjourn without the passage of a farm-tenant bill. It is well known that the farm-tenant bill as finally passed was everything but satisfactory to me, but it does commit this Government to a policy and means that after the first year at least $50,000,000 will be spent by the Government in an effort to solve the farm-tenant problem.

If the action of the Democratic steering committee on yesterday also proves to be instrumental in aiding in the passage of a real farm-relief program during the present session, then I submit, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, that it will prove to be the most important day's work of any committee during the Seventy-fifth Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 455. An act for the relief of J. R. Collie and Eleanor Y. Collie;

S. 1284. An act to change the name of the Chemical Warfare Service; and

S. 2086. An act to authorize the construction of a Federal reclamation project to furnish a water supply for the lands of the Arch Hurley Conservancy District in New Mexico.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, July 23, 1937, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Subcommittee on Aeronautics of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives will hold an open meeting on Friday, July 23, 1937, at 10:30 a. m., for the purpose of investigating the establishment of a District airport in the vicinity of naval radio receiving station at Cheltenham, Md., Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, chairman.

The Committee on Naval Affairs will hold open hearings on the bill H. R. 5529, to replace the airship *Los Angeles*, Monday, July 26, 1937, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The subcommittee appointed by the Committee on the District of Columbia to consider the following bills: H. R. 2344, David R. Thompson; H. R. 4302, Ralph S. Warner; H. R. 5645, James F. Day; H. R. 5916, Davis B. Cole, all relating to reinstatement of former members of the Metropolitan Police force, will meet Friday, July 23, 1937, at 10:30 a. m. in room 345, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation at 10 a. m., Monday, July 26, 1937. Business to be considered:

H. R. 6091, to provide for a preliminary examination and survey to determine the feasibility and cost of diverting the surplus waters of the Green River, Wyo., to the Bear River, for the purpose of irrigating the lands in the Bear River Basin.

H. R. 7567, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the payment of the costs of repairs, resurfacing, improvement, and enlargement of the Arrowrock Dam in 20 annual installments, and for other purposes.

H. R. 3786, providing for the allocation of net revenues of the Shoshone power plant of the Shoshone reclamation project in Wyoming.

H. R. 5960, to provide for studies and plans for the development of a reclamation project on the Cimarron River in Cimarron County, Okla.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., Wednesday, July 28, 1937, at 10 a. m., eastern standard time, on H. R. 7486, known as the bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast Guard.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

735. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the United States Golden Gate International Exposition Commission in the sum of $1,500,000, and the United States New York World's Fair Commission in the sum of $3,000,000, amounting in all to $4,500,000 (H. Doc. No. 307); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

736. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to regulate the manufacturing, dispensing, selling, and possession of narcotic drugs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SCOTT: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1115. An act to amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6444. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1906, entitled "An act creating a United States court for China and prescribing the jurisdiction thereof"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUCK: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4543. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to exempt vessels arriving for the purpose of taking on ship's stores and certain sea stores from the requirement of formal entry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JONES: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7909. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933, to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Uunion.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7315) for the relief of Jacob L. Hartsfield; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 823) for the relief of the dependents of Vincent A. Clayton; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KOPPLEMANN: A bill (H. R. 7967) to conserve the domestic supply of certain metals and to provide for the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 7968) to provide longevity pay for postal employees as a reward for long and continuous service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 7969) to designate a building site for the National Conservatory of Music of America, founded in 1885 by Jeannette M. Thurber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7970) to protect producers, manufacturers, and consumers from the unrevealed presence of substitutes and mixtures in woven or knitted fabrics and in garments or articles of apparel made therefrom, manufactured in any Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia, or transported or intended to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce, and providing penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana: A bill (H. R. 7971) to regulate interstate commerce in goods produced under conditions exposing employees to the hazards of silicosis and related dust diseases; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 7972) to provide an adequate and balanced flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, to provide revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. O'DAY: A bill (H. R. 7973) to create a Committee on Purchases of Blind-Made Products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 451) to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Conservation and Preservation of Iron Ore and Steel Scrap; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LAMNECK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 452) to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Conservation and Preservation of Iron Ore and Steel Scrap; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MEAD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 453) to determine the nature and effect of economic conditions or statu-

tory provisions tending to produce unfair or inequitable discrimination on the basis of age in obtaining and retaining employment in public service and private industry; 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. ANDRESEN of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 7974) for the relief of the estate of K. J. Foss; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 7975) authorizing the United States Employees' Compensation Commission to take jurisdiction over the claim arising from the death of W. P. Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC: A bill (H. R. 7976) for the relief of Elmira Margaret Vanatta; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWOPE: A bill (H. R. 7977) granting a pension to Lottie Lee Stoner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 7978) for the relief of John P. Mahoney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 7979) granting an increase of pension to Harriet A. Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3004. By Mr. KENNEY: Petition of the Trenton Typographical Union, No. 71, endorsing the Wagner-Steagall housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3005. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the United Scenic Artists, Local Union 829, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, New York City, concerning the Schwellenbach-Allen resolution; to the Committee on Labor.

3006. Also, petition of the New York State League of Savings and Loan Associations, New York, concerning the enactment of the Federal mortgage bank bill (S. 1166); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3007. Also, petition of the Mine Inspectors' Institute of America, Pittsburgh, Pa., requesting appropriations to the United States Bureau of Mines for fire fighting, mine rescue, and recovery work following mine fires and explosions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3008. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the United Scenic Artists, Local Union 829, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, New York City, concerning the Schwellenbach-Allen resolution; to the Committee on Labor.

3009. Also, petition of the New York State League of Savings and Loan Associations, New York, concerning the Federal mortgage-bank bill (S. 1166); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3010. Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., New York City, concerning the Black-Connery bills; to the Committee on Labor.

3011. By Mr. QUINN: Resolution of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Musical Society, requesting that those removed from Works Progress Administration rolls and who are unable to secure employment in private industry, shall be immediately reinstated; also resolution from the Mine Inspectors' Institute of America, recommending that the United States Bureau of Mines be requested to seek appropriations and maintain facilities to create controllable mine fires; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 23, 1937

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 22, 1937)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, July 22, 1937, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7896. An act granting pensions to certain soldiers of the Civil War;

H. R. 7897. An act granting increase of pensions to certain widows and former widows of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War;

H. R. 7898. An act granting pensions to certain widows and former widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War;

H. R. 7899. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain helpless and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War; and

H. R. 7905. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain widows, former widows, and dependent children of soldiers of the Civil War.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6958) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate nos. 5, 8, 12, 24, 28, 30, 46, 54, 73, 87, 90, 94, 123, 129, 132, and 134 to the bill and concurred therein; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate nos. 35, 37, 53, 93, 95, 97, 98, 124, 125, and 133, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate nos. 74, 89, and 121 to the bill, requested a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. O'NEAL of Kentucky, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. RICH, and Mr. LAMBERTSON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 455. An act for the relief of J. R. Collie and Eleanor Y. Collie;

S. 1284. An act to change the name of the Chemical Warfare Service; and

S. 2086. An act to authorize the construction of a Federal reclamation project to furnish a water supply for the lands of the Arch Hurley Conservancy District in New Mexico.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. 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	Capper	Hale	McCarran
Ashurst	Caraway	Harrison	McGill
Austin	Chavez	Hatch	McKellar
Bailey	Clark	Herring	McNary
Barkley	Connally	Hitchcock	Maloney
Berry	Davis	Holt	Minton
Bilbo	Dieterich	Hughes	Moore
Black	Donahey	Johnson, Calif.	Murray
Bone	Duffy	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Borah	Ellender	King	Nye
Bridges	Frazier	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Brown, Mich.	George	Lee	Overton
Brown, N. H.	Gerry	Lewis	Pepper
Bulkley	Gibson	Lodge	Pope
Bulow	Gillette	Logan	Radcliffe
Burke	Glass	Lonergan	Reynolds
Byrd	Green	Lundeen	Russell
Byrnes	Guffey	McAdoo	Schwartz