

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, February 10, 1926

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

Our blessed heavenly Father, we thank Thee for that care that keeps us through all vicissitudes and holds us close to Thee. Open our spiritual hearts that we may know Thee more richly and abundantly. Lift us to a higher realm where our souls may hear the music of Thy infinite love. In every condition, whatsoever it may be, may we be conscious of the everlasting arms that never fail. Give us freely all things needful to attain the measure of the stature of Him who is Thy First-born. Keep before us day by day, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets." This prayer we ask in the name of Jesus our Savior. Amen.

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

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, this is Calendar Wednesday, and the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures is on call. This committee has one bill to consider. I now ask unanimous consent that at the completion and close of the business reported from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures the further business of Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of action upon the bills to be offered by the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures further business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-day. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and in order that the House may understand, I wish to inquire if the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have the call next Wednesday?

Mr. TILSON. So I understand.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In other words, of course, the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures would be entitled to have two days.

Mr. TILSON. Yes. But they will finish their work to-day.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have the call next Wednesday?

Mr. TILSON. That is the understanding. We desire to give the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce two full days, beginning a week from to-day.

## CONCERNING EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a parliamentary question. I would like to get the views of the Speaker, and perhaps a ruling on the same, as to how far he thinks an individual Member of the House can go under general consent for the extension of remarks. Suppose I make a general request to revise and extend my remarks. How far am I allowed to go in including extraneous matter? It is my understanding, and I think it is the general practice and usage of the House, that a general extension request means simply to embellish or round out your own remarks and give your own attitude on any public bill or measure, but that it is not intended that you shall bring in and include any great amount, at least, of extraneous matter.

I have in mind especially in making this inquiry at this time the extension of the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] on Monday. In his general extension he included about eight or nine pages of private letters and various exhibits of various kinds. I have no personal altercation with the gentleman on this proposition; I do not know whether it should have been included or not. But I think the practice has gone to such an extent that we should have a ruling from the Chair and have some definite program to be followed by Members of the House. If one man under general extension can bring in eight or nine pages of extraneous matter, of course every other man can; and if this is to go on unchallenged in the House, eventually we shall have a daily Record as big as a dictionary. I think it is time that we should have general understanding and, perhaps, ruling from the Chair, so far as may be possible in a general way, on what is expected in a general extension of remarks.

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

Mr. SNELL. Gladly.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to state to the gentleman from New York that at the time mentioned "the gentleman from Texas"

had control of an hour and a half of general debate. He could have objected to the unanimous-consent request to confine the general debate to the bill, and could have used his hour and a half to read into the Record every word of said discussion mentioned.

Mr. SNELL. I am not arguing that.

Mr. BLANTON. What I put in the Record was pertinent and on the bill. I could have read every word of that into the Record during the hour and a half that I controlled, but I wanted to give that hour and a half to certain colleagues who wanted the time.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I want to answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] first.

Every word that is in the Record in the extension referred to discusses the business administration of the office of the Director of Public Grounds and Public Parks of the National Capital, into whose hands we were placing \$345,000.

Mr. SNELL. If I recollect correctly, the gentleman's correspondence was with Colonel Sherrill. Now, Colonel Sherrill is no longer here. He is out in Cincinnati, probably spending some of Brother LONGWORTH'S money. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. But it is a fact that his successor, the present director, stated that he would carry out the program and policy of the former director, Colonel Sherrill, and I wanted to characterize that program and policy, which I said was wantonly wasteful and grossly extravagant.

Mr. SNELL. I do not undertake to say whether the gentleman was right or wrong, but I am giving the fact and making the inquiry whether a gentleman in an extension of general remarks ought to print eight or nine pages of extraneous matter.

Mr. BLANTON. I could call the attention of the gentleman to the inclusion of eight or nine pages of extraneous matter in several instances from the gentleman's own side where the inclusions did not pertain to the question under discussion at all.

Mr. SNELL. I did not yield for this discussion. I yielded to a question, not an argument.

Mr. BLANTON. I just wanted to state that I had a perfect right to put in everything I put in. I could have read it into the Record during my hour and a half if I had wanted to do so, but I did not want to take up the time of the House. I wanted those matters in the Record so that the Members of the House could read them and see exactly just what has been going on in this department and try to remedy conditions if possible.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I have not the floor, but if the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], who has the floor, will permit, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. Does not the gentleman know he could not even have read that into the Record without the consent of the House?

Mr. BLANTON. I had the time in general debate, an hour and a half, and I had a right to read into the Record anything that was pertinent.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman certainly knows he has no right to do that except by the consent of the House and only if there is no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is mistaken. In general debate you may discuss anything. I know the gentleman from Iowa tries frequently to stop us, when there is something he does not want. The gentleman did not want us to get a record vote on that \$345,000 proposition yesterday, and he made a point of no quorum in order to head off a record vote, but the membership would not stand for that, and voted for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. That is not the question before the House. It is just a general parliamentary inquiry, and I think I have said everything I desire to say.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SNELL. I shall be very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know the matter that is in the Record, and I do not think that is material.

Mr. SNELL. I do not think it is especially material at this time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I just want to venture the suggestion that so far as I know the Speaker, like all the rest of us, has no control over the Record. I do not know whether a parliamentary inquiry would get us anywhere, but possibly the Speaker may have looked into that. However, so far as my recollection goes the Speaker has no control over the Record any more than any individual Member on the floor.

Mr. SNELL. I agree with that suggestion, but I want to call attention of the House to this practice.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from New York has the floor, but if he will permit I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. SNELL. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. TILSON. This is the question that the gentleman from New York has raised, and I think it is a fair one: If it be understood, when general leave to extend is granted, that only the gentleman's own remarks be inserted, which I think has been the general understanding, then is it not an abuse for one having secured general permission to extend his remarks to put in long letters either of his own or from somebody else, and should he not do the House the courtesy of stating that in the extension of his remarks that he wishes to include certain letters, so that if anyone desires to object he could do so at that time? It seems to me that would be the better practice.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I agree with the gentleman about that.

Mr. SNELL. That is practically all I wanted to bring out, and have some general practice agreed upon by the House.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. However, I understood the gentleman from New York to ask for a ruling from the Chair, and I am just wondering whether a ruling from the Chair would get us anywhere on that matter?

Mr. SNELL. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks in that connection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Connecticut yield to me, by permission of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. TILSON. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Connecticut how the matter is before the House.

Mr. TILSON. It is a parliamentary inquiry by the gentleman from New York, but I do not know that there is anything before the House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it the contention that it is a matter affecting the privileges of the House, or on what basis is it raised?

Mr. TILSON. I presume it might be considered a privilege of the House in regard to the printing of the Record.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that is not a parliamentary inquiry and not a matter which calls for the decision of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be inclined to hold that it is a parliamentary inquiry, but the Chair is not prepared to say that it is within the province of the Speaker to make a ruling on the subject.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. If the Speaker will pardon me, will the gentleman from New York yield in this connection?

Mr. SNELL. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Why does not the gentleman from New York, in view of the confusion and misunderstanding about this matter, bring in a rule which will in the future definitely fix the practice of the House with reference to the Record?

Mr. SNELL. I think there are pretty definite rules now, so far as that is concerned; it is simply a question of enforcing them.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Why does not the gentleman bring in some concrete proposition which will make the ruling effective? Some general observation on the part of the Chair as to a general proposition does not bind anybody, and it does not fix any precedent.

Mr. SNELL. I think perhaps the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The great difficulty about that, I may say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], we could only control this body and would turn the other body loose to do many things we would perhaps not want to do here and give them advantage, possibly, over our own Members.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will say to the gentleman in reply to that statement the House could make the rule as broad as it desired. If the House wants its Members to have extreme latitude, it could say so in this rule, and in that way avoid this continual squabble.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the membership of the House can be trusted to protect the Record. The parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from New York was presented so that we may have a better understanding among ourselves. These extensions can only be made by unanimous consent. If it were found that any Member or any group of Members are inclined to abuse the privilege, then, of course, it would be the right of any Member of the House to refuse such Member or Members the right to extend at all.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, I withdraw the request for a ruling.

#### ITALIAN DEBT SETTLEMENT.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks briefly on the Italian debt settlement resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would not vote for the Italian debt settlement for several reasons, among others the following:

First. Because the settlement entered into between the United States Government and Mussolini government is an outright cancellation of approximately 75 per cent of the indebtedness which Italy owes the United States.

Second. Because such a settlement is against the spirit if not the letter of the law.

Third. Because in no event should the payment of the amount agreed upon be postponed for 62 years.

Fourth. Because the rate of interest agreed upon is ridiculously small.

Fifth. Because in my judgment it was an unwise action for our Government to deal with Mussolini upon any terms of settlement where postponement of payment is involved, because of the extreme uncertainty of the payments agreed upon being made.

Sixth. Because this Government, having reached the conclusion to deal with Mussolini at all, should not have done so except upon a present cash basis.

#### ITALY'S INDEBTEDNESS TO THE UNITED STATES

The amount of indebtedness due by the Italian Government to the United States which was incurred prior to the armistice, November 11, 1918, totals \$2,042,000,000. Under the 62-year payment plan this debt with interest will amount to more than \$5,500,000,000. Since November 11, 1918, the date of the armistice, the United States has loaned to Italy \$617,034,050.90, on which Italy has paid \$164,852.94, leaving balance due by Italy to the United States on the principal debt, \$616,869,197.96. The amount of interest due on this debt up to the date of the time of the debt settlement is \$144,364,250, on which there has been paid \$6,948,424.65, leaving a balance due on loans made Italy since the armistice of \$616,869,197.96, principal, plus \$137,415,825.35 interest, totaling \$754,285,023.31.

In the settlement which was made with Italy the loans made since the armistice were not taken into consideration.

#### TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

Under the form of settlement contract the Italian debt bears no interest at all until June 15, 1930, and thereafter the interest rate varies from one-eighth of 1 per cent per annum from June 15, 1930, to 2 per cent per annum after June 15, 1980. What a contrast this rate of interest which the United States agreed to accept is with the rate which Great Britain demanded and which Italy agreed to pay upon the debt she owned Great Britain, the same being at the rate of 5 per cent per annum and uniformly at that throughout the long period of indulgence. Under the agreement entered into the total annual payments begin at \$5,000,000 and reach \$80,000,000 in the sixty-second year.

Dealing with the settlement in another way, the American taxpayer will carry about 75 per cent of the burden of the loans made to Italy, while the Italian taxpayer carries but 25 per cent.

When the United States Debt Commission was created by Congress certain limitations were imposed upon it, namely: The commission was forbidden to cancel any part of the capital sum of any debt; it could not negotiate an interest rate lower than 4½ per cent; and it could not extend payments beyond a given length of time. This settlement is in conflict with each one of these limitations, which of itself would be sufficient reason for my opposition to this debt settlement.

The editor of a magazine entitled "Advocate of Peace" says:

There seems to be a definite connection between the process of funding war debts in Washington and the extension in New York of new loans to European countries. France failed in reaching a settlement with our Debt Funding Commission, and her request for a loan in New York was promptly refused. Italy accepted and signed the debt-settlement arrangement, and almost immediately \$100,000,000 were placed at her disposal.

Before this settlement was made Mussolini's representative was aggressively protesting and strenuously insisting that Italy could not pay \$5,000,000 yearly to the United States in discharge of her loan indebtedness, and yet after the debt



settlement was executed Italy made an agreement to pay \$8,000,000 per year as interest and amortization charges on the new Morgan loan. The check for \$5,199,000 so spectacularly presented by Count Volpi, representing Mussolini, to Secretary Mellon on the day following the debt settlement was drawn against the proceeds of a \$50,000,000 loan extended to Italy by the Morgan banking house several months ago.

Italy's assertions of incapacity to pay and her appeal upon this ground for extension of leniency is inconsistent with her ability to borrow money, which should be taken into consideration in determining her capacity to pay. Notwithstanding she plead poverty, to which appeal the Debt Commission yielded, she has been able to borrow from the United States Government since the armistice over \$600,000,000, and from the Morgan banking interest that we know of \$50,000,000 about six months ago and \$100,000,000 additional a day or two after the debt settlement was completed, and has a promise of the Morgan banking house for another loan of \$60,000,000 for various Italian municipalities.

A special from London to the Washington Post regarding the settlement entered into by Great Britain with Italy reads as follows:

LONDON, February 15.—The Westminster Gazette charges that there is a secret understanding between Great Britain and Italy by which the two countries will cooperate in a military sense in case the Turks make a fight for the Mesam oil fields.

This, according to the Gazette, is the real explanation of the easy terms granted Italy by Great Britain in the matter of the former's war debt.

In this settlement between Italy and Great Britain the latter got something out of the settlement, viz, the valuable oil interests referred to, under a "secret understanding" between the countries. In the settlement between Italy and the United States we know the latter got nothing out of it, but we do not know what the banking house of Morgan and the Morgan banking interests may have gotten out of it under some "secret understanding" known only to Mussolini and Morgan.

The national and international bankers of this country, including Morgan and his partner, Dwight W. Morrow, who, it is said, spends a large part of his time at the White House, and who is often consulted on matters of great financial import, is the same crowd who were responsible for the deflation policy of 1920, which did more harm to the people of this country than all the wars this Government was ever engaged in. These banking interests were the silent influences behind the curtains which made effective this destructive deflation policy in the one case and which brought about the cancellation of about 75 per cent of Italy's debt to the United States in the other case.

To demonstrate the monumental blunder which I think was made, and the great achievement which Mussolini accomplished under the debt settlement, is shown by the following figures which can be relied upon as being accurate because they were vouched for and printed by the bureau of business conditions, a division of the Alexander Hamilton Institute, published in New York City.

If the Dawes plan works without any revision the Allies will get approximately \$600,000,000 annually from Germany as soon as the full standard payment is in effect. Great Britain will receive \$132,000,000 per year, or nearly enough to pay her annual obligation to the United States Treasury. Italy will receive \$72,000,000 per year, or about twice what she will need for total payments to Great Britain and the United States. France will receive \$312,000,000 annually, which is twice as much as she will need to make total payments to Great Britain and the United States, if she pays England \$60,000,000 annually and the United States \$100,000,000 as suggested last year.

On its face everything will balance so that the Allies can pay their debts to the United States from what they get from Germany. Germany will pay the Allies and they in turn will pay the United States. This was admitted by Count Volpi, Mussolini's representative, when he made the following statement to newspaper reporters in Paris:

The weight of the two agreements Italy has made with Washington and London corresponds to what she should get from Germany. By virtue of these two transactions, Italy can say she really has no debt abroad.

The world now conceives that the house of Morgan and Mussolini secured a great triumph in the settlement of Italy's debt to the United States, according to press reports from the principal nations interested. Great Britain was glad to get off at paying 75 cents on the dollar. France offered 58 cents, which Mellon had practically accepted, but this settlement was de-

feated because Morgan protested. The question arises why it is that the most vicious dictatorship in Europe has been granted the most favorable terms.

#### MUSSOLINI

It is an undisputable fact that Mussolini, who was formerly a revolutionary bolshevist, was always a believer in and an advocate of violence. It is a matter of world history that Mussolini is a despot and that the Fascist Government which he has established holds its power only by force. The laws of Italy and international laws mean nothing to this dictator when it serves his purpose to ignore them. He silences his opponents, according to press dispatches from Europe, by threats of violence and when necessary by death.

He has under him an organization known as the "Battalion of Death" formed purposely to enforce his will and his decrees. The sword, the bludgeon, and the torch are his tools when necessary to suppress those who oppose his will. Mussolini is merciless toward his enemies and unmindful of opponents in all his activities as a premier of Italy.

The New York World indicts Mussolini in the following language:

With parliamentary institutions suppressed, free speech muzzled, a free press no longer in existence, and a dictator in complete control of every avenue of act and expression.

Dr. Bertrand M. Tipler, long a resident of Italy, publicly asserts that to-day in that country Mussolini is "both loathed and hated by the majority."

In the Washington Star appeared a special article from Berlin by the Associated Press, which is as follows:

BERLIN, February 20.—"Washington must free Europe from Mussolini," declares Vorwaerts, the socialist organ, in commenting on news from the United States of opposition in the Senate to the debt funding agreement concluded by Count Volpi and Secretary of the Treasury Mellon.

"In the interests of European democracy it must be hoped that the opposition against ratification of the agreement will be so strong that the Cabinet will remember the great traditions of the country," says Vorwaerts. "It would be a gruesome joke of world history if through the Washington debt agreement the name of one of the noblest champions of the freedom of peoples, George Washington, were to be linked permanently with the name of a suppressor of all freedom, Mussolini."

Vorwaerts asserts that Mussolini now plays a rôle in Europe similar to that of the Kaiser before the war, and makes the charge that his ruthless oppression of all opposition dates from "the diplomatic triumph over Secretary Mellon."

There is one phase of the life and character of Mussolini which probably is not material to the merits of the debt settlement and yet it is a matter of world-wide interest. I refer to his animosity to the Masonic fraternity and his remorseless activities against this institution. It is a historical fact that his avowed purpose is to banish the Masonic fraternity from Italy. He is the bitterest enemy of any of the world rulers to Masons and the Masonic fraternity. As evidence of the accuracy of these observations I submit by consent of Congressman RAINEY, from Illinois, a copy of a letter addressed to him by a Mason, which speaks for itself:

THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF THE THIRTY-THIRD AND LAST DEGREE ANCIENT AND ACCEPTED SCOTTISH RITE OF FREEMASONRY, SOUTHERN JURISDICTION, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 2, 1926.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I inclose copy of resolution adopted by the Supreme Council of Scottish Rite Freemasonry for the southern jurisdiction of the United States at its recent session.

Our brethren of the Masonic fraternity in Italy are in deplorable difficulties—persecuted, discriminated against, deprived of their former rights of freedom of thought, speech, and action, falsely accused, and physical injuries inflicted even to the extent of murder. Their temples have been attacked and damaged, the furniture smashed, the records and paraphernalia destroyed or carried away, and this in the twentieth century.

Such a condition is a blot upon civilization and ought not to exist in this day of enlightenment and liberty. If you can help them or can advise or suggest a means of relief, your efforts will be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN H. COWLES,  
Grand Commander.

The names of Mussolini, Mellon, and Morgan are so intimately connected with this Italian-debt settlement as to cause the thoughts of the peoples of Europe and the United States to center upon their activities in making effective this settlement which will continue during the next 62 years with un-

abating interest. The question will ceaselessly be propounded in good faith as the years come and go why such unprecedented liberality and such extreme generosity were extended to Mussolini. In all probability the inquiry may also be made by people of interested nations whether in accomplishing this settlement any "secret understanding" was entered into; and if so, what it is? In submitting this observation I am making no charge, nor am I thinking in terms of dishonor, and certainly have not in mind the able and honorable members of this commission from the House and Senate, and yet if any such secret compact was entered into by these three world figures I trust that the future will draw aside the curtains and disclose it. In considering this subject the citizens of the United States will naturally associate Mussolini with Rome, Mellon with Washington, and Morgan with Wall Street.

In the meantime I am wondering if this triumvirate and the other millionaires and multimillionaires of the United States, when dealing with each other in the frenzied struggle for power, position, and wealth, have forgotten the individual who is a supremely important and necessary unit of society, whom Edwin Markham had in mind when he wrote that imperishable poem entitled "The man with the hoe," part of which is as follows:

O masters, lords, and rulers in all lands,  
How will the future reckon with this man?  
Bowed by the weight of centuries he leans  
Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground,  
The emptiness of ages in his face,  
And on his back the burden of the world.

#### NATIONAL SCREW THREAD COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the roll of committees.

Mr. PERKINS (when the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 264) to amend an act to provide for the appointment of a commission to standardize screw threads.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a bill, as the gentleman knows, that has been before this House and has been vigorously contested for several years.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will permit, I never knew it to be contested before.

Mr. BLANTON. It has been defeated here once.

Mr. PERKINS. Oh, no.

Mr. BLANTON. And the last time, it passed only after strong opposition.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman just read the bill? This is not the bill which the gentleman has in mind. If the gentleman will listen to a statement just one moment, I think I can make it clear. This House passed a bill in 1918 creating a national screw thread commission—

Mr. BLANTON. Is not this the Vestal bill?

Mr. PERKINS. No; it has nothing to do with the Vestal bill.

Mr. TILSON. I can explain the bill, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. BLANTON. I see that I am mistaken. I thought that it was the Vestal bill called up. Does this bill affect the Treasury?

Mr. TILSON. No; it does not.

Mr. BLANTON. Then why is it on the Union Calendar? It should not be on the Union Calendar if it does not affect the Treasury.

Mr. TILSON. Theoretically, it may affect the Treasury, but in its existence of seven or eight years it has never cost the Treasury anything and no authorization for any appropriation has ever been made and none is carried in this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Then why was it put on the Union Calendar?

Mr. TILSON. Because, theoretically, it takes the time of certain officers of the Government, and to that extent, of course, does affect the Treasury indirectly, although they would draw their pay and do something else if they were not performing this duty. Theoretically, it does affect the Treasury in that way, because it takes the time of certain Government officials for a short time.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not interfere if the majority and minority leaders are willing for it to go by.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PERKINS]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a commission to standardize screw threads," approved July 18, 1918, as amended by an act approved March 3, 1919, and extended by public resolutions approved March 23, 1920, and March 21, 1922, be, and the same is hereby, amended so that it will read:

"That a commission is hereby created, to be known as the commission for the standardization of screw threads, hereinafter referred to as the commission, which shall be composed of nine commissioners, one of whom shall be the Director of the Bureau of Standards, who shall be chairman of the commission; two representatives of the Army, to be appointed by the Secretary of War; two representatives of the Navy, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy; and four to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, two of whom shall be chosen from nominations made by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and two from nominations made by the Society of Automotive Engineers.

"Sec. 2. That it shall be the duty of said commission to ascertain and establish standards for screw threads, which shall be submitted to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce for their acceptance and approval. Such standards, when thus accepted and approved, shall be adopted and used in the several manufacturing plants under the control of the War and Navy Departments, and, so far as practicable, in all specifications for screw threads in proposals for manufactured articles, parts, or materials to be used under the direction of these departments.

"Sec. 3. That the Secretary of Commerce shall promulgate such standards for use by the public and cause the same to be published as a public document.

"Sec. 4. That the commission shall serve without compensation, but nothing herein shall be held to affect the pay of the commissioners appointed from the Army and Navy or of the Director of the Bureau of Standards.

"Sec. 5. That the commission may adopt rules and regulations in regard to its procedure and the conduct of its business."

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, are we to pass this bill without any comment or explanation?

The SPEAKER. The bill has been read.

Mr. RANKIN. It seems to me, regardless of the parliamentary situation, that we ought to have some explanation of the bill before we attempt to pass it. I would like to have an explanation by the proponent or the gentleman in charge of the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this is a bill that continues the life of the National Screw Thread Commission.

The Congress in 1918 passed an act establishing this commission, which is unique in more than one respect; but it is particularly unique in the respect it has not since 1918 cost the Government one cent, nor is it expected at any time in the future it will cost the Government anything. The purpose of the commission is to get the industry together for the purpose of regulating the threads of screws, bolts, nuts, and the like. This may seem a very small matter, but the testimony before the committee, particularly that of Secretary Hoover, is that this commission has saved the people millions of dollars per annum.

The object is the standardization of screw threads and nuts and bolts. To give an illustration of the work of the commission, one thing the commission has done has been to attempt to standardize the screw threads on fire hose. You can readily appreciate, gentlemen, if two departments, having different size screws on their hose, are called to put out a conflagration, if the screws are not interchangeable they can not work together. This same work applies throughout all Government work. The bill only applies, in a compulsory way, to the screws and the bolts and the nuts manufactured in the Government departments.

The industry itself originally filed with Congress a petition for the appointment of this commission, and the industry has four members on the commission. The commission consists of nine members—the Director of the Bureau of Standards, two members appointed by the Secretary of the Navy, two members appointed by the Secretary of War, and four members from the industry. They get together as a body and coordinate and simplify the screw threads, nuts, and bolts.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. This has nothing to do with screws, nuts, and bolts manufactured by private enterprise?



Mr. PERKINS. Nothing in a compulsory way; private manufacturers are glad to have the Government agency advise them about their work. The tendency is to have all sorts and sizes of screws and threads with threads of all sorts of angles, and this is to simplify it.

Mr. RANKIN. If the Government fixes a standard will private enterprises regulate their manufactures accordingly?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes; they do it voluntarily, there is nothing compulsory in the bill whatever.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I will.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Does the gentleman mean one particular industry or all industries?

Mr. PERKINS. All industries that manufacture bolts, screws, jigs, dies, machinery—all of them. It has been adopted by a large number of motor-car manufacturers and other industries throughout the United States.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Why has not the commission accomplished its purpose in the eight years?

Mr. PERKINS. They have accomplished a great deal, for many industries have unified their standards. In recent years they have standardized the screws, nuts, and bolts used in the oil fields, and as new things come up and new threads and bolts are manufactured and as they want to have them standardized this commission will operate, and that is the object of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Different industries are from time to time adopting the program laid down by this commission, and it is the purpose of the commission to continue until such time as all industries have come in under regulations?

Mr. PERKINS. That is the object, precisely.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I shall be glad to.

Mr. TILSON. The object is to have such a commission in existence. If there is nothing to be done it will simply sleep, as the members draw no pay, but in case something of this kind arises it will be ready, a tribunal before which it can be brought, to determine the question of standardization. It is more important that there be a standard than that there be correct standards. To have a single standard is better than wasting time trying to get infinitesimally accurate standards.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is there anything in this bill that differs from the original bill creating the commission?

Mr. PERKINS. No; it is continuing the commission.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It continues it indefinitely?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. The life of the commission expires March 1, 1927. In order to give them time to plan their work, this action is taken so as to give them a continuance of life. The commission would not wish to begin any new work if it were to end in 1927.

Mr. MAGRADY. Mr. Speaker, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, I would like to say that there is nothing in the bill except a continuation of a commission already created, and that the commission is without any cost to this Government. The object is to set a standard, and it is hoped that all other industries employing such screws, nuts, and bolts will follow the Government practice. That is the whole intent of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGRADY. I will.

Mr. RANKIN. The commission has been in operation some time?

Mr. MAGRADY. Yes; and the life is about to expire, having reached nearly the limitation set.

Mr. RANKIN. What has been the conduct of the private manufacturers heretofore with regard to adjusting their practices to the standards fixed by the commission?

Mr. MAGRADY. The practice of the manufacturers is to seek the advice of the Government, and they accordingly adopt those standards and the really economic advice.

Mr. RANKIN. If the Government sets a standard and the private manufacturer does not comply with it, it would be impossible to use this standard material with other material.

Mr. MAGRADY. There is no desire that the Government shall impose its wishes on individual manufacturers.

There is great economy, for instance, as was recited by the chairman of the committee, where, say, a great fire may occur, and a fire company from a neighboring town be asked to help. If the threads on the hose ends are not uniform, they could not assist in the work of quenching the fire.

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

Mr. MAGRADY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. When the House passed this bill several years ago for the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], it being one of his pet measures, we had an idea that the automobile manufacturers were to adjust their threads to the recommendations made by this commission. Yet we find to-day that practically all of them have different screw threads. You can buy a part from one and it will not fit another machine. It seems to have been a failure so far as automobile parts are concerned. Why is it that the automobile industry does not adopt the recommendations of the commission?

Mr. MAGRADY. I believe the gentleman from Texas will agree that it takes a long time to get even the most ordinary idea through all of the trades.

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

Mr. MAGRADY. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. May I suggest there that the General Motors Corporation has adopted it, the Willys-Overland has adopted it, and also the Westinghouse Electric Manufacturing Co. and the International Harvester Co.

Mr. BLANTON. How about Ford?

Mr. PERKINS. We still have hope for him.

Mr. MAGRADY. Our best information is that the trades are falling into line. It takes a long time to broadcast an idea and make it effective. It takes as long a time to make the practice general. That practice is growing. The object of the commission, and the object of the extension of its life, is to give the practice permission to grow until it is completed.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman advise the House as to the procedure? Is there some particular department of the Government that takes upon itself the responsibility of bringing the standards desired to be adopted to these various groups?

Mr. MAGRADY. The commission itself gives whatever information is available out of its own experience, which is a rich experience, and the manufacturers are profiting by it without cost to anybody.

Mr. KETCHAM. Does the Bureau of Standards, our great bureau dealing with problems of this sort, assume any supervision of this, directly or indirectly?

Mr. MAGRADY. The person in charge of the bureau is a member of this commission and accordingly advises and works with it and gives it the benefit of his experience.

Mr. KETCHAM. At conferences that are called, I suppose?

Mr. MAGRADY. That is a matter of operation about which I know nothing. The commission, itself, is fully aware of that.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. Supplementing what the chairman of the committee [Mr. PERKINS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAGRADY] have said, I wish to add a few words in regard to this measure. In 1917 when we entered the war and manufacture for the Government in the making of munitions began on a large scale, it was found that in bringing together the component parts of munitions manufactured in various factories there was difficulty in assembling the parts on account of the differences of screw threads, because the difference in tolerances and allowances were so great. The Bureau of Standards was appealed to and became interested in the solution of the problem. Doctor Stratton was at that time the director of the Bureau of Standards. He and others interested in the subject conferred with me, knowing that I was interested in munitions. The older Members of the House, especially, will remember that I was very much interested in munitions at that time. I went over the matter with these people, and this commission was hit upon, to be composed of two representatives of the War Department, two representatives of the Navy Department, two members from the automotive engineers, and two from the mechanical engineers, with the director of the Bureau of Standards as the chairman.

The commission adopted the policy of holding meetings and conferences all over the country where the men who know most about these questions, who were making screws and bolts and the appliances and tools for the manufacture of these articles, would gather. They came together and had long and numerous conferences in regard to the subject, in order that the standard set should be as nearly as possible the proper commercial standard. It was required in the law that the Secretary of Commerce should promulgate these standards and that thereafter they should be used in all Government contracts. No penalty is attached, as will be observed. Under the law private industries are not required to come in, but their best interests impel them to come in. They wish to manufacture for the Government when occasion offers, and they wish the standards used in their factories to be such that at any time they can do Government work, so they gladly

came in. The commission has gone on for seven years and has accomplished a great work.

One instance was referred to by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PERKINS] which indicates the condition of affairs before this commission was created. It relates to the matter of screws on fire hose. Some Members will remember the great fire that occurred in Baltimore some years ago which burned up a good part of the city. Washington sent over all of the fire apparatus that this city could spare. It was hurried over there only to find, when they attempted to couple the fire hose of the Washington apparatus to the hydrants of the city of Baltimore, that the threads on the screws were so different that they could not attach the hose to the hydrants. This is just an illustration of what was going on all over the country in many lines of mechanical industry. The industry was exceedingly glad to have some one formulate a standard, and the fact that it was done by the Government, under Government auspices, made it more acceptable and has given it weight and authority.

In 1919 this commission went abroad to take up the question of international standardization with the British and French, and far-reaching results are still hoped for in this direction. In April of this present year the British standardization committee is expected to come to this country to take up again with our commission the matter of trying to arrange for international standards for screw threads.

Mr. SEGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I will.

Mr. SEGER. Is this legislation permissive or mandatory?

Mr. TILSON. It is mandatory so far as the Government requirements are concerned, but it is entirely permissive so far as private industry is concerned. Nobody is compelled to come in unless they desire to do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Here is what I am trying to get at. To what extent did private manufacturers cooperate in the standardization of these screws, nuts, bolts, and so forth? The reason I ask that is, if the Government has one standard and private manufacturers have another standard, it seems to me we are going to come to a place after a while where we can not change or interchange material.

Mr. TILSON. That is exactly the situation we were in in time of the war, and I am glad to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the manufacturers of such products all over the country have very largely accepted the standards formulated by the commission. Likewise, the makers of tools for the manufacture of screws have all, so far as I know, at any rate the leading manufacturers, adopted the national screw-thread commission standard.

Mr. MENGES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I will.

Mr. MENGES. Could this commission cooperate with the Patent Office when new patents are introduced there, say, for instance, for agricultural machinery and other machinery, so as to use the standard?

Mr. TILSON. No; the commission would simply formulate the standards to be used in all Government work and promulgate them for the use of such private individuals as may see fit to use them. Fortunately private manufacturers have seen their own advantage in using it.

Mr. MENGES. Could not this enforce it—

Mr. TILSON. No; it is not necessary to enforce it, and I am glad that there is no penalty attached.

Mr. RANKIN. Can the gentleman state the number of standards that have been fixed by the commission?

Mr. TILSON. I hold in my hand the first tentative report, made in 1922, I believe, with numerous tables of standards of different sizes and fits of nuts and bolts. I think there are four different fits provided for. There is a loose fit, so that the nut may be turned with the finger. Then there is a somewhat tighter fit, and then a very fine fit. Different standards are required for different uses, but the commission has reduced them to four different types of standards.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me see if I get the gentleman's meaning. Does the gentleman mean they will only be made in four different size threads, four different type threads—

Mr. TILSON. No; for the same size bolt there will be four different fits.

Mr. RANKIN. Four different fits for a bolt of a certain size?

Mr. TILSON. The fit depends upon what they are to be used for. Some things you want the fit so tight that it will be air-tight and water-tight, and then there is what we call a wrench fit where it takes a wrench to turn it.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman means all four of these bolts can be used in the same nuts in case it becomes absolutely necessary?

Mr. TILSON. No; I do not mean that. Loose fits would ordinarily be on the larger bolts, and the very tight fits as a rule would be on the smaller ones, but it might be the same size bolt in all four of these different standards.

Mr. CARSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I will.

Mr. CARSS. If I understand the gentleman correctly, the gentleman wants to establish a standard pitch and a standard number of threads to the inch?

Mr. TILSON. That is the lead and the pitch and the angle of the screw thread.

Mr. CARSS. And to do away with different standards that exist in every manufactory which they maintain themselves.

Mr. TILSON. That is correct.

Mr. CARSS. The gentleman desires to bring them together so you can go and buy a bolt and nut of the same size and they will fit every other bolt.

Mr. TILSON. That is what we desire to have happen.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TILSON. May I have five minutes more?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TILSON. We sent out and purchased 20 bolts and 20 nuts from different sources and then tried to assemble them together. Only a very small part of the number would fit into each other, although they were supposed to be the same size nut and bolt.

Mr. CARSS. But they did not have the standard threads?

Mr. TILSON. The threads were of a different standard.

Mr. CARSS. A different number of threads to the inch?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; and the pitch, as the gentleman understands, and the angle.

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

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Referring to the question I propounded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, will the gentleman please give to the House information as to who is the directing head of this work? Really where is it centered?

Mr. TILSON. The Bureau of Standards is the head by law. The Director of the Bureau of Standards is made the chairman of the commission and the Secretary of Commerce is charged with the duty of promulgating the standards after they have received the approval of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and his own approval.

Mr. KETCHAM. Do I understand that whenever any manufacturing plant enters into correspondence with this commission to take up the question of standardization the correspondence comes to the Bureau of Standards, and it is a matter of mutual conferences, not orders, or anything of that kind?

Mr. TILSON. Entirely. One of the officials of the Bureau of Standards acts as secretary of the commission. In its meetings the director of the bureau acts as chairman of the commission. They lay out their work, appointing subcommittees of the commission, and they take the work home and work on it. When they get ready they come back and the whole commission acts upon it.

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

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. May I ask the gentleman whether the loosening up of these nuts will cause a flow of anthracite coal to tide-water in the next few months?

Mr. TILSON. I am talking about a matter to which the question of the gentleman is not at all pertinent. [Laughter.] Now, Mr. Speaker, if there be no further questions, I yield the floor.

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

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

On motion of Mr. PERKINS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8917, making appropriations for the Army.

The motion was agreed to.



The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8917, the War Department appropriation bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8917, the War Department appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8917) making appropriations for the military and non-military activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELLIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I deem this an opportune time to say something which I believe ought to be said.

Mr. Chairman, an appropriation of fifty millions for waterways! What then? The paramount concern of the inland West in this bill is in this single provision. Apart, perhaps, from tax reduction the paramount concern of the Mississippi Valley in the work of this Congress is that ample provision be made for waterway development—for the relief to our industries in general, and to our agriculture in particular, that is bound up in the improvement and use of our western rivers as waterways.

The proposed appropriation of fifty millions affords satisfaction. The action of the subcommittee is meeting with hearty approval. It affords me a peculiar pleasure to assure the distinguished chairman [Mr. ANTHONY] that he has won the plaudits and earned the gratitude of the people back home.

But, Mr. Chairman, I go straight to the purpose of taking the floor at this time, when I say that the people for whom I speak are not and will not be content with this one act at this session on this subject. They will want to know, are asking now, if, when this bill carrying this appropriation for the next fiscal year shall have passed, their Representatives in this Chamber are going to place a period to legislative efforts and legislative concern for this session; are to fold their arms and let their voices fall. They want us to move, move now, and move resolutely for a new departure in this waterway business.

The vision of the Secretary of Commerce first reflected in his great speech at the October waterway conference at Kansas City, reflected again in his statement the other day to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors—that vision of a great, comprehensive transportation system of developed, standardized, coordinated channels, trunk lines, and feeders, to be put to use with perfected up-to-date equipment, has not only caught the imagination, it has appealed to the practical common sense of the people everywhere.

They want realization. They want a new start to be made at once and that the work be carried forward vigorously. They have read in the newspapers Mr. Hoover's statement to the committee; how in stressing the importance of immediate development of the inland rivers into dependable channels of commerce, he said that—

the engineering questions are behind us as to the Mississippi system; that we know what should be done—

And that—

we know it can be completed to the present contemplated stage for something like \$100,000,000 and would require about five years if we went at it vigorously.

That, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, is precisely what our constituents want to have accomplished. Eight hundred thousand dollars are now in bank in Kansas City ready to be invested in a fleet of barges just as soon as the river is made fit for their operation. The engineers say that not more than 10 per cent of the river below Kansas City is now unfit for successful navigation. And Major Gee, the engineer on this same reach of the river, has given assurance that, if provided with funds for continuous, vigorous operation, in three years such progress will have been made that the boats may be put into the channel.

The other day I wrote General Taylor, Chief of Engineers, to advise me what legislation would best subserve the purpose of prompt, continuous, and vigorous action. Here is his answer. I commend it to your careful consideration:

The simplest bill that could be prepared, and one which, if enacted, would place the river and harbor work on a basis for rapid and economical prosecution, would be a bill authorizing appropriation of

\$250,000,000, of which \$50,000,000 would become available immediately and \$50,000,000 on July 1 of each succeeding fiscal year for four years. While this sum would not enable us to entirely finish all projects, as it would have to provide for the maintenance also, it would give us a sum which experience has shown is that which will permit of the prosecution of these works at a rapid rate, and most economically.

Such a bill would be in line with the last flood control bill for the Mississippi River, which authorized an appropriation of \$10,000,000 per year for six years. Since this has been in effect, the Mississippi River Commission has made far more rapid progress toward the completion of the flood-control works in the Mississippi Valley, and with marked economies, than ever before.

In a bill such as I have suggested, it would not be necessary to refer to any particular streams, as the sum appropriated each year would, as I have stated, give sufficient money to carry on the work authorized by Congress as rapidly as could economically be done.

Why, I ask—and I would address the inquiry to any member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors who may be present, as I shall hope soon to ask that committee in session—why should we not provide for these great endeavors, these outstanding internal improvements, now, at this session, as was so provided for the endeavor for flood control? Or as we did so promptly, resolutely, and effectively a few years ago in the national endeavor for good roads?

We know it would expedite operations. Every one appreciates that. We also know that to fail to so provide will retard operations. Over and over again in annual report after annual report, the Chief of Engineers has explained lack of satisfactory progress and has extenuated enormous wastes in operations on those alluvial streams by attributing them to irregular and insufficient appropriations.

But there is another very important consideration, not so well recognized, brought out in the hearings on this bill. Owing to this uncertain piecemeal, hand-to-mouth method or lack of method, we have been pursuing—and shall continue to pursue unless the advice I have just read from General Taylor shall be heeded—it has been necessary to confine operations on these projects almost entirely to Government plants and forces. We have not been able to get the benefit of competitive bidding or of private enterprise; and in this we are losing money year by year. In the hearings on this bill, General Taylor asserted that assured, continuous appropriations, for a prescribed period of years, would encourage the building of private plants and the result would be lower bids and great saving in the cost of these works.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I might sufficiently impress the fact that with respect to these rivers and the present industrial conditions in the West, we are dealing with an emergency. That is the way it appeals to me and, far more important, that is the way it appeals to the Secretary of Commerce and to the President. It is not simply action that is needed. There should be quick, effective action. It will not do to trust to this talk that is floating about, that this increased appropriation means a new policy. I hope that is all true. But we must get it out of the air.

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

Mr. ELLIS. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Do I understand that the gentleman wants a separate bill, a separate appropriation, to carry on this work, apart from this general appropriation?

Mr. ELLIS. What I want is to have done in this case what was done in flood control, and what he did in respect to good roads—to prescribe a definite program for a definite period, and to provide the funds for the work during that period. That is what we want for the rivers. What we are doing to-day is to provide an appropriation for a fiscal year. If you will examine these hearings you will find that General Taylor says plainly to this committee that practice means that he can not look forward beyond one year; he can not lay out the work beyond the fiscal year; he can not invite private contractors to take hold of the work. He must keep within that period and confine operation to Government plants.

That is piece-meal work. That is haphazard work. That is work without a method. What I am asking for now is a bill in this Congress authorizing appropriations from year to year. In fact, I am advocating just what General Taylor says in this letter is the thing that should be done.

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

Mr. ELLIS. Gladly.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I have listened, as I always do, with much interest to what the gentleman has to say, and I thoroughly agree with him that we ought to have some definite, fixed policy as to future development of our rivers and harbors. Certainly as to the great Mississippi system, in which the gentleman is interested and in which we are all inter-

ested, realizing that a waterway, regardless of the many miles now improved, is no better as a commerce carrier than its shallowest channel, the public is denied the use of that system as a whole as a great carrier of commerce. The public is denied the benefits of cheaper rates, and will continue to be denied the use of this system until its completion as a great trunk-line carrier of standardized depth. The Department of Commerce made some investigation as to the saving in freight rates by the use of our inland waterways, if they were all properly developed, and my recollection is that the testimony before the Rivers and Harbors Committee several days ago showed that a saving of 5 to 9 cents per bushel could be realized on wheat shipped to foreign markets, using our inland waters to reach the seaboard. The gentleman, I am sure, is aware that General Taylor testified before the Appropriations Committee that he needed \$55,000,000, and that he could economically expend that amount during this next year.

Mr. ELLIS. Fifty-four million and a half, to be quite exact.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Approximately \$55,000,000. The Budget Director recommended only forty millions for the next year. After several days and weeks of consideration the President sent an additional estimate, or an amendment to the original Budget estimate, adding \$10,000,000 to the original estimate of \$40,000,000, making \$50,000,000, and that amount is carried in this bill. We are glad the President himself appreciates the necessity for at least fifty millions next year. Does not the gentleman think that General Taylor can carry on the work in which he is interested, making substantial progress on the Mississippi system as well as on all of the projects throughout the country, with that amount of money? Did not General Taylor suggest he could make fair progress during the next year with \$50,000,000, but could not do so with any less amount? I think we should have the speedy completion of all the major projects already adopted, and especially the Mississippi system.

Mr. ELLIS. That is his recommendation, precisely stated. But General Taylor goes further than that in his argument before the committee, and has always gone further. He has said over and over again that what he needs is a program that covers more than one year—that covers a period of years. That is what he has recommended when I asked him what should be done in the way of legislation. He said an appropriation each year for a period of five years should be authorized now.

I know that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE] is interested in this subject and is ready in every way possible to forward the work on our waterways and harbors. Now, what has been the situation before this subcommittee? The subcommittee has been waiting for weeks for word from the Budget Director as to how much to put into this bill. But it did not have to wait a minute to know what is going into the bill for flood control. That is fixed in the law. The subcommittee did not have to wait a minute to determine that some \$30,000,000 shall go into our highways this year. That is fixed in the law. Why should it not be fixed in the law that next year, and for a period of four years thereafter, \$50,000,000 shall annually go into our waterways? If we really mean to do that, if we want to do that, then that is the way to insure accomplishment.

I know there is some talk here—it is floating around in the air—that this increase in the appropriation from \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000 is an earnest of a new departure and a new policy on the part of the Government; but it is in the air. I want to get it out of the air.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I quite agree with the gentleman that we ought to know what we are going to do for a few years ahead.

The CHAIRMAN (Mrs. KAHN). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. ELLIS. I want to appeal to my colleagues, and I want to appeal to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for action at this session to put this endeavor on the high plane of the precedents that have prevailed in all other instances of our great national undertakings.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not think the gentleman quite understood me. I noticed that in the building of the Conowingo Dam between Maryland and Pennsylvania the enormous expense of assembling a plant entered into the proposition, and that unless the contractor could get the entire work, or knew they were going to go ahead for several years, the assembling

of the plant would represent a very large proportion of the entire contract. But if that could be spread over several years, it would necessarily make the contract price less; and if we had a policy or program, then the man would know just how to calculate on the assembling of his plant, and that would result in reducing the contract price.

Mr. ELLIS. That is entirely right, and that is precisely what General Taylor said here in the hearings, to which I have just adverted. That is the economical principle I want to invoke. If we are in earnest, let us write into the law a program for vigorous action that will insure promptness rather than delay, economy than waste, certainty than doubt, method than madness. The iron is hot; it is time to strike. [Applause.]

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

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. [Applause.]

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have a leaflet which has been sent, I believe, to every Member of Congress by the Native Brotherhood of Southeastern Alaska, the pamphlet bearing on the fisheries situation. I ask unanimous consent to insert it in full in the Record, and with your permission I will read briefly from it in order to indicate why the native people of Alaska appeal to you:

We appeal to you as a Member of the American Congress to use your influence and your voting power to correct the unbearable conditions that have been imposed on the native people of southern Alaska by the Department of Commerce of the United States in its administration of the Alaskan fisheries.

From time immemorial our people have subsisted by hunting, fishing, and trapping. Many of the islands upon which our fathers hunted and trapped have now been preempted by white men for raising foxes. The intensive hunting and trapping by the whites has almost destroyed our fur supply. The sea otter, upon which we formerly relied for food and clothing, is now almost extinct, while the restrictions placed upon the killing of fur seal makes our revenue from that industry almost nothing.

Our only remaining source of revenue is salmon fishing, and by the ruthless, unfair, and discriminatory policy of the Department of Commerce we are now shut out from equitable participation in that business, and our wives and children must suffer thereby.

We are a fishing people; our food from generation to generation has been the salmon that once swarmed in our streams. Our right to catch salmon in the many bays and rivers of Alaska was first exercised by our ancestors. To-day our fishing rights are ignored, and we have been ordered out of the bays where our forefathers fished and from favorable places for fishing with the form of fishing gear to which we are accustomed, while the large cannery interests are permitted to fish unrestrictedly in the places that are favorable to the use of their mammoth fishing machines. The salmon that are not caught by these large machines are migrating to our fishing grounds, but we are forbidden to take them by the Secretary of Commerce.

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

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Briefly.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to know the situation as to the seal fisheries on the Pribilof Islands in these days?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The seal herd is increasing under Government supervision. There is no question about that.

Mr. RANKIN. Did the gentleman propound his request for permission to insert that leaflet?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes. I ask unanimous consent to insert the leaflet in full.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alaska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting the pamphlet referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The pamphlet referred to is as follows:

AN APPEAL TO CONGRESS FOR JUSTICE TO THE NATIVE PEOPLE OF SOUTHERN ALASKA

GRAND CAMP, ALASKA NATIVE BROTHERHOOD,  
Ketchikan, Alaska, September 17, 1925.

DEAR SIR: We appeal to you as a Member of the American Congress to use your influence and your voting power to correct the unbearable conditions that have been imposed on the native people of southern Alaska by the Department of Commerce of the United States in its administration of the Alaskan fisheries.

From time immemorial our people have subsisted by hunting, fishing, and trapping. Many of the islands upon which our fathers hunted and trapped have now been preempted by white men for raising foxes. The intensive hunting and trapping by the whites has almost destroyed our fur supply. The sea otter, upon which we formerly relied for food and clothing, is now almost extinct, while the restrictions placed upon the killing of fur seal makes our revenue from that industry almost nothing.



Our only remaining source of revenue is salmon fishing, and by the ruthless, unfair, and discriminatory policy of the Department of Commerce we are now shut out from equitable participation in that business, and our wives and children must suffer thereby.

We are a fishing people; our food from generation to generation has been the salmon that once swarmed in our streams. Our right to catch salmon in the many bays and rivers of Alaska was first exercised by our ancestors. To-day our fishing rights are ignored, and we have been ordered out of the bays where our forefathers fished and from favorable places for fishing with the form of fishing gear to which we are accustomed, while the large cannery interests are permitted to fish unrestrictedly in the places that are favorable to the use of their mammoth fishing machines. The salmon that are not caught by these large machines are migrating to our fishing grounds, but we are forbidden to take them by the Secretary of Commerce.

The Secretary of Commerce says that this unjust policy is in the interest of conservation. We claim that this policy imposes the entire burden of conservation upon us and the few independent white fishermen who use our method of fishing by nets and seines. The people who are least able to bear the burden of conservation are compelled to bear it all.

Our race occupies all the coastal territory of North America from Bering Sea to the Straits of Juan De Fuca. When Russia ceded Alaska to the United States an imaginary dividing line was established on the north shore of Dixon's Entrance, and those of our people who lived south of that line went under British sovereignty. Under this monarchical government of British Columbia the common right of fishery has always been recognized, and under just and equitable laws the native people of British Columbia have always and do to-day enjoy equal fishing privileges with the white residents.

The Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, who visited Alaska in the summer of 1923, noted the contrast between the unjust and inequitable fishery laws of Alaska and the fair and equitable administration of the British Columbia fisheries, and expressed his observations on the floor of Congress in the following language:

"I saw a large number of fishing smacks off the coast of British Columbia. These men were catching fish for a living. They were protected by the laws of British Columbia. There were no traps, no large nets, but they could go there and catch all the fish they pleased and sell them to the canners or ship them to any part of the world. But when we got into Alaska we found that even our ex-service men were driven from the fishing grounds by the canners, some of the very people who had been prosecuted for selling spoiled salmon to our soldiers during the war. Congress should force them to take their traps out and let the small men, the individuals who work for a living, enjoy the fruits of their labor, as the American worker does, or should do, in the continental United States."

By reason of her observation of the common right of all people to participate in fishery on an equal footing, British Columbia has built up a large and prosperous fishing industry, which is financed largely by American capital, and her fishery products compete in the world's markets with the Alaskan product.

We claim that under the American Government we should receive treatment equally as just as our racial brothers are accorded in British territory; that a republic such as ours should protect its citizens in rights that are recognized and protected in every monarchy on earth; and we believe it to be the desire of the American people that we should receive the just and equal treatment in the pursuit of our calling that is given in all fishing countries except Alaska.

We are not appealing for any exclusive privileges for a class of citizens; we ask no favors that others do not receive; we simply ask that all fishermen in Alaskan waters be placed upon the same competitive basis under as stringent measures as the Secretary of Commerce may care to impose for the protection of the fish supply. We are able to compete with the whites in fishery if we are given an equal chance with them, but under the discriminatory regulations of the Secretary of Commerce whereby monopoly is given to certain favored whites competition is impossible.

We have appealed to Mr. Secretary Hoover for a square deal, and our representatives have plead with him to treat us fairly, but he ignores our pleas, and therefore we now appeal to the American Congress for redress. We pray that the power to which Mr. Hoover is subject shall intercede for us and instruct the Secretary of Commerce to administer the Alaskan fisheries in fairness and justice to all who are engaged in the industry.

THE ALASKA NATIVE BROTHERHOOD,  
By FRANK D. PRICE, *President*.

Attest:

GIBSON DUNCAN, *Secretary*.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have the regulations here for this coming season, and the regulations indicate that 63 bays, in the section of Alaska where these natives reside, have been closed to fishing.

For years they have operated their small, and we might say primitive, fishing gear in these bays. When the white cannery men first came to Alaska they recognized the rights

of the Indians to fish in certain places. Finally two fishing crews came into conflict over ground that had been virtually leased from the Indians, and when it was taken into the court, the court held there were no exclusive fishing rights in Alaska and therefore the rights of the Indians were dissipated and destroyed.

These 63 bays have now been closed to them. They have been driven out of the waters where their small gear operates well, and are compelled, if they fish at all, to fish in waters where it is almost impossible to accomplish anything with the form of gear they have.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman mean it has been closed to all fishing or just to the small fisherman?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The bays are closed to all fishing, but in some cases where the line across the mouth of the bay is drawn, the termination of the line on each side may be a trap site, where a large machine is operated for fishing. I do not know that it occurs in any bay that there is a trap on each side, but there are bays where the line is drawn right to the trap, and in that case, of course, the natives are compelled to go outside of that trap at least 300 feet to do their fishing with their little nets and seines. The point is, they can not fish successfully.

I want to read you from the regulations. Some of the natives as well as some of the whites, when they were driven out and found their gear was useless in waters where only traps are suitable for fishing, started in to fish with small traps, and here are the regulations for this year:

All traps shall be at least 1 statute mile apart laterally.

That is a regulation of the department under the authority given them to close certain areas to fishing; but here is the law as written in the very same act of June 6, 1924, under which the Secretary of Commerce closes areas to fishing and fixes a mile, and in some cases a mile and a half, between trap sites. This is the law that was written at that time:

It shall be unlawful to lay or set any seine or net of any kind within 100 yards of any other seine, net, or other fishing appliance which is being, or which has been, laid or set in any of the waters of Alaska, or to drive or to construct any trap or any other fixed fishing appliance within 600 yards laterally or within 100 yards endwise of any other trap or fixed fishing appliance.

The law specifically fixes the distance between these contrivances at 1,800 feet and the Secretary of Commerce extends it to 1 mile, and in one section to a mile and a half. This certainly must drive out a great number of small trap owners. It could drive out a large trap also, but the effect is it increases the efficiency of the traps that are allowed to remain with this space of 1 mile or a mile and a half apart, and sets up an exclusive privilege in fisheries. This act specifies that no exclusive or several right in fisheries should be recognized. This is the ruling case law definition of a several fishery:

A several fishery is an exclusive right to fish in a given place, either with or without the property in the soil at such place, and no person other than the owner of the fishery can lawfully take fish at such place.

Now, that would be a question, of course, for adjudication in the courts, but I hold it is absolutely the establishment of an exclusive privilege in a fishery set up, as I believe, eventually to obtain title to the site and to the soil. This is what the native people of Alaska are protesting against.

The natives in Alaska hold they have the right to fish in these bays and that the fisheries should be so regulated that there would be an escapement into the bays, and that they should have an opportunity to take fish on the fishing grounds that they have always occupied, and this theory is held all over the fishing world—the right of upper and lower fishery; and to say that a man in an upper fishery must be driven out and take his chance on a lower fishery, where there is no opportunity for him to fish, is unfair and I maintain should be declared illegal.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It is not then in the interest of conservation?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Secretary of Commerce would say so, but I say that the establishment of these traps a mile or a mile and a half apart increases the efficiency of each trap so placed, when the others are driven out, and I will also concede that if you take two traps out and only two remain on a certain line of the shore, there is going to be a greater escapement of fish. That is conceded, but beyond that is the

right that has been established in all countries on earth of every man to fish, and to fish on a fair and equitable basis.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Do I understand the gentleman to mean they specify that these traps must be a mile or a mile and a half apart?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; a mile, and in some cases a mile and a half apart.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And a company may have a very large trap, and yet the individual with a little trap can not be within a mile or a mile and a half of that trap; is that correct?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Any trap that gets a station a mile or a mile and a half away from another trap, as the case may be, may operate.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I understood the gentleman to say that that gave these large companies the advantage, because they could have the large traps, while the individual fishermen you speak of would have to be a mile or a mile and a half away.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. A large trap costs a great deal of money.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The small fisherman can not operate a big trap, and he has gone to the use now of a small floating trap.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. As bearing on the question of conservation, it would be interesting to the House if the gentleman could insert some figures showing the amount that were caught when the traps were only 1,800 feet apart and the number of fish caught now under the changed regulations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That would have to be done after the fishing season is over for this year. I do not think I could submit anything on that point at this time.

I call your attention further to the regulations:

The total aggregate length of gill nets on any salmon fishing boat, or in use by such boat, shall not exceed 200 fathoms hung measure.

All traps shall be at least 1 statute mile apart laterally.

No salmon fishing boat shall carry or operate more than one seine of any description, and no additional net of any kind shall be carried on such boat. No purse seine shall be less than 200 meshes nor more than 300 meshes in depth, nor less than 150 fathoms nor more than 250 fathoms in length, measured on the cork line.

That is a good fishing regulation; that would be done in any good fishing country in the world. It is designed to enable all men who are engaged in the business of fishing, and there is a limitation on the efficiency of the gear they use, but here there is no limitation on the efficiency of the trap—not the slightest. And so if I am fortunate enough to get a site a mile from another man I may make it as large and efficient as I desire. So I say it is creating an exclusive privilege, building up a monopoly that may be handed down from generation to generation. It means that the small fisherman in Alaska has no opportunity to fish in the waters where only traps can operate successfully.

There are departments in Washington whose action would indicate that they believe their function is to build up monopoly, and that is what the Department of Commerce is doing in fishing. They know what was meant by the law of 1924 when it was written, that no exclusive right of fishing should be recognized, and that any man could fish where any other man fishes. And yet in the case of trap fishing the law is ignored.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am very much interested because in my State the clam industry has become almost extinct, the great shad industry is at a low ebb, the oyster industry about one-tenth of what it used to be, and we think there was not proper conservation. It looks to me as if this was in the interest of conservation, and if it is not I would like to have the gentleman suggest what should be done.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would suggest a reduction in the efficiency of all fishing appliances. If traps are to be used, I would let any man operate a trap, but the size should be reduced so that all would contribute to conservation.

Now, I want to say that when anyone to-day makes an appeal for small business he is very apt to be ridiculed. Business is going in almost every line to great combinations. The

mercantile business is becoming established on such a scale that the small storekeeper is passing out of business. Recently we understand by the press that it is extending even to the baking of bread, and the small corner baker is passing away. It probably would be ridiculous to appeal for the small business man to-day, and perhaps I would be deserving of ridicule. But I maintain that if there is one industry on earth where this monopolistic system for the purpose of efficiency should not apply it is the fishing business. All through the centuries the right of man to participate in this great natural resource on an equality has been recognized, and there is no exigency of commerce to-day that requires a monopoly in that business. And so my appeal is for the native people who have appealed to you in this matter, a subordinated race, but they appeal to you to protect them in the right they believe the Constitution guarantees them, the right of fishing on an equality with any other man engaged in the business.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Just what concerns are there that operate on the large scale the gentleman describes in the waters of Alaska?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Any of the concerns that drive the large traps. The small man is unable to furnish the great machinery required to drive a trap. It is a mammoth fishing machine. It is driven by great pile drivers, carried on scows, with a large crew of men. It requires machinery and appliances which costs a great deal of money to drive it.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Do these concerns own their own canneries?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; in almost all cases. Some are independent.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Do they have connection with the packing industry?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, yes; Libby & Co., the Booth Fishery Co., the California Canning Corporation—all are very large packing concerns.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman state whether those fish after they go into the stream and spawn die and float out to sea?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. They never go out and come back again?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No.

Mr. LINTHICUM. If you did not catch a great many, you would not get the supply you need.

Mr. RANKIN. The evil of the present system is that those you catch never reach the spawning bed to produce their kind.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Is anything done with the spawn of these fish that are caught in these traps and later canned?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No. It is used as offal in some cases; ground up for fertilizer.

Mr. WOODRUFF. No attempt is made to bring that spawn through to life?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No.

Mr. WOODRUFF. It occurs to me that it would be rather a good thing for the Government to undertake that particular work.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. When the fish are desirable for canning, the spawn is not quite ripe.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Certainly when these fish come in to spawn many must be about ready to spawn.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; but they are not as desirable then for food. They are desirable for food before the spawn is ripe.

Mr. WOODRUFF. How about the canning companies up there? Do they carefully select from these fish the fish most desirable for food, or do they can them all and sell those not quite so desirable as second grade?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The spawn is in its ripe condition when the fish enters fresh water, and they catch none of them in fresh water.

Mr. WOODRUFF. How far from the fresh water?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In some cases quite a great distance.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Congress is in sympathy with the position taken by the gentleman that the rights of the individual fisherman should be protected. The gentleman recognizes, however, that even the small fisherman, where there are great numbers, should have some regulations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, indeed, yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. So as to protect the fishing industry. I have listened to the gentleman's statement, and I failed to hear that the gentleman had any constructive pro-



gram that he would suggest which would correct the dangers that he anticipates from the large fisheries.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The constructive program is simply to regulate in such a way that every man will have an opportunity to fish and not deny to some, as I have illustrated, and give special privileges to others.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Has the gentleman protected what is more important still, the fishing industry?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. In other words, has the gentleman looked after the conservation in the program that he has announced?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; the Secretary has power to fix closed seasons, and that, in my judgment, is the proper way to protect the fish, and that is the way exercised all over the world.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And the gentleman would restrict the efficiency of these large traps?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRAND].

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Chairman—

Poppies in the wheat fields, on the pleasant hills of France,  
Reddening in the summer breeze that bids them nod and dance.

[Applause.]

So sang a soldier poet of the American Expeditionary Forces that blazing summer of 1918 when an unleashed American Army was writing victory into our history. He sang of poppies because it was through machine-gun raked fields of them that the doughboy charged; he sang of poppies because the doughboys plucked them and wore them on their helmets as they forged ahead; and we wear them to remember—

Poppies in the wheat fields, how still beside them lie  
Scattered forms that stir not when the star shells burst on high;  
Gently bending o'er them beneath the moon's soft glance,  
Poppies in the wheat fields, on the ransomed fields of France.

Great events of human progress are symbolized more or less in emblems. Great nations have their symbolic flowers, and events of world importance are brought to mind by these flowers. The Easter lily reminds the Christian world of the resurrection morn. The shamrock brings to the heart of every understanding son of Ireland the Trinity. The thistle reminds the Scotchman that its piercing thorns brought a groan from the encroaching enemy which aroused the sleeping Highlander to defend his frontier. The rose of England is still inspiration for the yeomanry of the empire to stand for King and country. As for the fleur-de-lis, it is to the Frenchman as full of sentiment as it is of beauty and fragrance. It is France! and calls her sons to her defense.

The newest flower to take its place of symbolism among the nations is the poppy of the World War battle front of Belgium and France.

It was immortalized by Col. John McCrae's poem, which gave the challenge to the liberty-loving people of the world to come to the rescue of the falling torch of liberty, which so valiantly had been held aloft by those whose places were then marked by white crosses and red poppies:

WE SHALL NOT SLEEP

In Flanders fields the poppies blow  
Between the crosses, row on row,  
That mark our place, and in the sky  
The larks, still bravely singing, fly,  
Scarce heard amidst the guns below.  
We are the dead. Short days ago  
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,  
Loved and were loved, and now we lie  
In Flanders fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe!  
To you from falling hands we throw  
The torch. Be yours to hold it high!  
If ye break the faith with us who die,  
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow  
In Flanders fields.

[Applause.]

No poem of the World War was more widely read or used as inspiration than this poem.

From it came the idea to Miss Moira Michael, in November, 1918, that the poppy of Flanders fields should be the memorial flower for symbolizing the sacrificial blood shed by our valorous defenders of world liberty.

And also the thought which resulted in a dedication which Miss Michael made to keep the faith and to wear always a

red poppy of Flanders fields as a token of her pledge to hold high the light of liberty symbolized in the torch.

She wrote her pledge in words to those written by Col. Dr. John McCrae entitled "We Shall Not Sleep," her reply being entitled "We Shall Keep the Faith," and is as follows:

WE SHALL KEEP THE FAITH

O you who sleep in Flanders fields,  
Sleep sweet—to rise anew!  
We caught the torch you threw  
And, holding high, we keep the faith  
With all who died.  
We cherish, too, the poppy red  
That grows on fields where valor led;  
It seems to signal to the skies  
That blood of heroes never dies,  
But lends a luster to the red  
Of the flower that blooms above the dead  
In Flanders fields.  
And now the torch and poppy red  
We wear in honor of our dead.  
Fear not that ye have died for naught;  
We've learned the lesson that ye taught  
In Flanders fields.

[Applause.]

There may be in other portions of the United States or of the world some person who may have answered that immortal poem of Colonel McCrae, but I have failed to see it. There are multitudes of good women, both married and unmarried, throughout the length and breadth of this land who have felt the same way about it as Miss Moira Michael does, who have entertained the same thought and made the same dedication, but it has been left to the Southland of this great country and to the Empire State of Georgia and to this fair lady of my native county and district to pick up the torch which fell from the hands of the dying soldier in Flanders Fields, and be it said to her everlasting glory, to dedicate her life to the living and the dead, "To keep the faith."

If "peace on earth and good will toward men" is ever to prevail, it will be largely due to the mothers of this Nation and the other civilized nations of the world. [Applause.] With infinite compassion mother overlooks the faults of erring men, and with boundless love she forgives their sins. The children of men never worshiped at a purer or a more sacred altar than at the feet of mother. The word "mother" is the most beautiful word the pen of mortal man ever wrote. Mother's face is the sweetest face the brush of the artist ever painted. The prayers of the mothers of this Republic followed the soldier boys wherever the American flag was unfolded upon the battle field and wherever their country called them to duty. Their prayers not only followed but comforted and strengthened them when the camps, both here and over there, while at the cantonments and upon the high seas, yea, even—

In Flanders Fields, where the poppies blow,  
Between the crosses, row on row.

[Applause.]

Under the privilege unanimously granted me to extend my remarks I submit the following facts relating to Miss Michael's service in the World War and her activities concerning the poppy being made the Legion memorial flower.

I hereby express my acknowledgment to Miss Michael for most of the information set forth in my remarks.

It is a source of pride to me that while I was addressing the committee Mrs. FLORENCE P. KAHN, the gentlewoman from California, was presiding as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. To me it was very appropriate that she should be presiding when these remarks were submitted, because she enjoys the priceless heritage of being a mother and is the widow of Hon. Julius Kahn, who was largely trusted by the House of Representatives with much important work of the Military Committee during the World War, in the performance of which he was always courteous and fair, standing solidly for America's cause in this war, and exemplifying in everything he did 100 per cent patriotism, though he was born in Germany. [Applause.]

Before there was any organized work in the way of Young Men's Christian Associations or Young Women's Christian Associations overseas, Miss Michael was busy planning a "Georgia home" in France. In the meantime she was organizing every way possible to help the boys in the camps.

She then received her appointment to the Young Men's Christian Association overseas headquarters at Hamilton Hall, Columbia University, New York City.

While serving on the staff there a soldier placed on her desk a copy of the Ladies' Home Journal, with Col. John McCrae's "In Flanders' Fields," illustrated, about the 6th of November, 1918. The training of the twenty-fifth conference of overseas Young Men's Christian Association and Young Women's Christian Association workers was then in session, November 6-13, 1918. During a quiet morning hour in the headquarter's office Miss Michael read this poem and studied its graphic illustration.

Her dedication was then and there made to keep the faith and to wear always a red poppy of Flanders fields as a sign of remembrance and a token of her pledge to hold high the light of liberty symbolized in the torch.

At that moment three men, as a committee from the twenty-fifth conference, appeared at her desk to bring a check for \$10 from the twenty-fifth conference in appreciation of her efforts to make a model hostess house of their headquarters. She replied:

How strange. I shall buy red silk poppies—25 red silk poppies. I shall always wear red silk poppies—poppies of Flanders fields! Do you know why?

Then she showed them the poems and illustrations. This committee was duly impressed and asked to take it all upstairs to the conference room, "old No. 3, Hamilton Hall."

The conference was equally pleased, and after adjournment the men came down asking for red poppies to wear. The first scene of wearing the poppy for "all who died on Flanders fields."

That afternoon Miss Michael went to Wanamaker's to get red poppies.

The next morning she made a visit to her friend Dean Talcott Williams, of the School of Journalism. She told him she had a little idea. He replied, "Cherish it, my daughter." But she informed him that she had come for him to help her. She told him all about it. He was enthusiastic and informed her that the same afternoon he was to meet a war worker's committee, on which would be Mrs. Preston (Mrs. Grover Cleveland) and Rodman Wanamaker. He would take her material and get their opinion of the idea. Of course she was delighted. He brought back most favorable reports.

Then Miss Michael put her energies behind the idea.

The armistice was signed. Other conferences met and adopted the poppy. "Home-coming programs" were made, and the poppy was used. The Gotham's Art Co., of New York, struck off buttons and pins with the torch and poppy as the emblem of remembrance and token of pledge to keep the faith. Memorial poppy gardens were planted, Sandusky, Ohio, having in the spring of 1919 one of the prettiest ones.

Miss Michael wrote her Congressman, CHARLES H. BRAND, and this is his reply of December 10, 1918:

I am writing to-day the War Department in behalf of your suggestion that the poppy be adopted as the national emblem in commemoration of our soldiers who died in France—

And so forth.

The idea had grown considerably, and in 1920 Dr. Pender Jensen, of Tacoma, Wash., went back overseas to search for his "buddy" among the cemeteries of France. He was so impressed by the crimson waving masses of poppies over the graves of our men "over there" that when he returned he had his Legion post adopt the poppy as the memorial flower.

Mr. Charles M. Galliene, of Post No. 1, Atlanta, Ga., took charge of the material and presented the movement to the State convention in Augusta, Ga., August 18-20, 1920. It was adopted, and the delegation to the national convention was instructed to present it at Cleveland, Ohio, and to support the resolutions.

These same resolutions were taken to the national convention at Cleveland, Ohio, September 27-29, 1920, when the poppy became the national American Legion memorial flower.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves that the committee do now rise, and on that vote he demands tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed Mr. BARBOUR and Mr. LAGUARDIA to act as tellers.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 1, noes 88.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote discloses that there is no quorum present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

		[Roll No. 32]	
Adkins	Fuller	Luce	Schneider
Beers	Funk	McFadden	Sears, Nebr.
Box	Gallivan	Madden	Shreve
Britten	Gambrill	Mead	Sinclair
Burdick	Gibson	Merritt	Stephens
Butler	Gilbert	Michaelson	Stobbs
Chindblom	Glynn	Mills	Sullivan
Cleary	Hardy	Mooney	Summers, Tex.
Colton	Hawley	Nelson, Me.	Swoope
Connally, Tex.	Hayden	Nelson, Wis.	Taber
Connelly	Hooper	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, Colo.
Corning	Houston	Newton, Mo.	Tillman
Cox	Hudson	Norton	Tincher
Cramton	Hudspeth	O'Connell, N. Y.	Treadway
Crisp	Hull, Morton D.	O'Connor, La.	Underhill
Crowther	Johnson, Ill.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Upshaw
Davey	Johnson, Wash.	Oldfield	Vare
Dickstein	Keller	Patterson	Vinson, Ga.
Dominick	Kendall	Peavey	Volgt
Douglass	Kless	Peary	Wainwright
Drane	Kindred	Phillips	Warren
Dyer	Knutson	Porter	Wefald
Eaton	Kuuz	Rainey	Wood
Fairchild	Kurtz	Reed, Ark.	Yates
Fish	Lampert	Roid, Ill.	Zihlman
Flaherty	Lonham	Robison, Ky.	
Fredericks	Lee, Ga.	Sabath	
Freeman	Lineberger	Sanders, N. Y.	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 8917, finding itself without a quorum, under the rule he caused the roll to be called, whereupon 323 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he presented a list of the absentees to be recorded in the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its session.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRAND].

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made a few moments ago, and in connection with that request, Mr. Chairman, I want it to appear in the Record that the lady from California [Mrs. KAHN], who is the widow of Mr. Kahn, former chairman of the Military Affairs Committee during the war, was presiding in the chair at the time this address was made. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRAND].

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to talk about bread. [Applause.] That is a familiar subject nowadays. The Army bakes and produces bread, so I have a right to talk about bread at this time.

I have introduced a bread bill standardizing the size of a loaf of bread, the same bill which I introduced in the previous Congress, which was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture for passage by the House, but which failed to get a rule or an opportunity for consideration by the House. We are inclined to be generous on this point and say there was not time in the short session of last year for the consideration of this measure.

I am asked whether or not this bill is intended to control in any way the merger of the big bakeries of the country which has attracted such attention. In reply I say that it controls only the weight of the bread which they sell, which is a perfectly practical matter.

A survey of the baking business of the United States, made by the Bureau of Standards, especially for the purposes of this bill, shows that 2 or 3 ounces of bread are pinched off of every loaf where there is no law requiring full weight. It also shows that where there is a State law requiring full weight—and there are 11 States that have such laws—the consumers get full weight bread and that the price is the same as in the States where short-weight bread is sold, because there is no law to the contrary.

For example, the survey shows that in New York City 20 ounces of bread sold for 12 cents, and in Ohio 24 ounces sold for 12 cents.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. In the District of Columbia there is a law which permits only a certain sized loaf to be baked, and upon each one of them the weight of the bread must be printed. Now, Congress only has control on this subject over the District of Columbia. We have no right to enter a State and tell them what they shall do. That is a problem which each State has to work out itself. I am asking the gentleman for information.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I will say to the gentleman this bill applies only to interstate commerce, and before I get through



with my statement I think I will be able to show that interstate business in bread must be controlled if the public is to be protected against short-weight bread.

Who is against this measure? At the hearings before the Agricultural Committee all classes of people in the United States were heard from. The big farm organizations were represented by witnesses and unanimously approved full-weight bread. It meant to them not only that the consumer gets what he is paying for, but also an increased use of wheat in the production of bread amounting to many thousands of bushels.

Labor organizations were before the committee, and without dissent from any quarter were for the bill, because they want the laborers of the country to have every ounce of bread to which they are entitled.

About six of the women's organizations of the country appeared and unanimously indorsed the bill and are to-day very much interested in its passage.

The Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce are both interested in this measure and are fully acquainted with every word in it.

The weights and measures officials of the States met in Washington and unanimously indorsed this measure. They had been having trouble in the States in securing the enactment of a similar law by the State legislatures. In the first place, the law is difficult to write, and they need a model.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman must not conclude that I am antagonistic to him, because I have been cooperating with him since he has been here. I am sympathetic to his measure, but we have already a law in the District of Columbia which requires the weight to be printed on the bread. Now, does not the gentleman think that Congress should confine its time and attention to the great monopoly that has been now formed, a \$2,000,000,000 monopoly, that is to control all forms of food-stuffs over the country—

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I do not think that Congress should confine itself to the District of Columbia when Congress can provide full-weight bread for all the people just as it has in the District of Columbia.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I will.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In connection with the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas, these very large companies to which he has referred do an extensive business in interstate commerce?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Absolutely.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They run into the States of New Jersey, Connecticut, and so forth, and that could be reached by a proper law?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I think that will appear if I have time enough. As a matter of fact, bread is baked largely in the cities, and most of these cities reach out into several States. New York City sells bread in four or five States; Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington each reach into several States; Cincinnati four States; St. Louis, Chicago, as many; Minneapolis, Omaha, and Kansas City are in like position; and the Ward interests, who are promoting this \$2,000,000,000 merger to control the food of the country, have branches in each of these cities, I think, and are selling short-weight bread wherever the law permits.

Shall we wait for each of the States to enact full-weight bread laws?

Here is the trouble:

Whenever such a law is proposed in a legislature, opposition from the Ward interests immediately appears and generally they are able to have the bill amended so that in effect it means nothing. Many such laws have been passed. These baking interests in the first place fight against any law, but when necessary, compromise on a requirement to put the weight on a loaf, which at first consideration seems to meet the needs of the case; but you can readily see that if the law permits them to put 14 ounces on, and all bakers in a territory agree not to make over 14-ounce bread, that the public has no opportunity to buy full-weight bread.

What is needed is the Federal law establishing full-weight bread in interstate commerce. Then these big bakers admit that they must change their position entirely and urge State legislators to pass a similar law. Why? Because a baker in interstate commerce will not want to ship full-weight bread into a State that permits short-weight bread.

That situation exists, I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] in the city of New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; and they are putting fancy labels on the bread, too.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. If we pass this Federal statute, you will see the States immediately taking action, urged by the big bakers in interstate traffic.

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

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. WURZBACH. Has the gentleman any information as to the proportion of the bread that is sold, bought, and used throughout the country as interstate commerce that would be affected by that kind of legislation?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I will say to the gentleman that I will reach that in a moment.

Probably half the bread sold by the 103 branches of the Ward combine goes into interstate traffic.

Bread went up 4 ounces in the loaf without any change of price. The city of Cleveland had a law at that time requiring full-weight bread, and I became acquainted with the fact that the trucks delivering bread delivered full-weight bread within the city, and outside the city limits they delivered short-weight bread at the same price.

Secretary Hoover during the war enforced full-weight bread throughout the United States, but when the war was over Secretary Hoover lost his power to control, and the bakers slipped back to short-weight bread where there was no law to the contrary.

In Ohio they slipped back about 4 ounces on a loaf, and when we passed the law in Ohio in 1921 the weight of the loaf went up to full 16 ounces without any change in the price, and there has been no change since.

Who are those opposed to this bill?

We also had the bakers of the country before the committee. The retail bakers of the country, representing probably 25,000 bakers, who are the small bakers of the country, are in favor of the measure because it provides fair competition with the big fellows. They claim that the big baker advertises a loaf and gets the consumer to calling for a certain brand. Then they can pinch off a piece of the loaf and thereby pay for the advertising. The little baker does not want such competition.

Ohio and Indiana have full-weight bread laws, and the people of these States have been receiving full-weight bread for years, and the bakers in their conventions have indorsed the laws in those two States, and the only dissenting votes were the big bakers located in those States.

Who are these big bakers? They are the Ward interests, now attempting to merge into a \$2,000,000,000 corporation to control the food of the Nation. They want the privilege of selling short-weight bread. Their representatives appeared before the Agricultural Committee and opposed this bill. That is the only opposition so far developed to this measure.

By careful computation of the amount of bread used in New York City it is shown that the people of New York City alone have \$10,000,000 worth of bread pinched off the loaf each year. This is going on all over the country except where there are laws to the contrary, and the total loss to the people of the United States is something around one hundred millions a year, or a dollar a person. This is just enough to pay the soldiers' bonus.

This law governs interstate traffic only. What is the need in interstate traffic of such a law? Is there much bread in interstate traffic? The big bakers are generally located where they sell in several States. New York bakers sell bread in several States. The same applies to Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Pittsburgh, Wheeling, Cincinnati, Toledo, Detroit, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Omaha, Kansas City, St. Louis, and many other cities of the country.

What danger is there in not having an interstate law? There is no danger that all the States that have bread laws will have them nullified in practice, because it is generally conceded that a baker can go from one State into another and make one sale of his product without entering intrastate traffic; that is, he can drive a truck into Ohio and sell the consumer short-weight bread without violating the Ohio law. If this is true—and I am advised by lawyers that it is—the Ohio law can be nullified.

A year and a half ago I was in Europe and investigated conditions there relative to bread. A pound of bread was selling at that time in Ohio at 8 cents, and when I got to England I found a pound of bread selling at 4½ cents.

The delivery system in England is exactly the same as in America. Bread is delivered by wagons to each house and was at that time sold at 4½ cents.

When I got to France I found a pound of bread sold for 3 cents, but the situation was entirely different. I saw no big factories there. You generally found a baker in each block, and the delivery system that I found consisted of some woman who made a pittance by carrying bread to consumers in the immediate neighborhood. But the consumers received the bread on a basis of about 3 cents in our money per pound.

In Italy and Greece I found about the same situation as in France, and on investigating I found in all the countries a considerable proportion of the bread was made from American wheat.

Can bread be sold in the United States at such prices as prevail in Europe? One answer to this question is as follows: The Corby Baking Co. in Washington a little over a year ago made a contract for delivery of bread to the Government at 3.60 cents per pound and at the same time they were selling wholesale to the retail dealers in Washington at 8 cents, more than twice as much. The quality was the same.

As to the labor cost in the United States, I counted 18 men actually occupied in a factory producing 100,000 loaves of bread a day. In England I was in a factory of similar size, but the people occupied were so numerous that it was impossible to get the count. The difference in the machinery explains the difference in the number of people.

In France, Italy, and Greece bread is made by hand, consuming an immense amount of labor.

The labor cost of making bread in the United States is much less per pound, although wages are higher.

As to the cost of administering this law, the President has investigated this for me and the Department of Agriculture has reported to him that their present force can handle its administration without expense.

If we in the United States are paying more than double as much as Europe pays for bread, are not the people of our country entitled to full weight? [Applause.]

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

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. ANTHONY. I am sorry, but we have not the time left.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I desire to talk very seriously in regard to what is perhaps the most important matter that is before this Congress, and the general subject of which is the most important matter that has ever been before this or any Congress. Because history reveals, and the Constitution itself expressly shows on its face, that one of the prime purposes in the organization of the Federal Government was to provide for the common defense.

Therefore, I want to speak a little while with regard to the national defense. The importance of this subject is discovered by a very superficial study of the Budget itself. Eighty-two per cent of the total appropriations of this Congress must go to providing for the expense of past wars and to make proper provision for possible future wars. But for the fact that we have had wars, and but for the possibility that we may have future wars, the Budget of this Nation might be cut 82 per cent. Therefore, I say that national defense is of prime importance to the taxpayer; it is of prime importance to the people, who, by their labor and toil, must produce the substance from which the taxes must ultimately be paid. The Budget Bureau wisely groups all Army and Navy items under the general head of "National defense."

Gentlemen, when President Harding about three years ago proposed for the consideration of this Congress that it might be wise and expedient in the promotion of efficiency in preparation, as well as in promotion of economy, that we should have one single department of national defense, that all defense activities should be merged in a single department, at first blush, it being contrary to over a hundred years of history and tradition, it seemed to me to be rather visionary and theoretical and impractical; if this suggestion now is coming to your minds perhaps for the first time, and it appears to you to be at all visionary, I ask you to go into the matter with that seriousness and earnestness that an 82 per cent proportion of the Budget requires, and that the life of this Nation itself for the future requires; and when the matter is finally and fully sifted in all its factors through your minds I believe you will come to the same conclusion as President Harding did. I believe that history will force upon you and that the logic of the situation will force upon you this thought, that the national defense of this Nation is one single enterprise; that it comprises one single, mighty project; that the taxpayers, and we as their responsible Representatives here, are not interested in any particular agency of defense; we are interested only in the proposition of defense itself; and whatever agency is efficacious and wise to bring about the concrete result of defense, that is the agency that we desire to promote, and that is the agency that we desire shall have its proper rela-

tion and proportion to all the other agencies that we maintain for bringing about the common result of national defense.

The Constitution itself prescribes that the President shall be the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy and, of course, by implication, of any other force that this Congress may subsequently create for bringing about and providing for the national defense. In these later days the President is not elected with regard to his qualifications as a military leader or with regard to his knowledge of the principles of grand strategy, or with regard to his understanding of wars and effective agencies for accomplishing national defense. You know that the Presidents are elected on economic questions; they are elected as heads of their respective parties; and we know that national defense looms far in the background of the minds of the people when they come to nominate a standard bearer in their conventions and come to cast their ballots at the quadrennial election. But, nevertheless, the power is there with the President, and wisely it is there, because all history compels us to conclude that the only effective means by which to accomplish victory, the ultimate of war, is unity of command—that one single person and one single mind shall be in command. When during the recent war General Pershing was commissioned to go in charge of our forces beyond the sea—the grandest military enterprise that this Nation has ever undertaken—he was given by the great Commander in Chief here at home carte blanche: "The job is yours; I put the responsibility upon you; I give you the power. If you do the job well, the glory is yours. If you show you are inefficient and incapable, I will remove you from your position and I will put another in your stead that I think has the power to accomplish results." So there must be unity of command in order to accomplish victory.

Now, what is the situation at present? The President, ordinarily, has no time to think of what should be done to provide for the common defense of the future. When these questions come, as they have come up in the last year or two in this Nation, with regard to what agencies are best calculated to promote and provide for the common defense, the President must take counsel from somebody? Whom does he advise with? He turns to his official advisers. He turns to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. Now, suppose these gentlemen do not agree, as has actually happened? What is going to be the result? There is a deadlock and there is paralysis. Suppose war should break and the Secretary of War should say, "Mr. President, I advise that the Navy be mobilized and be employed to blockade a certain coast or be employed to provide a cooperative movement with the Army against a certain portion of land." The Secretary of the Navy says, "Oh, no; that is not my idea of strategy; that is not my idea of the means by which to bring about the result. I think the Navy should be employed in some other way." What is the President to do? He says, "Here are my official advisers and I am paralyzed with uncertainty, because they are both patriotic, they are both sincere, yet they disagree." Now, that is what we have had for practically the last three years as to air power.

When the World War concluded all citizens who had turned their attention to the subject in the most casual manner realized that a new agency had come upon the world in the making of war; that heretofore armies had operated only on land and must forever operate upon land; that heretofore boats had operated on the water and must forever operate on the water; but now these monsters of the air can sweep over the earth and over the sea; they know no limits of continent or ocean. A new element is now at the command of men in order to accomplish the ideals of civilization and procure the advancement of prosperity. But at the same time the most deadly weapon that the human mind has yet produced is now at the command of men for the destruction of each other. Why, gentlemen, there has been invented and can be put into production in 60 days some long-distance aerial torpedoes, which can be launched at a distance of 1,000 miles from the objective, say, some mighty city like New York; those torpedoes can be piloted directly over the city, cut loose from their conducting pilots and dropped at an angle by which they will come down in the city; and if 500 of such torpedoes were turned loose in New York City to-night, to-morrow morning would find New York as dreary a waste as the ruins of Pompeii or Ninevah or any of the ruined cities of the ancient world as revealed to-day by their ruins and the fragments of their former glory.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. Yes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Is that an American invention?

Mr. McSWAIN. Sure, that is an American invention. Gentlemen, you need not talk about rules of civilized warfare.



You need not think that by a little word in a treaty or international agreement you can avoid the horrors of warfare. You can not accomplish that by a little clause in a book which, in substance, says, "We are going to play the game in a nice and genteel way." When war breaks, passions are aroused and the people feel their life is at stake, they will stop at no measure, and I do not compliment even this Nation by saying that she would stop at any measure necessary to preserve her life and to accomplish that victory which she considers and deems essential to the advancement of civilization and the protection and promotion of her national ideals.

Now, what do we have? About three years ago a board of experts—not just common, ordinary, know-nothing civilians, such as the gentleman who is talking to you—but experts, gentlemen, who have been educated at the expense of this Government, gentlemen who have been carried on the pay roll of this Government a lifetime, with nothing to do but to study the questions of national defense, studied this matter of aerial power. That was known as the Lassiter Board, and they brought in a recommendation that certain cooperative and joint producing agencies should be set up between the Navy Department and the War Department in order to save the taxpayers some money and in order to bring about efficiency. What happened? Well, one department said, "Yes; that is a very nice report, and we are in favor of it. Our experts recommended it." The other department said, "No; we do not like it. Our experts did not recommend it, and we will not do it." And here, in peace time, in this great era of economy, in the day when we ought to be saving every nickel for the advancement of the real ideals of civilization, we have two departments of national defense at loggerheads, producing waste and paralysis.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. Certainly.

Mr. LAZARO. Is it not true that during the World War the Allies found it necessary to unite their armies under one command in order to win the war?

Mr. McSWAIN. Yes; and there is a history back of it that, no doubt, the gentleman knows—but if he does not, I will tell him—that that incident alone illustrates the reactionary, conservative, and, you might say, do-nothing policy of the military experts of this Government. It illustrates it in what way? Here were the English holding the left flank of the western front, over toward the English Channel, and here were the French over on the east flank, extending toward the Swiss Alps. The two lines came together, and each one thinned down his force at the point of juncture at Barisis. But old Marshal Foch, with the prescience of a wizard, realized that that weak point would be the place where the Germans would next strike. And, gentlemen, let me parenthetically throw in here that we have a law that requires our generals and admirals to retire at 64 years of age. They have got to get out just when experience is ripening into wisdom. When Marshal Foch was in command of all the allied armies he was nearing his threescore years and ten; he was 67 years old and Hindenburg was 71 years old. At that age, with the vigor and energy of middle life, and backed by a lifetime of the study of the principles of warfare, he was directing the activities of over 5,000,000 combatants on the western front. However, that is all parenthetical.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWAIN. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Is it not a fact that there are a great many officers now drawing retired pay simply because they have served 30 years, and they are now engaged in outside business?

Mr. McSWAIN. Yes. Men educated and paid for 30 years to give their ripe experience to the Nation. That is another story, and that is something this House ought to study. I will now come back to the main subject. Marshal Foch, in conference with Lloyd-George and Clemenceau, had already said, "We ought to have unity of command." That was back in 1917. They sent out virtual instructions, a kind of polite little note, to Sir Douglas Haig, in command of the British Army, and to General Pétain, in command of the French Army. And do you know what these commanders did? These militarists, proud and haughty, ignored these instructions. They got together themselves and said, "We will arrange the matter of cooperation amongst ourselves on a different basis. We have a method by which to meet the German when he comes. We are the experts. We are on the ground; we know our business, and we are not going to let anybody, especially any civilian like Lloyd-George or any civilian like Clemenceau, take that away from us." And what happened? Their arrangement was a mere rope of sand. Each agreed to take over a part of such front as might be attacked. They defied the very governments that placed them in command. It now

developed that Gen. Sir William Robertson had been secretly conniving to overthrow the nonpartisan, war-emergency government of Lloyd-George. Such is "loyalty" in high command.

With the absolute precision of prophecy Foch had said, "The blow will fall in March near Barisis," and sure enough on the 21st day of March, 1918, Ludendorf commenced driving up his 92 divisions at the weak point, and one division followed another right down through the broken ranks of the English right flank until the Germans had almost reached Amiens, and if they had ever reached Amiens they would have pushed on to the English Channel. With the British and the French once separated, they would have driven the English into the channel, and they would have turned back and driven the French on Paris and quickly conquered Paris, and we would have been left alone to struggle with the mightiest war power that all history records.

When finally Sir Douglas Haig realized his impotency, he called upon his French general and friend Pétain, "Send me some reserves; send me some reserves, according to agreement." Pétain not having a supreme commander said, "Oh, I can not afford it, I am afraid they are going to strike me. I can not afford it; I need all I have got." The result was back, back toward Amiens and almost to a German victory.

Then on the 26th day of March, five days after that fell blow was struck, Sir Douglas Haig and General Pétain came in effect running like whipped boys and said "Lloyd-George, Clemenceau, Foch; we will now agree that you can take command," and at Douleus, on March 26, 1918, Marshal Foch was given the power to direct the combined energies of the British and the French, and later, like a patriot, when our forces in larger number had come upon the scenes, General Pershing, seeing the wisdom of it, said to the Supreme War Council, "Yes; and I submit our American forces to your supreme command, because we are concerned alone in the mighty objective of victory; we have no little national jealousy, we have no little official jealousies, and we are not willing to delay victory by saying 'I am not going to have my command taken away from me.'" This had been the attitude for nearly two years of Sir Douglas Haig and General Pétain—"Oh, I know all about this command. I am not going to let anybody be over me. I am not going to have a boss. I know it all." This illustrates the situation of every professional militarist, gentlemen, and I say this with all friendliness and charity. You will see by an examination I conducted the other day, which is on record, in seeking to get the psychology of these gentlemen I said they are patriotic, and I mean by these gentlemen, the gentlemen who constitute the General Staff and the general Navy Board, because they are the War Department and the Navy Department.

Gentlemen, the Secretary of the Navy admits he speaks not his personal but departmental views on the subject of national defense. He admits it. And the Secretary of War says he is speaking for the War Department and expressing a group judgment, and this group is the General Staff.

In this country the civilian force and civilian law must be ever supreme, and the purpose of this Government in creating a civilian Secretary of War and a civilian Secretary of the Navy was to have the civilian ideals to check, to restrain, and to equalize the excessive zeal of the professional soldier; and yet under the present system the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy become the special pleaders for their departments. They never use their power and authority and say as civilians: "Look here, you experts, you are going too far; look here, you are too unreasonable in your judgment; look here, I am speaking as a civilian representing the civilian people who do the work and pay the taxes, and who in fact, when war breaks out, do the fighting." The civilians are the people I am talking about. [Applause.] They get in the trenches and die like heroes in their tracks, and make the Alvin Yorks and all the other heroes whose names have added glorious luster to the military and civilian annals of the people of this Republic. Civilians not only do the working and tax-paying in time of peace, but do the major part of fighting in time of war; and I say the civilians should dominate in those departments always; and yet, in spite of that, these Regular Army people—some people call them bureaucrats—and though we have a way of cussing bureaucracy in general, when we see the individual we back off, because we know that that bureaucrat has a power we may need to appeal to some time. [Applause.]

Why, what can the General Staff do with a poor civilian when you put him in there as Secretary of War? Think back a few years when our nice Democratic friend, an elegant and brilliant lawyer and single taxer, from Cleveland, came down here to take the post of Secretary of War. Many jingo papers

who had protested against the virtual dismissal or the polite resignation of Lindley M. Garrison said, "Why, this Newton D. Baker, he is a pacifist; he is going to disband our Army; he is going to convert our swords into plowshares, and he is going to put our Army to planting peanuts and digging potatoes; he is not a militarist." Gentlemen, the militarists had not had him here many years before they not only converted him to a big army, but they had him advocating an army of 500,000 men, and worse than that, they had him writing magazine articles and making speeches all over this country advocating universal compulsory service for every boy over 18 years of age. That is going some in time of peace.

If they can do that with a single-taxer who was the special pet and political heir at law of Tom L. Johnson, the mayor of Cleveland, that big-hearted friend of humanity, in God's name what can we expect from these gentlemen, one of them a graduate of Annapolis and the other a graduate of Yale, I believe? Gentlemen, I do not blame these men. I say now, as I often say to their faces in the committee, I regard them as high, noble, and patriotic men, but they are the helpless victims of a system that we have allowed to grow up.

Now, what have we got to do? We have got to establish a single department of national defense [applause], a recommendation that a special committee from this House recently submitted. About a year or more ago this House, realizing that some sort of restraining, checking, repressing influence was going on among the professional militarists with regard to the development of air power, appointed a committee to look into it, and that committee said, "Yes; we need the fullest possible development of air power, but we are also interested in the broad, general subject of national defense, and in order to procure national defense in an effective way, efficiently, and to get the nearest to 100 cents of value for every dollar spent, we must have a single department of national defense." [Applause.] Why? What is the logic of it? You know the very argument made against it reveals the lack of logic. They say, "Oh, but the job will be too big for any one man; it is too big for any one man to undertake to compass the proposition of national defense."

And yet the Dwight Morrow committee reported recommending against a department of defense by argument, but by reference to historical facts destroyed that very argument. By the way, gentlemen, it is rather singular that the experts of the War Department made a recommendation that did not satisfy the War Department and the experts of the Navy Department made a recommendation that did not satisfy the Secretary of the Navy, and so the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War last October wrote and said to the President, "We suggest that you appoint a board, largely of civilians not experts, to study the national defense." So the board was appointed on the recommendation of Secretary "Dwight" Davis and Secretary Curtis "Dwight" Wilbur, and when the board appeared for breakfast at the White House it was convened with "Dwight" W. Morrow as chairman. I do not know whether there is any significance in the name of "Dwight," but it is a strange coincidence that these two Secretaries placed so much confidence in the report of the Dwight W. Morrow board, which was contrary to the conclusions of several departmental boards of "experts."

This committee of Congress, the Lampert committee, recommended a department of national defense. Why? Here is the logic of it. The bureaucrats say that one man can not attend to the job, and yet in their report the Morrow Board refer to the importance of unity of command, and then they say:

During a war the President, as Commander in Chief of both services, must act as the director of national defense. President Lincoln in the Civil War and President Wilson in the World War had to assume such a position. Moreover, when the President assumed such a position the necessity of linking the defensive agencies of the Government does not stop with the Army and the Navy. The Council of National Defense, which during the World War was organized to coordinate our industries and resources, includes the Secretaries of War, Navy, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor.

Now, if in time of war, when our present Army of 125,000 men had expanded to 4,000,000 men; when our Navy had expanded to nearly 1,000,000 men; when all the life of the Nation and every man, woman, and child, little and big, old and young, were acting to achieve victory for the ideals of the Republic, they say that one man then had the power and personality to control with his brain all the activity of the defense forces of the Government and of the Nation. They say that of Wilson, and they say that of Lincoln.

And yet they would have us think that in peace time no one man can be found able to handle our relatively small peace-

time forces. The argument lacks consistency, lacks logic, and, more still, lacks common sense and ordinary business sense.

Mr. Chairman, the net result of all this preliminary statement of fact is that the Navy and Army and the Air Service do not need special champions and spokesmen in the person of secretaries with places in the Cabinet. To create a separate department of air with a secretary in the President's Cabinet would be to create a tripartite division of our defense forces. The simplest principles of warfare demonstrate that we must have unity of command in war and unity of command in preparation for war. Just as the duality of command now existing between the Army and Navy is bad and defeats both efficiency and economy, so a tripartite separation of defense powers between land and sea and air would be still worse. Yet something must be done to make possible the development of air power in this country. It is the most economical means of providing for the common defense. One thousand powerful bombing and pursuit planes can be built and equipped for the cost of one great battleship. The crew of a great battleship is about 1,000 men. So that we have 1,000 airplanes with their pilots set over against 1 battleship with its crew. Any man that has given the most superficial study to the power of destruction possessed by this weapon of fighting in the air and from the air must realize that there can be no fair comparison between the power of these 1,000 engines dropping bombs from the air and the single battleship cruising at relatively slow speed on the water in fighting off enemy invaders of our country and our country's possessions and commerce. Our experiences since the close of the World War in spending more than \$500,000,000 on various projects to develop air power under the Army and Navy having demonstrated to the complete satisfaction of the country that this arm of fighting and defense will not be properly developed and utilized by the existing agencies of the War Department and the Navy Department, we are driven to the alternative of either creating a single department of national defense or of erecting a new department of unified air service. This conclusion is made manifest by every investigation that has ever been made. Both the War Department and the Navy Department have had various and numerous boards of investigation and of study with their recommendations all consisting of their own experts, and yet these recommendations have not been adopted and put in practice.

Nearly three years ago what is known as the Lassiter board made certain recommendations as to joint activity between the Army and the Navy to bring about efficiency and economy, and ever since then the War Department and the Navy Department have been at loggerheads over this recommendation of experts, and absolutely nothing has been done.

Finally Congress appointed by resolution a committee known as the Lampert committee, made up of a widely diversified personnel, and this committee on December 14, 1925, filed its report and unanimously recommended the establishment of a single department of national defense, headed by a civilian secretary, specially charged with the coordination of the defenses of the country.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, the War Department and the Navy Department, not being satisfied with the various recommendations of the boards created by their own order and composed of their own experts, appealed to the President to appoint what is known as the "aircraft board," made up of civilians and retired officers. This board realized that there was something seriously wrong with our laggard development of air power. This board ascribes such failure to make progress in aviation to the conservatism and natural pride and inevitable jealousy of and between the officers of these two departments. Yet this board proposes a solution that leads to the dispersion and scattering and consequent weakening of the forces of defense. This board recommends another Assistant Secretary of the Army, charged with aviation, and another Assistant Secretary of the Navy, charged with aviation, and an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, charged with civil aviation. This is the substance of the recommendations of what is popularly called the "Morrow Board," or the President's aircraft board.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, it must be manifest that these recommendations fly in the face of the fundamental principle of unity of command. The inevitable result of such division of power will be costly rivalries, expensive jealousies, and paralyzing inaction. The inevitable result will be to well-nigh double the expense of developing air power and at the same time cut in half the efficiency of air power for defense. With equal, if not greater, reason could this Morrow Board have recommended another Assistant Postmaster General to have jurisdiction over aviation in that department. In like manner they could have recommended the creation of an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture to have jurisdiction over aviation



activities in that department. By the same token there should be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior to control aviation in that department in patrolling our forests to prevent fires. With greater force the board could have recommended the creation of another Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to have a fleet of airships and airplanes to patrol all our coast lines and border lines to prevent the smuggling of bootleg liquor. With all due respect and in great sincerity it is entirely manifest that the recommendations of the Morrow Board are pure compromises. There was a realization that the country is restive and well-nigh rebellious over the wild waste of money with little visible results. It was plain to the President and to his advisors that the administration itself might suffer in public esteem if it allowed this paralyzing prejudice of professional bureaucrats to prevent the development of air power, and allowed these heads of bureaus inexperienced in business matters and in the proper expenditure of money to continue to scatter our substance and to call for more money to prosecute further their confused plans in aviation.

Something had to be done, and so the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy appealed to the President to appoint a board, largely of civilians. And this board comes with a report that is less progressive and with greater demoralizing diversification in development of air power than the boards of these two departments composed of their own experts. A great effort has been made by administration propaganda agencies to make it appear that the conclusions of the Morrow board are the last word in wisdom. Though the personnel of this board is distinguished individually and collectively, yet I dare in great modesty to dispute their conclusions and to deny the force of their arguments and to resist their recommendations that the defense forces of this Nation be further scattered and distributed to the consequent weakening of our national arm of defense.

Mr. Chairman, the key to the philosophy of a single department of national defense is contained in the words of that recommendation of what we call the Lampert committee, as follows:

A single department of national defense, headed by a civilian secretary specially charged with the coordination of the defenses of the country.

The word "coordination" is the heart of the proposition. It will not require a great sailor to be the secretary of national defense. It will not require a great soldier to be such secretary. It will not require a great aviator to be such secretary. But it will require a man of broad knowledge of history, a well-trained mind, with a general understanding of the mission of an army and of a fleet and of air power, and with sufficient business experience and knowledge to require that these forces of army and fleet and air power work together for the common defense. In other words, what these arms of defense need is not a special champion as they now have, not a special pleader, but what they need is a master that will coordinate their expenditures, prescribe their special missions in training and in action, and will proportion between them, in proportion to their respective capacities to contribute to the national defense, the sum total of the revenue which the taxpayers of the Nation are willing to contribute to the single concrete result of national defense.

The taxpayer has no special pride in maintaining a Navy within itself. He is not willing to spend \$300,000,000 a year just to say that we have a Navy to look at and to think about. What the taxpayer wants is a Navy to resist the invader and to protect our rights at sea. In the same way, the taxpayer cares nothing about an Army within itself as an ultimate result. But the taxpayer is tremendously interested in having just so much Army and no more as can provide for the common security in peace and for the common defense in war. In like manner, the taxpayer is not interested in our maintaining a great fleet of airships and of airplanes just to gratify our vanity and pride. But the taxpayer is vitally concerned in our Nation having adequate equipment in this latest and most powerful of all agencies to make our civilization and our very life itself secure. With a single secretary of national defense, with all this intellectual equipment and experience, not being an expert in any line, we may expect greater economies in peace time and greater efficiency in the preparation for the coming, in the distant future, we hope, of that inevitable clash of arms between our Nation and some nation, we know not which, that may seek to infringe upon our rights or to threaten our national life. This single secretary of national defense will be a master of and for all these agencies, and when the President, who is the constitutional Commander in Chief, shall ask for counsel and advice as to what he should do in any emergency, there will be no confusion of councils between two

or three or four advisers, there will be no conflict of opinion, there will be no resultant paralysis of action, but the single mind of this secretary of national defense, having thought of all these problems through all these months and years, and having correlated and coordinated in advance the very agencies by which to accomplish the defense of the country, will be able to say, "Mr. President, here and now is the thing for you to do."

But, Mr. Chairman, many of our friends, equally as patriotic as myself, equally concerned with the great result of national security, fear that a single department of national defense can not function, and they seem unable to see how we can still have a Navy without a Navy Department and still have an Army without a War Department and have air power without an air department. To my mind, the problem is relatively simple. We have but to create the department of national defense, with jurisdiction over all defense activities, and create an undersecretary for the Army, with the same relative administrative functions as the Secretary of War now performs. At the same time create an undersecretary of the Navy, with the same relative administrative functions that the Secretary of the Navy now performs. Create an undersecretary for air power, with the same relative functions with regard to air power that the undersecretary for the Navy and the undersecretary for the Army would perform. It may be found desirable to create within the department of national defense an undersecretary especially charged with the study of national resources, with the preparation of plans for mobilization of all the material, financial, economic, and transportation agencies of the Nation. Let these three or four undersecretaries, together with the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of the Bureau of Operations of the Navy, and the chief of the bureau of operations of air power, and the chief of the bureau of procurement and supplies, and the undersecretary of national resources, constitute a general staff of advisers to the secretary of national defense. I would stipulate that each of the undersecretaries above mentioned must be a civilian, in order to insure that the civilian view may properly appraise and counterbalance the excessive zeal and perhaps professional jealousy of the experts in the several subdivisions of the principal department.

Mr. Chairman, a very happy statement of a certain inherent weakness to grasp great and far-reaching issues of strategy is to be found on page 231 of a book entitled "David Lloyd-George, War Minister," by J. Saxon Mills. This statement is in response to the statements already made in this discussion that Lloyd-George and Clemenceau and Foch began back in 1917 to try to bring about unity of command between the Allies on the western front, especially to create a force of joint reserves that might be thrown in by the single commander at any point that might be attacked by the Germans. I have already mentioned the fact that the military and professional opinion in both the French Army and the English Army was hostile to a joint high command. Even among some of the civilians of these two countries there was an opinion growing out of an intense national pride that a single command would be a sort of reflection upon the officers in high command of that army from which might not be selected the generalissimo. I have already referred to the disregard by Sir Douglas Haig, soldier with a great career that he was, and by General Pétain, magnificent leader that he was, of the advice of these civilians, Lloyd-George and Clemenceau, and the great soldier Foch, and how this disregard came near to proving completely disastrous to the cause of the Allies in the great German drive of March 21, 1918, and how after this disaster General Haig and General Pétain, realizing their impotency, submitted to the creation of a joint high command at Doullens on March 26, 1918. With this review the appropriateness of the following language is manifest:

In purely military matters, and perhaps even beyond that limit, the government had let the soldiers decide. But Mr. Lloyd-George was right in maintaining the claim of the civilian power to take its share in the conduct of the war and in the last resort to control the military. It may be desirable to leave tactics to professional soldiers, though even here many people have a certain suspicion of the rigid professional habit of mind. Common sense and imagination can not be taught by textbooks, and some of the greatest commanders in history have been wholly without professional training. It may even be said that in no department of life does the professional mind require the control and correction of the free lay civilian mind more than in that of military affairs.

So Mr. Chairman, it will not suffice for us to continue to criticize the War Department and the Navy Department and do nothing about it. Their action is entirely natural and entirely patriotic from their viewpoint. I do not question their

sincerity. I do not even attribute their attitude to jealousy or pride or ambition. I say it is the inevitable result of a lifetime of narrow, exclusive, impractical, professional training. They are mere tacticians in their respective arts. They are doing what seems to them to be the best thing for the country. But the responsibility is not theirs. They are neither the constitutional nor the legal advisers of the Congress. It is our privilege to call upon them and we do. But it is our duty to exercise our own judgment, founded upon an understanding of history, the broad principles of business, and the common-sense essentials of strategy. It is our business to protect the interests of the taxpayers. It is our business to enact laws to accomplish efficiency in the defense forces. It is our business to create such offices here and to abrogate such offices there as shall bring about this unity of training and unity of command. It is our business to counteract the propaganda that seeks to foist the recommendations of the Morrow Board upon the Congress and the country. The Morrow Board was an unofficial assembling of men. If the President will agree to call another aircraft board and not allow the War and Navy Department to pick the personnel for that board, but will authorize the Secretary of State to place in a box the names of 100 practical, successful, prominent business men of this Nation, men who pay large taxes, and then shake up those names and allow a blindfolded boy to draw therefrom 9 names and submit to those 9 business men with wide business experience, who feel the pinch of tax paying, the same testimony, word for word, that was submitted to the Morrow Board, then I am willing to gamble that the report of this new board of business men will agree almost line for line and word for word with the conclusions of the Lampert committee.

No business men would ever agree to divide their business forces such as this country now divides its defense forces. No business men could see any sense in a recommendation to further disperse and scatter their industrial agencies as it is proposed by the Morrow Board to scatter and divide our defense forces. No business man can read the Constitution that places the solitary responsibility of command in the President without seeing that the logical consequence of that is a single secretary for national defense as the sole advisor of the President on defense problems. No business man would approve of duplication of production, duplication of procurement, duplication of training, duplication of landing fields, duplication of hangars, duplication of boats and transports, duplication of warehouses and bases of military supplies, duplication of clerical personnel resulting in duplication of expense. Again I repeat that the recommendations of the Morrow Board do not reveal a single consistent, coherent plan. They do not show that there was a single dominating idea in the commission. It shows that there was a compromise all along the line. It shows that some one member wrote the recommendations about the Army, and another member wrote the recommendations about the Navy, and another member wrote the recommendations about the Department of Commerce, and each member got in the result what he started out to get when he went on the commission, to wit, a sort of vindication and justification for his preconceived ideas of a proper policy. This is no capricious or personal criticism. It is not made in any offensive spirit. I am discussing the facts in the light of the responsibility that rests on me as a representative of the people and of the taxpayers and as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs which, under the rules of the House, is charged with all problems relating to "the common defense." We have the responsibility of considering the whole field of national defense on land or on water or in air. We have the responsibility of considering whether or not the agencies operating in these three different elements shall act separately or jointly. Whether these agencies shall be scattered or unified. Whether the expense of these agencies shall be reduced or multiplied. I am discussing the matter purely from a detached and impersonal standpoint.

I feel a responsibility to say what appears sincerely and honestly to my mind as the truth of the situation. I have no selfish motive save the desire to serve my country and to conserve the resources of my country, both human and material. I have no grudge to gratify and no prejudice to follow and no personal interest to serve. I may be mistaken, but I am sincere. But seeing the situation as I do, believing it is the truth, I am compelled to declare it whether it affects the Morrow Board, or the President's Air Craft Board, or the policy of the War Department, or of the Navy Department, or the plans and policies of the President himself.

On another public occasion I have expressed confidence in the President's patriotism. I have said that our country is safe against any rash entry into war so long as Calvin Coolidge is President. I rely upon the fact that he is not a militarist,

that he does not "rattle the sword," that he does not swagger around with a "big stick," and that he is willing to preach that this Nation must give and take in its international relations in order to live peaceably with other nations. But I modestly and respectfully submit that all wisdom can not repose in one man, though it now seems that the War Department claims that the report of the Morrow committee expresses the quintessence of presidential wisdom, and the War Department seems about to enter upon another period of persecution against those who have dared to believe with General Mitchell and General Patrick that the air force is being repressed and discouraged. It now seems that all the talk by the War Department that officers are not muzzled was itself propaganda. It now seems that the War Department requires that all officers of every grade, from major general down to second lieutenants, even including reserve officers, pronounce the shibboleth "Morrow Board." These magical and mystical words "Morrow Board" admit to the inner circle of sanctum sanctorum in War Department preference and promotion. But the barbarians that refuse to pronounce this shibboleth and dare think for themselves and dare disagree are to be made to suffer either expulsion from the Army or the consequences of the official frown. Let the bureaucrats do their worst. Let them seek to discipline Major General Patrick for submitting a plan to the Committee on Military Affairs at its special request. Let it be remembered that this plan was the same plan that General Patrick submitted to the War Department more than a year ago on which no action was taken.

Let it be noted that General Patrick ought to be within the elect circle. He is a graduate of West Point and has run the gauntlet of promotion through honorable service until he is now nearing the period of retirement at 64 years. Unless General Patrick were sincere in his convictions, he would also pronounce the shibboleth. He can gain nothing by differing from the crowd. He must soon retire by operation of law. Perhaps the fact that he is serving under a new appointment, by confirmation of the Senate, as Chief of the Air Service for a full period of four years, and perhaps the fact that he must retire before that four years expires, accounts for his having some independence of judgment. Perhaps he realizes that the frown of the War Department can not hurt him. Doubtless he realizes that when he comes to end his career upon this earth he must answer to himself this question: "Have I been honest with myself and honest with my country in telling the various investigating committees and the committees of the Congress of my country what I honestly and sincerely believe to be the best thing for my nation now and hereafter? Is it not better for me to have the approval of my conscience in that great hour of judgment than it is to have the temporary approval of my comrades in the War Department? Have I not a responsibility higher than that of loyalty to any institution? I have not rushed into the public prints. I have not foisted my opinions upon the public or Congress. But when I have been officially summoned and have been asked on my honor to tell the Representatives of my country what I think with regard to what should be done to provide for the common defense, can I expect the approval of my conscience in the supreme testing time of life if I fail to say what I honestly think, and like a coward subscribe to the manufactured shibboleth of the General Staff?"

There is intolerance in the General Staff. It is probably due to the narrow field of education and experience, but it exists. Congress sees it and discounts their machine-made opinions.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, this Congress will be called upon soon to pass upon a bill which is most significant and far-reaching in its importance. I refer to the Elliott public building bill, and being a member of that committee which considered the bill and reported it favorably to this House, I desire to discuss it before this body for a few minutes.

It is hardly necessary for me to talk of the imperative need for such a law when we realize that this Government is paying approximately \$25,000,000 yearly in rentals for buildings to be used in the transaction of the business of this country. When we realize this, there can be no doubt about it being good policy and good economics and good business sense for this Government to undertake to build its buildings and so avoid this tremendous cost.

This bill, gentlemen, the terms of which, I take it, this House is very familiar with, provides that \$165,000,000 shall be appropriated over a period of five years for the construction of public buildings for this Government. Fifty million dollars of



this amount is to be used in the city of Washington. One hundred and fifteen million dollars of this amount is to be used in the country generally throughout all the States, and at those places where the necessity for buildings is most apparent.

It will be interesting to this House to consider for a few minutes the history of the methods by which this Government has engaged in the construction of public buildings. The opposition to this bill appears to be based upon two reasons. The first, they say, is that this will take away from Congress the power which it has had delegated to it under the law, and which ought not to be taken away from it; that the Elliott bill provides that these appropriations shall be expended through two executive departments, and they insist that that ought not to be done, that it has been the time-honored policy of this country to let Congress say where these buildings shall be put and the amount used in the construction of them.

I have taken the trouble to make some historical investigation as to the manner in which the country has built its public buildings. I find that in the earlier years of our history, when the first buildings were being constructed, that this duty was intrusted to the President himself to designate where the buildings were to be put and have general supervision of the construction of them. After a few years, by specific provisions of law, the Secretary of the Treasury was charged from time to time with the construction of certain public buildings, and it appears that the Secretary of the Treasury for a number of years designated where these buildings were to be built, how they were to be built, and how much must be appropriated for their construction. During the time when the Secretary of the Treasury had charge of this and in the early days of our history, we constructed 23 public buildings, about 18 marine hospitals, and about 15 customshouses. After a while this method of constructing buildings was changed, and there was constituted by law a department in the Treasury Department of this country known as the "Construction branch of the Treasury Department." That was in 1853 during the administration of President Pierce and while Mr. Guthrie was Secretary of the Treasury. For a number of years the public buildings of this country were constructed through this construction department in the Treasury Department. That was done up until 1860, and the Government directed that an engineer from the War Department should be at the head of this construction department, and he was at the head of it.

From 1860 until 1875 several civilian architects were in charge of this construction department. In 1875 provision was made by Congress (18 Stat. 371-396) for the organization of the Supervising Architect's Office in the Treasury Department, and since then all construction work placed under the Secretary of Treasury has been carried out in the Office of the Supervising Architect, and the method we have now is under the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department. So, it appears that for 100 years and more the public buildings of this country were constructed by and through the methods in many respects similar to those designated in this bill known as the Elliott bill.

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

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I notice the gentleman is referring to the construction of buildings, the buildings being constructed in the manner designated and called for by the engineers. How were the designation of these sites provided for?

Mr. KERR. My impression is that those sites were designated by the parties who had the construction of the buildings in hand.

Mr. DOUGHTON. When did that change take place?

Mr. KERR. That change took place in 1902, and from 1902 until 1913 we had the omnibus or so-called "pork barrel" bills, and this is the only period in the history of this country when we have had an omnibus public building bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am asking for information. Was the first omnibus public building bill passed in 1902? If so, what was the cause for abandoning the old policy?

Mr. KERR. I do not know. So far as I know, and so far as it appears, both policies or methods have been entirely satisfactory to the country.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the present policy is entirely satisfactory?

Mr. KERR. Yes; and I think the old policy was also.

Mr. LANKFORD. Will the gentleman put in his remarks the exact language of the statute under which the buildings were constructed prior to this time?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

The sundry civil act, approved July 1, 1898 (30 Stat. 614) places under the Secretary of the Treasury the custody and

control of all courthouses, customhouses, post offices, appraisers' stores, barge offices, and other public buildings outside of the District of Columbia, and outside of military reservations, purchased or constructed out of appropriations under the control of the Treasury Department, and invests the Secretary of the Treasury with full authority to assign and reassign space in such buildings. Congress annually appropriates funds for the maintenance or operation of all such buildings, and all contracts for the repair, extension, remodeling, and so forth, of such buildings, pursuant to such appropriation acts, are entered into by, or under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

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

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Where is Wilson, N. C.?

Mr. KERR. It is in my district.

Mr. HASTINGS. I notice in looking over the hearings that it is one of the places mentioned on page 65.

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. It is the only one mentioned in North Carolina, is it not?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. And no other district or city in that State will get a building.

Mr. KERR. I shall explain why that is mentioned and why no other North Carolina town is mentioned, and I am very glad that the gentleman has been kind enough to call that to my attention. In addition to the \$150,000,000 which is to be expended in the construction of new buildings, the bill provides that \$15,000,000 additional shall be set aside to finish the unfinished projects, buildings which have heretofore been authorized, but not built in this country. One of the unfinished projects is the Wilson courthouse and post office in my district. But the bill provides that not only shall the Wilson project be finished, but that 65 other projects in 38 different States of the Union shall be finished, in accordance with plans and specifications and cost estimate of the Supervising Architect.

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

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I believe the gentleman says that this building at Wilson will be finished?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. What progress has been made, and what steps have been taken, and how much has been done toward the construction of this building?

Mr. KERR. The lot has been purchased, and there was an appropriation of \$50,000, which was not enough, and the department so found, and they made a new estimate of how much it would take, and that new estimate is what I trust will be put into this building.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Then, as I understand it, the building will be constructed rather than finished?

Mr. KERR. Yes; it will be constructed, and the project will be finished.

Mr. DOUGHTON. You could not finish a building that was not begun?

Mr. KERR. The law authorizing the construction of this building will be carried out?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. What was the population of Wilson in the last census?

Mr. KERR. About 11,000. It has doubled its population in every 10 years since the 1900 census.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman knows that all of our towns when we want a public building have gained wonderfully in population since the last census.

Mr. KERR. I stated to the gentleman what the population was in 1920—11,000.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That is according to the census?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Would the gentleman be good enough to tell the House how many places in North Carolina with a population of more than 11,000 according to the last census have not been designated in his bill?

Mr. KERR. I do not know of any. I know that the gentleman has in his district two towns for which he has introduced two bills asking that the Congress appropriate money to build public buildings in, and neither one of those towns has as many as 4,000 people in it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If the gentleman will again yield, I have an authorization for a building that has been authorized since 1913.

Mr. KERR. No, sir; I did not know that. I know the gentleman has a site authorized, but I know the gentleman has not an authorization for a building.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We have a site bought.

Mr. KERR. I know there has been a site bought in towns not half the size, probably, of yours.

Mr. DOUGHTON. What does the gentleman propose to do with those?

Mr. KERR. I do not propose to do anything.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Where are these sites in towns of less than 2,000 inhabitants?

Mr. KERR. Right now I can not tell the gentleman, but I will be very glad to verify what I said to the gentleman at some later time; I think I can do so.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Publicly; there is nothing private.

Mr. KERR. I have not the information right at hand.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I will.

Mr. ARENTZ. Suppose there are a number of incorporated towns, such as Wilson, of 14,000 or 15,000 inhabitants who want to get a post office and who need a post office; how is it proposed under this bill to get the authorization and provide for its construction?

Mr. KERR. I think the \$100,000,000 proposed to be appropriated under the Elliott bill will cover such projects as that.

Mr. ARENTZ. But how does the gentleman proceed to do it?

Mr. KERR. I would not proceed. This bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General shall proceed to do it if there is a need for the construction of such a building. The matter of spending this \$100,000,000 is vested in the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General.

Mr. ARENTZ. If there is a demand and a Member of this House, for instance, should go contrary to the wishes of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General, how are you ever going to get the place; tell me that?

Mr. KERR. Get the place? They have the right under this bill, these executive officers, to construct the public building. I do not think the gentleman understands the bill.

Mr. ARENTZ. I understand the bill.

Mr. KERR. And put it in a place where they think can best subservise the interests of the public and the Government.

Mr. ARENTZ. I think the Members know better where they should have—

Mr. KERR. Ask your question, do not tell me what they think—

Mr. ARENTZ. I would like to ask, how would you proceed?

Mr. KERR. Under the bill, I have just told the gentleman.

Mr. ARENTZ. No; you do not proceed, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General proceed. Suppose I bring before this House the needs of a certain town for a post office, and I impress the committee with the fact that the town needs a post office, do I go to the Secretary of the Treasury and say, Will you please build a post office?

Mr. KERR. This is the difference between an omnibus bill and the method proposed by this bill; You will have to convince these departments as to the merit of your project or cause.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I will.

Mr. McKEOWN. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the appropriations for public buildings heretofore in certain large cities of the United States runs as high as from \$2.49 in Detroit, Mich., per capita, and \$21.57 in San Francisco, and in other portions of the country it runs less than \$1 per capita?

Mr. KERR. Now, this brings me to the other point; that is, the other objection to this bill which I spoke of a while ago, and that objection is this, that this bill will enable the department to spend \$100,000,000 in the large cities like Syracuse, N. Y., Los Angeles, Calif., and the smaller cities and towns, which deserve as much consideration at the hands of the Government as the larger ones, will not be taken care of.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I will.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman, being a member of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, has doubtless made a very careful investigation and study of this matter. I will ask him, in view of the investigation he has made, how many places in North Carolina would stand a reasonable show to get a building under this bill, and how many towns larger than Wilson, in his own district, will not get buildings?

Mr. KERR. I will tell the gentleman that I think North Carolina, with its superimportance these days, has a great many places that should have Federal public buildings, and we will be compelled to build them before very long.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Can the gentleman recollect a conversation I had with him on the matter when I asked the pointed

question after the bill was introduced and he said two or three?

Mr. KERR. Since the gentleman has called my attention to that conversation, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the conversation in which I asked him if he was willing to deprive North Carolina of a million or a million and a half dollars to erect public buildings because he could not be assured of two in his district.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I did not state I would not support the bill, but here is what I said, that I would not support a bill that was unfair to our State in order to help two or three large cities. I ask my colleague if he is willing to help large cities at the expense of the small towns of North Carolina?

Mr. KERR. I am willing to help all the cities and towns that need help in this country. I am willing to stand by the department if they undertake to put these buildings where they are most needed in this country. There never was any trouble when they had control of these buildings in this department, and they had control of them for nearly 150 years.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Why, then, have they proposed a change?

Mr. KERR. I do not know, but it does appear that the bill under consideration to a great extent follows the methods pursued for a long number of years in respect to the construction of public buildings.

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

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does not the gentleman think that if one city with a population of 11,000 is entitled to a public building, all other cities similarly situated are entitled to it also?

Mr. KERR. I do. I think this is the beginning of a well-considered plan to build the public buildings necessary in this wonderful country of ours and I think this proposal will ultimately meet and include just such towns as that.

Mr. HASTINGS. We do not want to wait until they are all ultimately provided for. We simply do not want to be left out.

Mr. KERR. You will not be left out. If you have a project in your State for a public building in a city of 25,000, with no public post office in it, you will not have any trouble in my opinion about having this bill take care of that situation.

Mr. HASTINGS. There will not be any trouble about it while I am a Member of Congress.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The Treasury Department has to decide that.

Mr. KERR. I think it is a meritorious project, and I think the department will meet those meritorious projects. The second objection brought against this bill, as I was about to say a moment ago, is that you are putting \$150,000,000 up here and intrusting it to executive department heads who are not responsible to the people of the country; that these departments will spend this money in the large cities and not be fair to the people of the smaller towns. As to this, let us bear in mind that Congress still holds the purse strings on that \$150,000,000—\$10,000,000 of which is to be spent annually in the city of Washington and \$15,000,000 annually in the country at large. You would think, from the arguments heard here on the floor, that this money was to be put into the lap of these departments and that they could do with it as they please. That is not true and can not be true. This law provides that only \$15,000,000 is to be expended annually in respect to the country at large, and that is to be expended in accordance with the law of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KERR. May I have a little more time?

Mr. BARBOUR. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The inference that I draw from the gentleman's remarks is that he insists that the House will have the right to appropriate for these buildings, and by naming the towns in the appropriation bill Congress will have the right to locate the places where the buildings shall be constructed.

Mr. KERR. I did not say that. I did not mean to convey that impression to the gentleman. I say this, that each Congress annually passes upon the \$15,000,000 item of appropriation to pursue this building project. If this first appropriation, or any of them, is used in a manner which discriminated against any meritorious town or city, then the succeeding Con-



gress can cut off further appropriation, or even direct the place and manner wherein it shall be used.

If this amount appropriated for the country at large is not equitably and justly administered, then the gentlemen who oppose this bill and these appropriations will have something to stand on, but at present it is not fair for them to come in here and denounce this bill as a vicious bill, and as a notoriously unjust bill, and as a bill savoring of fraud, and as being a delusion and a snare. That is the argument always used when people have not a better one.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman's building has already been taken care of, and I submit that our sense of fairness sometimes falls out of the window when our personal interest comes in at the door.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman may be right about that. My building is taken care of. It is also a fact that 63 other buildings in this country, spread over 38 States, for which \$11,000,000 has been appropriated for years, have been provided for. These are named in the bill, and \$15,000,000 additional is appropriated to complete them. This fact itself, it seems to me, ought to impel every man who is interested in public buildings in this country to vote for this bill, because it expends in this country \$26,000,000 in one year outside of the city of Washington, in one item, and at the places designated.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Now that the gentleman's district has been taken care of, I want to compliment the gentleman, as a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, for having taken care of his district. He has taken care of his constituents. But the question is, Have the others been equally well taken care of, and have they been able to take care of their constituents with equal success?

Mr. KERR. I can not tell you what other Members have done about it. I do not think probably all of them have a project like mine.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Does the gentleman remember making the statement at any time that if his project was not taken care of he would not support the bill?

Mr. KERR. No. Possibly I told the gentleman some time ago when this bill was first under discussion that the old plan, the omnibus bill, suited me all right.

Mr. DOUGHTON. And further, that if you were not going to get a building in your district you would not vote for the bill?

Mr. KERR. No. I never have been willing to keep out of North Carolina a million and a half dollars simply because I could not get one or two projects located in my own district.

Mr. DOUGHTON. And I am not willing to tax North Carolina for the benefit of a few large towns, and rob all the smaller towns.

Mr. KERR. We will not quarrel about that.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit one more question?

Mr. KERR. Certainly.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does not the gentleman think he is as patriotic and knows as well the needs of his district down there in North Carolina and the necessity for locating a public building down there as the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. KERR. I do not know, but I think probably if I made a study of it as carefully and systematically as these parties in the Post Office Department then I would know even better than they.

Mr. HASTINGS. Have you not made such a study?

Mr. KERR. No; I am not prepared to say that I have.

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not think that the Postmaster General or the Secretary of the Interior here in Washington have as much knowledge of my district as I have, or are as patriotic in their attitude toward the needs of the district as I am.

Mr. KERR. Now, Mr. Chairman, I started out to discuss a few minutes ago, the facts in respect to the expenditure of the \$15,000,000 annually in the several States.

My idea about this is that it safeguards the interest of everybody in this Congress. I do not think the Members on either side of this House would be willing to have this money taken by an executive department and used each year for special favored localities; this would be manifestly unfair, and if done, I feel certain that Congress, which passes upon this appropriation each year, would so modify or change the law as to prevent such discrimination, even to the end of striking out the appropriation entirely; the purse string is not taken out of the hands of Congress, and those places which have merit in their demands will surely be taken care of. If I did not believe this, then I would not support this measure. Of

course, every town which needs a public building can not get one at once. This is the beginning of legislation, in my opinion, which will be continued until the Government has placed public buildings in every town where the business will justify it to do so, and I believe that there are many towns in my progressive State which will be clearly entitled to these buildings and will get them.

Suppose the opposition defeats this bill, what has it to offer? Nothing, nothing, just "what the bear grabbed at." It is well understood that this is the only public-building measure which can be passed through this Congress and receive the approval of this administration. I do not feel justified in an attempt to defeat a measure which holds out the only hope to the people of this country for accommodation in the matter of adequate Federal buildings to transact the fast-increasing business of this Government. As for my part I shall not do it; I shall not do it!

In conclusion let me say that the method of appropriation through this bill can be taken care of in our Federal Budget plan of annual financial estimates of the funds necessary to run the Government. The appropriations are spread over a term of five years and it will not be necessary to increase taxes to meet the expenses of this building plan; this feature should heartily commend itself to the taxpayers of this country.

I think the political party of which I am a member, and I hope a most loyal one, should have great credit, which it justly deserves, for its effort to reduce taxation and lessen the burdens upon the average citizen of this country, and for its initiation of and hearty cooperation in those sincere efforts to administer the affairs of this Nation in a conservative and businesslike manner. We can lose nothing by a continuation of this policy. It will commend itself to the intelligence of this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remark in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM]. [Applause.]

Mr. BRUMM. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, since I became a Member of this distinguished body I have never made a speech on the floor. It is not a habit of mine to make public utterances unless upon invitation or when I feel I have a firm conviction to announce. I would not take up the time of the House to-day were it not that I am impelled by the seriousness of a certain question which I feel is of great importance not only to myself, to my constituency, and to the people of neighboring territories but of interest to the entire people of the United States.

As you perhaps know, I represent one of the great coal counties of Pennsylvania. Nestling among the hills in the Blue Mountains, one of the most beautiful spots on God's footstool, and covering an area of hundreds of square miles, are the coal fields of Pennsylvania. This region, endowed by nature with untold mineral wealth, has given wealth and prosperity to millions of people, and up to the present time in the history of the United States, and perhaps the world, there has never been a single spot more continuously happy, prosperous, and without need of assistance. Our people are made up of all the nations of the earth; nevertheless, we have been able to assimilate them with remarkable facility, and the result is that we have a citizenry sturdy and strong, industrious and brave, assiduous as laborers, and liberal as spenders. The general effect is, barring the terrible casualties of a most dangerous trade, that no people in the broad expanse of the United States are more happy and contented.

But a crisis has arisen in that section. Peace has been turned into war, prosperity to devastation, and death and destruction is rife on every side. Everybody seems to talk about it except those who know something of it. Resolutions have been offered; speeches have been made and ranting has been done, but to no purpose. And why? Because those who are familiar with the situation know that they will accomplish nothing. Not a single word has been said on the floor of this House by the Representatives of the seven great coal districts. Why? Because these men knew the seriousness of the situation. These men are responsible not only for their political success but for the safety, prosperity, and the very life of their people. They did not trifle. This is no time for political gestures and legislative gymnastics. This is a time for the people of the United States to recognize that there is a serious condition, the like of which, through industrial troubles, has

never been experienced in the United States of America. From early last December these men from the coal counties have been running back and forth studying the situation and trying to reach this and that solution, but absolutely in vain. They have reached no solution which will save the situation.

Let me show the general situation. Two years ago there was a strike. These troubles have come up almost every two or three years, and while Members from New England, New York, or somewhere else talk about the coal barons and unreasonable miners, the fact of the matter is that they are no different than they are anywhere else. The point is that our people are intelligent people and they are well organized, and the coal barons, so-called, are the rightful owners of certain property which they handle with more benevolence, perhaps, than some of you men who are interested in other vocations. That is not the trouble at all. It is because it is confined, of course, to a certain territory. When this strike broke out two years ago the newly elected Governor of Pennsylvania went to the White House and said to the President:

These coal fields are entirely within my State and I will and intend to handle the situation.

The President said, "Very good," and he was right. The governor did handle it. The outcome has been very unfortunate, perhaps, both to the operators and to the miners and certainly to the general public, because the prices went up. Nevertheless, peace reigned for the two years past.

At the expiration of the present agreement an attempt was made to adjust their differences, but that failed. The governor came to the front as the governor of a sovereign State. The proposition was naturally his. Nobody disputes that, and as a matter of law that is as clear as can be. If the governor were capable or showed any chance of settling these troubles, it would be perfectly right for the White House to remain apart. The governor attempted and failed, and later he called an extraordinary session of the legislature for the purpose of passing legislation to settle the strike. Whatever may be said of his motives and whatever may be said of his good intentions as a lawyer, I know that these were the most futile and impossible methods that one could possibly conceive of. If within the borders of a sovereign State an impossible condition existed, the governor of that State, just as well as the President of the United States, under the ancient idea of the police power, when the health, safety, and prosperity of the people were at stake, would have the right to take hold, and under that ancient doctrine, invoked over and over in the history of this country, he might have insisted on these people getting together or subject them to the alternative of taking over the mines, as Governor Allen did in Kansas. But he did not. As I say, I am not impugning his motives, but his methods were certainly wrong, and the result is that the strike has grown and expanded, and the effects of it have reached over great expanses outside of Pennsylvania, and these outside territories are feeling the effects of this awful catastrophe.

Now, my position is this:

Having failed through the efforts of any of the departments or the bureaus to obtain relief, there is only one possible solution. Legislation is both inexpedient and impossible. The President told us in his opening message of a remedy for this sort of situation. He was right, but that was not to settle a strike present and growing. In time of war it is nonsense to make provisions for permanent peace. Why, great God, we have just gotten out of a terrible world calamity, and both this side and that side of the House will admit that the awful mistake was the combining of the articles of settlement of hostilities with the idea of permanent and everlasting peace and happiness throughout the world.

At the close of the Civil War, when the two great chieftains of the North and South, Grant and Lee, met together, sold, experienced men, knowing the terrible conditions under which the Nation had suffered, they made the settlement as simple and as easy as could be. Do you suppose if they had insisted upon measures for reconstruction, do you think if they had sought to settle all the questions between the white and the black populations, that the salutary result would be present which we experience now?

The long period of reconstruction, the unhappy moments of it for North and South, the dark days of misunderstanding, when blood was still hot and the wounds lay open, was no time to talk of permanent union. But as the years went on, by cool deliberation and with great common sense the Nation continued to prosper, slowly drew together the two great diverging lines, and to-day we have these happy, reunited indivisible United States.

So I say this is no time to talk of permanent peace in the coal regions. Why does the President so act? It is my

humble opinion this is the reason: The representations made to him have been largely along the lines of personalities—"this man is wrong and that man is wrong; this one has made a mistake and that one has made a mistake. It is a running sore. We must end it forever. The way to do it is to let them fight it out. If you keep your hands off, it will solve itself."

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

Mr. BRUMM. Please do not interrupt me until I am through with my general statement, and then I will be pleased to yield.

How in the wide world when these parties are driven to desperation, when terrible epithets have been hurled back and forth in their conferences, with misunderstanding and each having discredited one for the other, amidst the suffering and the hunger of the people, can you say let them wear it out? Great heavens, do you believe that would promote peace unless you absolutely obliterate the people of the coal region? Why, you are inspiring everlasting war. It can not be any different. Neither the miners nor the operators are in any fit condition to talk of permanent peace. We want this strike ended. That is what we ask, and by the grace of God through Executive intervention, I believe it shall be ended. Hundreds of thousands of people, running into the millions, are affected, and the hungry and the poor are crying out.

Mr. CARSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUMM. Please do not interrupt me for a question. I only have 15 minutes, and I ought to have at least an hour to properly discuss this question.

Mr. CARSS. I simply wanted to ask the gentleman what is his solution of the problem.

Mr. BRUMM. I will give it to the gentleman.

Banks are rocking to destruction. Our region is covered with little mills and factories, largely manned or womaned by the female portion of the mining families; all these businesses that dot the entire region have been helping these people. The banks have been lending and their credits have been extended until they have reached the bursting point, and yet you say, "Let them go and let them worry it out." O heavens, that can not be, because you are destroying this great industrious and populous section of the United States.

Now, is there a remedy? Legislation, I say, is foolish. That is what our governor is trying to do. It can not bring relief. It is too slow, and this is no time to deliberate. What can be done? Three successive Presidents of the United States, because of emergencies that existed, have taken hold of coal strikes. My question is, Why can it not be done now? The answer will come back, "The President feels that his offices would not be accepted." In my judgment that is not a fact. In my humble opinion both sides of this controversy will welcome intervention.

I do not care whether Mr. Lewis is right. I do not care whether the operators are right. These people are individuals, representing two great business interests, and it matters not for the sake of this argument; it is the cessation of hostilities we want and the President's good offices I humbly believe will be gladly accepted. [Applause.]

Now, what is the direct way of handling it? In my poor opinion it is this. As Executive of the United States—and remember while the President is the legal Executive of this Republic, he is something far more than that, as has been exemplified in innumerable instances, the President of the United States is not only the executor of the laws, but in time of stress, he is the source of information, the mouthpiece of the Nation, and his acts have the authority and sanction of the combined power of the people, as he is the veritable father of its citizens. Thus by the might of his office as Executive, if the parties to the controversy should refuse his kindly office, he can act in accordance with the declaration of President Roosevelt when he said "If something is not done to end this trouble I shall take over the mines"; and I say there is ample authority and precedent for it. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BRUMM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman remember that during the war we took over the railroads at a wasteful cost to the American people of several hundreds of millions of dollars?

Mr. BRUMM. I do not mean permanently.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, we did not take them over permanently. But it cost us several hundred millions of dollars' loss before we could turn them back.

Mr. BRUMM. Please do not interrupt me with questions about other incidental matters in the little time I have to discuss this subject.



Mr. OLIVER of New York. It is worth the price now, whatever it cost.

Mr. BRUMM. I have much in explanation I could offer you in reference to that particular phase, but I have not the time now.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUMM. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman's idea is that the President ought to intervene and try to settle the strike?

Mr. BRUMM. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does not the gentleman know that the papers this morning carry the statement that the President will not do that, notwithstanding the Senate passed a resolution requesting it?

Mr. BRUMM. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does the gentleman think the President would act because he asked it when he would not act at the request of the Senate?

Mr. BRUMM. I say, that when the President has the true facts before him, the facts as to the real physical situation and not as a legal question at all, he will intervene.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUMM. Yes; but please do not take up all my time. Mr. BLACK of New York. The gentleman seems to have a very perfect knowledge of the situation; to whom does the gentleman ascribe the difficulty, the operator or the miner, in this situation?

Mr. BRUMM. Oh, that has nothing to do with it. I would not attempt to answer that. That is what my speech is about. I do not care who is to blame. When San Francisco had an earthquake, did the Executive or anybody else stop and ask the cause of the quake? That has nothing to do with it. My people are suffering, some dying, and business is going off the map; therefore, something ought to be done.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the gentleman desire further time?

Mr. BRUMM. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. BRUMM. Now then, the direct point is this. If my voice could be heard at the other end of the Avenue where rests the executive authority of the Nation, they would do this. The Governor of Pennsylvania having apparently failed to bring about an end to the trouble, I would send a communication to his excellency the governor and ask him if he has a plan for the immediate settlement of the difficulty, and if so, to kindly give the time in which he thought it could be accomplished. If he had a plan, I should wait for that amount of time to expire. If he had none, I would then say "I shall take hold," and I would send for both sides to the controversy and see if they could not agree upon some sort of a board or commission or whatever you might call it—it does not make any difference what we call it—for the purpose of sitting down and adjusting their differences with the aid of the great power of the President of the United States behind them.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUMM. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman is a Member of the majority side of the House, and also a Member of the Pennsylvania delegation. Would not it be wise for his delegation to wait on the President and ask him to take some action?

Mr. BRUMM. It might or it might not. I said when I first started out, and I meant it, that I am not doing anything for effect. We have been doing what we thought was right and most expedient and not doing it for political effect.

Mr. BOYLAN. Would not it be a good suggestion to do that now?

Mr. BRUMM. We have done all we could to bring them together.

Mr. BOYLAN. But you did not do that.

Mr. BRUMM. Now, if what I have suggested did not result in anything salutary, as a last resort the President would have the right to invoke the police power of the United States and insist upon something being done. But as a matter of fact it never would approach that point because the differences between the two parties, as I understand it, are really not very great.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUMM. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. In view of the fact that the Senate of the United States has gone on record in requesting the President to interfere, what is the cause of the gentleman's optimism that the President would interfere when the papers this morning say that he will not interfere?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. It is the optimism of hope.

Mr. BRUMM. It is more than that; but you might as well ask what was the cause of the optimism of Columbus when he discovered America. I do not know. I know the conditions in the coal region, and both sides to the controversy. I am familiar with the psychology of the situation, and I know something about the problems, and I know the demarcation between the two. I believe, as I said before, that this thing has never been put in a proper light before the President of the United States. The emergency has not been stressed, but the hope of a permanent peace has been given.

Mr. MANLOVE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUMM. Yes.

Mr. MANLOVE. If the gentlemen around me knew the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania as I do, regardless of what may have been done or has not been done, I am of the opinion that the gentleman believes he is right and fearlessly assumes to avow his concern in this matter.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Nobody impugns the gentleman's motive, but I am surprised at his optimism when the gentleman says that they have done all they could in Pennsylvania.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUMM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I would follow the distinguished gentleman along any path that does not lead to Government control and Government ownership. If the eloquent gentleman who knows his present subject so well could give us some solution that does not lead to Government control and Government ownership, we would be getting along somewhere.

Mr. CARSS. In the present deadlock, is not that the only thing that will open the mines?

Mr. BRUMM. No; it would never go that far. I do not think it would lead to Government ownership. We have the experience of three separate strikes, and it has always worked out well. It would be a long matter for me to answer the gentleman from Texas, but I will say this, that I do not believe for a minute that the situation which is presented would lead to Government control and operation such as we had during the war of the railroads. It is not a similar situation in the mines, because under the law of Pennsylvania they could only have expert miners to work in the mines, and the taking over of the mines would have to be with the acquiescence of the miners' leaders and the miners themselves, for a very short interval, until concessions came from one or both sides.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say to the gentleman that I saw Director McAdoo hand out at one time \$763,000,000 out of the Treasury, and then I could no longer follow Bill McAdoo.

Mr. BRUMM. I congratulate the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOYLAN. If the power was given the President to take temporary control of the mines, could not he arrange for the miners to immediately resume work? They would not refuse the President, would they?

Mr. BRUMM. No.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUMM. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Does the gentleman know from any responsible leader of either faction in this situation whether or not they are willing to have the President intervene or have asked him to intervene?

Mr. BRUMM. I would not answer that if I knew. This is no new thing with me. I was raised in that region, and the problems have been discussed in my home ever since I was a child. My heart is full of sympathy for the people of my district. I have remained silent for the same reason that the other men from the coal counties have; because we wanted a real, honest-to-God solution of this proposition. We did not want to go off halfcocked, and I would not have opened my mouth except that I am convinced that we have come to the end of all avenues except calling on the President of the United States for help.

In my humble judgment, since the great Lincoln occupied the Presidency, no man has held that high office who has a finer courage or who has any more earnest intention, nor who has borne the weight of this great responsibility with more seriousness than Calvin Coolidge. [Applause.]

I do not believe that anyone has ever occupied that office who has a more thorough and comprehensive grasp of the spirit of America and of American institutions than he. I honestly believe that the heart of no President has ever been in closer sympathy with the wishes, the hopes, and the aspirations of the great common people of the United States. I have followed him from the time that he was first nominated for the Vice Presidency, and 90 per cent of everything that he has done I have indorsed. My admiration for him has grown with my experience here. My faith in him is profound and my trust

is unbounded. I believe that the facts have not been properly shown to him and that he does not thoroughly comprehend the seriousness of the situation. Nobody can gain counsel with me who says that his ears are deaf to the cries that come from the trembling lips, through chattering teeth, of the cold and hungry of the coal region. No one could ever make me believe that the heart of Calvin Coolidge is stone, and I hope that ere long the true light of this awful situation shall fall upon his honest brow, and that we who have waited so patiently may have some relief through the strong, the able, and the capable arm of the present Executive of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia].

Mr. LaGuardia. Mr. Chairman, much tempted as I am to talk about coal, I have another subject I desire to bring to the attention of the House. I would much prefer if some one else had taken up the question, because I may be charged with being biased.

I want to protest against the tyranny and oppression of the General Staff now being invoked against officers of the Air Service. You gentlemen who have had experience in legislation know that it is no uncommon practice to receive communications from Army officers or from citizens who are interested in the Military Establishment. A few days ago General Patrick, Chief of the Air Service, appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs of this House on the invitation of the committee and gave testimony before that committee in response to a request of the committee as to his views on the reformation of the Air Service of the country. His testimony is a public record. It seems that his testimony and his recommendations were circulated among ex-service flyers of the country, and immediately thereafter the General Staff started an investigation in the Air Service. General Helmick himself spent a day at the office of the Chief of the Air Service, and since then an investigation is being conducted by an Inspector general of the Army. That is in keeping with the attitude of the General Staff toward the Air Service ever since the Great War.

The country was startled and shocked not very long ago because of the punishment meted out to a brave, courageous, and gallant soldier, and on top of that the General Staff is keeping up its activities of oppression and intimidating these officers, to muzzle them, to depress them, to crush their spirit, and to prevent them from even thinking along lines of their own profession. I do not believe that the attitude of the General Staff can possibly meet with the approval of Congress.

If it is improper for an air officer to communicate with his friends in civilian life on matters pertaining to his branch of the service, so it is improper for any other officer of any other branch of the service to do likewise; but it is manifestly unfair and unjust for the General Staff to pick out the Air Service in its campaign of its oppression and to stifle the officers of that department. What is the result? It will be impossible for this House to receive any intelligent information from any officer of the Air Service, because he knows, if he comes down here to testify and he testifies according to his own views and not according to the views of the General Staff that he is going to be punished. They have the living example of what happened to General Mitchell, and now we have an investigation going on in the Air Service, conducted by the Inspector General of the Army, intimidating officers in that service. And we thought we were destroying Prussian militarism. You have it right here in your General Staff, and you can have it only if Congress is willing to permit that kind of spirit to grow up in the American Army.

I do not know where the Committee on Appropriations gets its information, but I know that the gentleman in charge of the subcommittee gave quite a laying out to a reserve officer, Brigadier General Delafield, who appeared before his committee. Personally I believe that General Delafield was entirely within his rights in appearing before the committee, and I think that the gentleman in charge of the subcommittee reflected the spirit and the Prussian attitude of the General Staff when he abused this distinguished citizen for coming before his committee.

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

Mr. LaGuardia. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I am sure the gentleman does not want to impute that any criticism of General Delafield, who is the man to whom he refers, was simply because he appeared before the committee of Congress. If the gentleman has read the Record he would know that General Delafield was criticized for deluging Members of Congress with unnecessary propaganda, and many Members of Congress have complained about it.

Mr. LaGuardia. Oh, General Delafield is a citizen.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; and he is also a reserve officer of the Army of the United States.

Mr. LaGuardia. Exactly; and that carries out the Prussian system. You have to obey orders; you can not appeal to your representatives. [Laughter.]

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman we are glad to hear General Delafield always; he is a fine gentleman, but the committee objects to answering propaganda.

Mr. LaGuardia. What right—

Mr. ANTHONY. Because we are tired.

Mr. LaGuardia. Now the gentleman knows that he would not object to propaganda of the farmers and to propaganda of manufacturers; of course not, but the gentleman from Kansas has been in contact so long with these hard-boiled eggs of the General Staff that he has got to be hard-boiled himself. There is a living example of it. The gentleman stands up and says he was tired out with letters. What of that; the gentleman is getting paid to attend to his business. [Applause.] It is part of your business and our business. Let us be perfectly frank about this. That is the spirit of the General Staff. It is about time we put an end to it. It does not represent the spirit of the American people. I will tell you these young men in the Air Service who take their lives in their hands every day with the rotten equipment they have, some good, as the gentleman from California stated yesterday in a very able statement. It is not fair to crush the spirit of these men just because the General Staff knows some day they will have to sit in a plane and fly a machine themselves. The man who is afraid to fly is yellow, and a man who is yellow has no business in the Army. They know what is coming; they know there is to be a change in military tactics, both offensive and defensive. They know a general will have to observe and transmit his orders from the air. They do not like it. They prefer the ballroom of the New Willard, which is more comfortable than the uncertain seat in a plane, and now they are trying to crush the most gallant branch of the American Army.

If there is anyone here in this House who desires to justify the attitude of the General Staff in jumping on the Air Service because some one circularizes a letter telling of General Patrick's testimony, I would like to have him take the floor and defend it. When we reach the paragraph in the appropriation bill I am going to offer an amendment, and I hope the gentleman from Kansas will not raise the point of order. It will come under the Holman rule as we understand it, and not under the poor Holman rule as it has been interpreted of late in this House. So I am not going to take any more time. It cost me a lot of time to get these few minutes, but I simply want to register my protest and tell the General Staff they had better stop their Prussian and oppressive methods. They have demoralized the Army to-day so they can not recruit American boys in the Army. I landed at Fort Tilden, I will tell the chairman, one day this summer, and as we landed the plane four soldiers came forth—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LaGuardia. May I have two minutes?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. LaGuardia. Now, I have a smattering of several languages. These four boys came over to help us, and I tried them in every language of which I had a smattering, and they could not understand it.

A MEMBER. Did the gentleman try English?

Mr. LaGuardia. They could not speak English. They were Syrians or Armenians, and I could not speak that language. That is the condition of our Army to-day. It is not attractive to the American boys, and the General Staff is entirely responsible. Your Army is top-heavy. You have an organization that is out of all proportion to your enlisted personnel. You can not get away from that. The organization appropriated for in your bill can not compare with any army in the whole world, because it is so top-heavy. It carries over \$300,000,000 for a small army—

Mr. COLE. If the gentleman will yield, there is only \$261,000,000 for the military branch itself.

Mr. LaGuardia. And the rest?

Mr. COLE. Is for rivers and harbors.

Mr. LaGuardia. Well, for \$261,000,000; compare that with the size of the Army and compare that with every other budget in the world. They have built up a machine, they intend to keep it, and intend to press over anyone who comes in their way. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARRISON. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Black].



Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am glad at last that we have heard from the anthracite-producing region in reference to the coal situation. The coal situation is not a new situation. We have had it for years and we have the well-informed gentleman of the mining district take the floor at this late hour and accuse other men who are trying to relieve the situation on behalf of the consumer of playing politics. And he comes in with a speech putting the situation right up to his President, and then lets his President out by making his President appear to be another Lincoln. If there ever was a political speech delivered in this House, it was the speech of the gentleman from the anthracite region of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has been in this House in times of peace in the anthracite region, and yet, with all his great knowledge of the anthracite coal situation, have we had a single constructive suggestion from the gentleman or from any other gentleman from Pennsylvania on the coal situation? No. Had these men, with their knowledge of the situation, come into this House before, in prior years, with plans to dispose of the coal situation, with the opinion of experts behind them, we who live in the coal-consuming towns would not now be in the great distress from which we suffer to-day.

Oh, no. We men from the consuming districts have not been playing politics. We offered suggestions at the beginning to assist the President and his party. There would have been no politics about the situation had the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others of the gentleman's party got into line with the consuming sections and asked that the President act. There would have been no discussion of this situation from the political standpoint. It is too late now to talk politics. It is too late now to do anything with the President and the gentlemen of his party. We were interested in relieving our people. We saw disaster and suffering facing them, and we were not informed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania or any other gentleman from the districts in which the coal mines are located as to helpful suggestions.

The same suggestion that he makes was made months ago to the President by us. I have great respect for the President, but I do not think he is another Lincoln.

I think if he had been Lincoln the slaves would have died before they were freed. But I have a great deal of respect for the President's political craftiness and I have a great deal of respect for him as a great politician. I am glad there is a great politician in the White House. It is a great place for a great politician. But there are times when the man in the White House should forget politics and do something from an entirely nonpartisan basis. The President always maneuvers from the strictly political viewpoint, and when I see him make political blunders, such as he is making now, I wonder what is back of it and why he is doing it; and I have come to the definite conclusion that the President of the United States, having always been supposed to be an opponent of union labor, is now taking the stand he is taking against the advice of the Senate and against editorial advice because he is now undertaking to break the Mine Workers' Union. That is what he has in mind, and when he does that, he and his satellites will then proceed to try to break down all the labor unions of the country. God help the country! For who is standing now between the American people and the Russian system? Nobody but the leaders of union labor, who are standing up, fighting toe to toe against communists in behalf of American ideals. God help you and God help the country when you break the unions of this country. [Applause.]

Last year we had a bill introduced into this House, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], a man well informed on this situation, and there was ample time to put through that House bill 5263. It went to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is the morgue of all decent legislation.

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

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can inform the gentleman that the union is against that bill.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Oh, I do not care about that bill particularly. But the question was presented to that committee, and they never held a hearing on that bill, or on any other coal bill, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] did not ask the committee at that time, in time of peace, to do anything to help that situation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can inform the gentleman that Mr. LAGUARDIA did not urge that bill. He consulted the labor leaders in regard to it and found they did not want it.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. LAGUARDIA has not helped any bill. It was Mr. LAGUARDIA's business to find out how his bill stood, and it was open to him to employ eminent counsel to help him.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman from New York himself has not done anything with his bill.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I am satisfied that my bill is dead, and, being satisfied of that, I have lined up with the bill introduced by my colleague [Mr. BOYLAN], and it shows some sparks of life.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will assure the gentleman that none of my bills are dead.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I did not intend to discuss coal, but a bill I put in yesterday for the purpose of striking from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD all statements not made on the floor of the House.

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman says he is going to strike out certain remarks?

Mr. BLACK of New York. From the RECORD all statements made by Members not delivered on the floor of the House; in other words, I want to see verbatim reports made in the House, and not newspaper clippings and statements made by people outside. In connection with that I want to insert a stenographic report of the meetings of the Cabinet. It is time the mysteries of the White House are revealed. It is time for us to know what the Cabinet is thinking about when they sit around the table with the President discussing great public questions.

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

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. I was reading an article in the Washington Post the other day about what took place in the Cabinet of President Wilson. We do not need to read anything along that line about the present Cabinet.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I might be able to obtain some information that would be of value if we had a stenographic record of their proceedings.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman think that the Secretaries of the various departments will ever be able to report by memoirs that are hereafter to be published or otherwise any of the secrets of the present Cabinet that would be of value?

Mr. BLACK of New York. I think they will be buried with most of them. [Laughter.] The Supreme Court of the United States files dissenting opinions. We know how the Supreme Court of the United States comes to a conclusion on a public matter and we know the process of reasoning that led up to it. The whole country knows how we are reaching conclusions. We reach them in the open, but nobody knows why the President comes to a certain conclusion. It is about time that this high public office became public instead of being a secret proposition, as it is to-day.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Will the gentleman include the statements of this unofficial spokesman of the President? Does the gentleman regard him as a member of the President's Cabinet or does he think the President is a ventriloquist and is speaking through some dummy?

Mr. BLACK of New York. I have too much respect for the President to say that the President speaks through a dummy when he speaks through himself as official spokesman.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. I just want to know if the gentleman referred to Colonel House?

Mr. BLACK of New York. There has been a proposition here for some time that we hear from the Cabinet officers on the floor of this House. That would take up a lot of time and probably get us no place. Let us get in our RECORD what they have to say to the President and what they have to say to each other, so that we will know what they are driving at. It is entirely unnecessary to bring them here, because we can all save time by the other process. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I had made up my mind I would not have anything to say about the proposed public building bill until I heard the gentleman from North Carolina take the floor in behalf of the Elliott bill.

Gentlemen, you may be in favor of that bill; you may have made up your mind you are going to vote to suspend the rule and pass the bill, but I have this to suggest to you: That whenever you do that and your community comes around wanting

to know about its public building, you are going to have some explanations to make before you will ever realize your ambition to get your public building.

There is no reason why Congress should surrender its prerogatives. There is no reason why these places should not be designated in the bill and the amounts fixed, and there is no reason why Congress can not be trusted just as much as to trust any member in the Cabinet.

I am frank to say to you that I would be opposed to this bill. I care not what Democrat was in the White House or what men occupied the offices of Postmaster General or Secretary of the Treasury. I have no personal feeling against either one of the two gentlemen, but I want to tell you now that whenever you pass this bill this money will go to the large cities and the smaller places will not receive any consideration. There is no reason why they can not make recommendations to this body. I say that when you talk about pork, pork-barrel legislation, that is an imputation that Members of Congress have not sense enough to save the money of the people of this country, when every day the Appropriations Committee and the Congress, acting together, are saving thousands upon thousands of dollars of money for the people of this country.

I have a list here which I am going to ask to insert as a part of my remarks. This list shows that there are many States in the Union which have towns of a population of 5,000 which do not have public buildings. I can show you that as to the State of Ohio and the State of Oklahoma.

In the State of Oklahoma there are 14 cities with a population of over 5,000 that do not have Federal buildings. In that number there are six Federal court towns that have no public buildings. The per capita amount spent in Oklahoma for public buildings is \$1.50. Take, for instance, the State of Ohio. In the State of Ohio there are 25 cities of over 5,000 in population, and in those cities the total receipts run all the way from \$90,000 down to \$13,000. The fair way to frame this public buildings bill is to fix the amount of the postal receipts and the population. That is the fair method of fixing a public buildings bill. I have no grievance against large appropriations for large cities, because they need large appropriations; but, gentlemen, I do have objection to turning the money over in a lump sum to one officer.

Now, you talk about the office of the Supervising Architect. The gentlemen in that office have been there through various administrations, so they can not be accused of anything political; but let me tell you what happened. When Congress appropriated money in 1913 for two buildings in the district I represent, I went to that office and urged them to change their plans. They had expensive plans, plans calling for large expenditures of unnecessary money in trimmings. I said:

What you want to do is to get away from this idea of adornment and give us useful buildings, buildings built for the purpose, not so much for looks, but buildings that will render service. That is what we want.

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

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. McKEOWN. What was the result? When they changed the plans they were able to build the building under the pre-war estimate, and they have as nice and complete a building as you can find anywhere. So, if we are going to go into the public building policy and we need public buildings throughout the country, we ought to go to work and see to it that the buildings are built for use and not so much for adornment. They will spend enough money on frieze work in some of these large city buildings to build one dozen comfortable buildings throughout the country.

Now, gentlemen, I have got just as much chance as the rest of you if this proposed public building bill passes. I have no more chance than the rest of you but I have got just the same scramble you have. How can you go back to your districts and say to the people of a certain town that you have been able to get a public building for them? If you pass this present proposed bill here is what is going to take place and what is going to happen to you and to all of us. Instead of having the place designated by Congress, here come two rival towns of equal claim and they will want your indorsement for a public building. Then, you will have to take it upon yourself to go down here to get a public building and if you are successful in obtaining the building for one of them, of course, you have got the ill will forever of the people of the other town. Whenever you let the judgment of 435 Congressmen, as well as the Senators, pass on it, they are not going to look at it in the same way, but you pass this bill and the big bulk of the money will be scattered out all over the country in the larger places and the Senators

whose prerogative it is to handle patronage will do very little consulting with the Members of the House about where these buildings will be located; and you can not tell me you can turn over a lump sum of money like this and they will not play politics with it. You take a man who has a position where he can handle as much power as men in the other branch of the Government or on the other side of the Capitol, he is going to give you very little consideration unless it pleases him to do so.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. I am sure my friend from Oklahoma wants to be accurate. I am not crazy about this bill myself, I will say to the gentleman, but I am sure the gentleman wants to make a fair statement, and the gentleman ought to tell the committee that the Postmaster General, after he has been consulting with the Congressmen and selects the places he is going have these buildings built, will submit his list to the Committee on Appropriations of the Congress; and then if the Committee on Appropriations passes favorably on the judgment of the Postmaster General, if the House does not like it, the House can either build it up or knock it down; is not that the fact?

Mr. McKEOWN. I will say to the gentleman it is true that the appropriations have to be passed on, but how is any single Member able to come here and defeat a proposition of that kind? The gentleman knows also that under this bill the Postmaster General will have nothing to say, or very little to say, until the Secretary of the Treasury first passes on the proposition, and then if it is a post office bill the Postmaster General is permitted to make a few suggestions. [Applause.]

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

[Mr. McKEOWN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD by placing therein some figures collated by Senator PINE, of Oklahoma.]

The matter referred to follows:

OHIO

Cities	Population			Postal receipts	Court town
	1910	1920	1925		
Barberton.....	9,410	18,811	23,286	\$36,133	No.
East Youngstown.....	4,972	11,237	15,985	13,175	No.
Bucyrus.....	8,152	10,425	11,720	44,908	No.
Cuyahoga Falls.....	4,020	10,200	13,700	31,834	No.
Fostoria.....	9,597	9,987	.....	54,002	No.
Mount Vernon.....	9,087	9,237	.....	52,672	No.
Wellsville.....	7,789	8,849	.....	17,317	No.
Dover.....	.....	8,101	.....	43,089	No.
Norwald.....	7,858	7,379	.....	60,490	No.
Gallion.....	7,214	7,374	.....	61,667	No.
Painesville.....	5,501	7,272	.....	75,634	No.
Troy.....	6,122	7,260	.....	90,363	No.
Ravenna.....	5,310	7,219	.....	62,411	No.
Kent.....	4,488	7,070	.....	64,965	No.
Circleville.....	6,744	7,049	.....	25,988	No.
Wellston.....	6,875	6,687	.....	13,591	No.
Girard.....	3,735	6,556	.....	13,524	No.
Nelsonville.....	6,082	6,440	.....	17,233	No.
Urichsville.....	4,751	6,428	.....	24,010	No.
Struthers.....	3,370	6,847	.....	11,311	No.
Bellevue.....	5,209	5,776	.....	34,067	No.
East Palestine.....	3,537	5,750	.....	22,119	No.
Shelby.....	4,903	5,578	.....	43,672	No.
Dennison.....	4,008	5,524	.....	13,095	No.
Wapakoneta.....	5,349	5,295	.....	24,950	No.

Population of State, 5,729,394.

Appropriations, \$18,105,322.76.

Per capita, \$3.14.

There are 25 cities in the State over 5,000 population without a Federal building.

KENTUCKY

No city in Kentucky over 5,000 population without a Federal building.

Population of State, 2,410,630.

Appropriations, \$6,520,631.

Per capita, \$2.69.

KANSAS

Cities	Population			Postal receipts	Court town
	1910	1920	1925		
Junction City.....	5,508	7,733	.....	\$40,106	No.
Dodge City.....	3,214	6,051	.....	36,674	No.

Population of State, 1,769,237.

Appropriations, \$3,514,605.38.

Per capita, \$2.01.

There are two cities in the State over 5,000 population without a Federal building.



ALABAMA

Cities	Population			Postal receipts	Court town
	1910	1920	1925		
Albany		7,652		\$28,761	No.
Sheffield	4,805	6,683		23,281	No.
Fairfield		5,003		14,910	No.

Population of State, 2,348,174.  
 Appropriations, \$4,410,620.  
 Per capita, \$1.87.  
 There are three cities in the State over 5,000 population without a Federal building.

NEW YORK

Cities	Population			Postal receipts	Court town
	1910	1920	1925		
White Plains	15,949	21,031	27,428	\$138,362	No.
Port Chester	12,809	16,573	19,283	85,658	No.
Watervliet	15,074	16,073	16,158	24,519	No.
Beacon		10,996	11,621	35,112	No.
Roseton	10,711	10,823	11,394	24,708	No.
Ostling	11,430	10,730	12,769	52,801	No.
Herkimer	7,820	10,463	10,910	38,971	No.
Ilion	6,588	10,109	10,429	64,245	No.
Endicott	2,408	9,500	15,027	230,923	No.
Glen Cove	8,030	8,664		33,124	No.
Freeport	4,836	8,599		46,709	No.
Johnson City		8,587		37,894	No.
Norwich	7,422	8,205		54,425	No.
Mechanicville	6,634	8,168		25,827	No.
Mannoneck	5,999	8,071		36,614	No.
Seneca Falls	6,538	6,389		51,732	No.
Rockville Center	3,667	6,282		18,469	No.
Lancaster	4,364	6,059		28,945	No.
Fredonia	5,285	6,051		34,966	No.
Medina	5,683	6,011		23,756	No.
Massena	2,921	5,993		14,411	No.
Dowagiac	5,000	5,859		60,322	No.
Hudson Falls	5,189	5,807		28,113	No.
Essex	3,954	5,708		34,433	No.
Waverly	4,855	5,270		27,701	No.
Whitehall	4,917	5,258		15,204	No.
Haverstraw	5,609	5,226		15,845	No.

Population of State, 10,335,227.  
 Appropriations, \$42,212,433.15.  
 Per capita, \$4.75.  
 There are 28 cities in the State of over 5,000 population without a Federal building.

IOWA

No city in Iowa over 5,000 population without a Federal building.  
 Population of State, 2,404,021.  
 Per capita, \$2.63.  
 Appropriations, \$6,436,127.55.

OREGON

Cities	Population			Postal receipts	Court town
	1910	1920	1925		
Corvallis	4,552	5,752		\$54,462	No.
Oregon City	4,287	5,689		50,150	No.
Bend	533	5,415		37,210	No.

Population of State 783,359.  
 Appropriations, \$9,826,628.  
 Per capita, \$4.85.  
 There are three cities in the State over 5,000 population without a Federal building.

UTAH

No city in Utah over 5,000 population without a Federal building.  
 Every city or town in the State over 3,000 has a Federal building or a site with the exception of six.  
 Population of State, 443,396.  
 Appropriations, \$1,475,000.  
 Per capita, \$3.27.

OKLAHOMA

Cities	Population			Postal receipts	Federal court town
	1910	1920	1925		
Okmulgee	4,176	17,430	25,269	\$95,883	Yes.
Bartlesville	6,181	14,417	10,182	90,515	Yes.
Sapulpa	8,263	11,084	14,207	49,028	
Picher		9,676		16,453	
Ada	4,349	8,012		37,655	Yes.
Ponca City	2,521	7,051		62,556	

OKLAHOMA—continued

Cities	Population			Postal receipts	Federal court town
	1910	1920	1925		
Miami	2,907	6,802		\$33,419	
Drumright		6,400		23,804	
Pawhuska	2,776	6,414		37,674	Yes.
Hugo	4,582	6,368		23,879	Yes.
Cushing	1,072	6,329		29,372	
Henryetta	1,671	5,869		31,015	
Vinita	4,082	5,010		25,295	Yes.
Norman	3,724	5,004		59,072	

Population of State, 2,028,293.  
 Appropriations, \$3,235,590.  
 Per capita, \$1.59.  
 There are 14 cities in the State over 5,000 population without a Federal building.

Table shows appropriations for Federal buildings

Cities	Population	Federal buildings	Per capita
New York	5,621,151	\$36,093,171	\$6.42
Chicago	2,701,705	11,535,840	4.25
Boston	748,060	11,343,945	15.16
Philadelphia	1,823,158	8,519,275	4.67
Cleveland	796,836	4,844,817	6.08+
Kansas City	324,410	2,266,030	6.58+
St. Louis	773,000	9,853,061	12.74+
Denver	256,369	3,997,436	15.50+
San Francisco	508,410	10,969,711	21.57+
Detroit	993,739	2,476,555	2.49+

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Browns]. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I also yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Browns].

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I was surprised and disappointed on reading the statement of Dr. James Empringham, who assumed the right to speak for the Episcopal Church in the matter of temperance, and who said the Episcopal Temperance Society, presumably a society of the Episcopal Church of America, was in favor of modifying the Volstead law so as to permit the manufacture and sale of light beer and wines.

I am very pleased to find upon investigation that Doctor Empringham does not speak for the Episcopal Church of America but speaks for a defunct temperance society. [Applause.] This society at one time, before the Volstead law was passed, had a membership of something like 20,000 Episcopallians. After the passage of the Volstead law there was not very much interest taken in this or many other temperance societies. They took it as a foregone conclusion that inasmuch as an amendment prohibiting the sale or manufacture of intoxicating liquors had been made to the Constitution and the law passed by an overwhelming vote of Congress was on the statute books, it would be enforced and the further work of any temperance society of this kind was really not needed, and so the society became practically a defunct society, and I presume the secretary's salary also became very small and insignificant. I find in looking up his history that this Doctor Empringham was born over in England. He was ordained in Canada. Whether he is an American citizen or not I do not know, but I have my doubts. He has had a quite varied career that I do not care to speak about here; but for him to assume to speak for the million and a quarter Episcopallians in this country is something not only presumptuous and ridiculous but something which the facts show he had not the slightest authority to do. [Applause.]

I want first to read just a short statement from the bishop here in Washington, Bishop Freeman, who says:

The statement made by Mr. Empringham does not in any respect represent the mind of the Episcopal Church. It is an individual opinion proceeding from one who holds an office in an organization that for years past has been semioribund. The only authoritative body of this church is the general convention. Such statements as Doctor Empringham's, without any indorsement or backing, must be taken as purely individual opinion. It is safe to say that no such expression of opinion could proceed from the authoritative voice of the church. The present law has been in operation comparatively a few years, and no adequate test has been made of it. Its effect may be disclosed inequities and inconsistencies, but it is the basic law of the land and as such must be obeyed. It is an unfortunate thing for any representative of the Christian Church by word or act to condone the offense of those who evade or willfully violate the law. It is hardly the business of the church or any of its representatives to seek to promote a senti-

ment that is inimical to the duly constituted authority of the church. If the chosen officers of the church would address themselves more vigorously to the upbuilding of the moral character of our people, there would be need for fewer laws to regulate human conduct.

[Applause.]

I have the testimony here of very many other bishops and clergy who had once been members of this temperance society of the Episcopal Church, and they were not even invited to this little townhouse meeting where this man passed the resolutions that were given such publicity. The force back of the resolutions of Empringham is about the same as the force back of the resolutions adopted by the three men who met in the city of London and passed resolutions that began, "We the people of London." Empringham speaks in about that same capacity for the Episcopal Church of America.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. A number of our colleagues here in the House are Episcopallians, does the gentleman know of a single one of them who indorses the sentiment of this "defunct secretary in New York"?

Mr. BROWNE. No.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can name one.

Mr. BLANTON. Which one?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Myself.

Mr. BROWNE. So far as I can ascertain, none of them indorses it. Representative Caness, of Minnesota, a vestryman of the Episcopal Church at Duluth, informs me that he and the other members that he has talked with repudiate Empringham's statement.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] is the only one I have ever heard of, and coming from New York I am not surprised.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Well, that is not a fair statement. We have many good Episcopallians in New York.

Mr. BROWNE. I want to read from a statement of the Bishop of my own State, who is a man of national reputation, Bishop Reginald Weller, and other bishops that stand high in the Episcopal Church and who voice my sentiments, and, I think, the sentiments of 95 per cent of Episcopallians of America:

I think the prohibition amendment as interpreted by the Volstead Act has done as much good as could have been expected, considering the looseness of its enforcement. During a long period it has been a football for politicians, but at present seems to be in the hands of its friends, who are making reasonable progress. The old saloon system, with all its attending evils, was under the control of the breweries and the distillers and any radical amendment of the Volstead Act would put them in the saddle again. I do not think we can afford to admit that the liquor ring is stronger than the Government, nor do I think the Supreme Court would allow Congress to practically nullify the Constitution. (Bishop R. N. Weller, of Fond du Lac, Wis.)

Many bishops and other leaders of the Episcopal Church, both clerical and lay, have repudiated Dr. James Empringham and the statement issued by the Church Temperance Society urging the modification of the Volstead Act. This organization is declared to be moribund, to be small in membership, not prohibition in character, and without any authority to speak in behalf of the church. Among the many replies to Doctor Empringham from bishops and others the following, published by the New York Times, are significant:

I entirely disapprove of the stand of the Church Temperance Society favoring modification of the Volstead Act. The history of the State of Kansas has demonstrated the value of prohibition and the practicability of its enforcement. (Bishop James Wise, of Topeka, Kans.)

Empringham statement does not represent church's attitude. What he may say, or small groups employing him, does not express the mind of the Episcopal Church. Most heartily disagree with his recommendations. After living 10 years in old Chicago red-light district as chairman of Chicago's first municipal vice commission, am convinced conditions to-day improved tremendously over wet years—socially, economically, morally—notwithstanding deplorable disregard for law enforcement in certain quarters and among certain classes; drunkenness throughout old district almost universally due to beer drinking and vice protection by brewery interests.

Return to beer is for no other reason than to provide intoxicants. Those who deny this are either ignorant or interested in doing so. Volstead Act law is here to stay. Fathers and mothers and wives who have suffered will prevent its modification, which would ultimately and intentionally end its usefulness. It can be upheld and is bound to be more and more as time passes. (Walter Taylor Sumner, Bishop of Portland, Oreg.)

Bishop William T. Manning, of New York, in his sermon Sunday, February 7, 1920:

There is at the present time much discussion of the question of prohibition, and in view of the great importance of this question to the life of our people I feel it right, as bishop of this diocese, to make some statements upon the subject and to state clearly my own judgment in regard to it.

Let me say first that undue importance has been attached to certain statements made in the name of the society known as the Church Temperance Society. This society has no official authorization and no right whatever to speak in the name of the Episcopal Church. It is a voluntary association and its statements have only such weight as may attach to those of any voluntary organization. They are not to be taken as representing the mind of the Episcopal Church. For some years past the church has scarcely been aware of the existence of this society and it has not been regarded as having weight and influence in the church.

#### CITES HOUSE OF BISHOPS' STAND

How the findings were reached which were recently announced in the name of the society and whether this announcement was authorized and indorsed by the society itself we have still to learn. The mind of the House of Bishops was expressed at the general convention in New Orleans last October by the adoption without a dissenting vote of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That facing the danger of the spirit of lawlessness in American life we welcome the renewed efforts of the Government of the United States to enforce strictly and impartially the prohibition laws and the antinarcotic laws which are so widely and cynically disregarded, and we call upon the people of our church to set a good example of that obedience to law without which no democracy can endure."

As indicating the mind of our own diocese our diocesan convention in 1923, after full consideration, adopted a resolution appealing to Governor Smith to veto the bill repealing the Mullan-Gage law. No action by the convention since that time has suggested any change in its sentiment upon the subject.

My own judgment and conviction upon this question remain what they were when I addressed our convention upon the subject in 1922. I have given much study to the question and have considered carefully the evidence presented by those who believe in prohibition and by those who are opposed to it and I have found no reason to change my views. I do not hold that to drink wine or other intoxicant in moderation is in itself a sin. But I believe that the prohibition law, properly enforced, will make us a healthier, stronger, and better people, and I believe that these laws can be and ought to be enforced and are being more and more generally observed in the country as a whole.

Am wholly out of sympathy with statements of the Church Temperance Society, which does not speak for the Episcopal Church, and probably has not members in the West. The Episcopal Church in these parts is whole-hearted on the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act. To modify the law would but open the way to further lawlessness. Most of us are glad to obey the law and rejoice in the good influence upon our economic and social life. (Bishop R. H. Mize, of Salina, Kans.)

Terrible things have been attributed to prohibition which have had other causes and which would have been worse without the constitutional amendment. This is true of the behavior of young people. It is the extreme of the new freedom, and parents are reaping the harvest of the laxity, materialism, and irreligion they themselves have sown.

The disrespect for law had a serious menace in this country even before the World War. I believe that the general condition of our people in this country has been decidedly improved by prohibition. Prohibition is a huge national social experiment in the result of which the world is interested. Let respectable people, and, above all, Christians, set an example of loyalty to law; let them deny themselves for the sake of weaker brethren. Such a stand will turn the tide in favor of prohibition and give us a Nation sober and prosperous. (Bishop Lewis W. Burton, of Lexington, Ky.)

Bishop Lines, of Newark, entirely disapproves of the action of the officers of the Church Temperance Society and thinks no one ought to regard it as expressing in any way the minds of the Episcopal Church. The society had no official connection with the Episcopal Church whatever, and the friends of strong drink are seeking unwarranted comfort from the report, while the enemies of strong drink should not be discouraged.

I do not believe this action of the Church Temperance Society represents the feeling of the majority of the members of the Episcopal Church of the country. I did not vote for the Volstead law, but I



would not vote to have it repealed. I disapprove of the principle of the modification of the act, because I do not believe there is a middle ground. (Bishop George A. Beecher, of Hastings, Nebr.)

#### WHO IS DOCTOR EMPRINGHAM

The Rev. George C. Wadsworth, rector of Christ Church, Oil City, Pa., a member of the Church Temperance Society, answers the question, "Who is Doctor Empringham?" in his sermon last Sunday, when he discussed the organization which he described as "sleepy, dead-and-alive." He said:

In the first place, who is Rev. James Empringham, that he presumes to speak for the Episcopal Church or any part thereof? I first became acquainted with Doctor Empringham about 20 years ago, when he had been in the country only a short time. He is an Englishman by birth and in Canadian orders. Whether he is an American citizen or not, I do not know. His doctor's degree was given him by Syracuse University in 1911. When I first knew him he was working in the interests of a well-known fraternal society and acted as Sunday "supply" in various vacant parishes in the diocese of central New York. Among these was St. Pauls, Syracuse, the largest and most influential parish in the city. Attracting attention by his unusual ability as a preacher, Doctor Empringham was engaged by the vestry as special preacher and acted in that capacity until he was actually called to the rectorship in 1907. Doctor Lockwood, the former rector, had died in 1904.

It was while Doctor Empringham was at St. Pauls that he made overtures to me to become his assistant; but, after seeking counsel of friends, I decided to remain at my post. I have never regretted my decision. Shortly after I had become rector of Christ Church, Troy, however, I was surprised to hear that he had resigned St. Pauls to become associated with the Anti-Saloon League. The reason given was that he felt a special "call" to the work, but it was an open secret that the book "The Episcopal Church, for Which Does She Stand?" published by Doctor Empringham, a copy of which I have in my library, had greatly interfered with his usefulness as a parish priest.

While Doctor Empringham was connected with the Anti-Saloon League, he visited me a number of times in Troy and spoke in my church. I tried to get him other appointments, but the storm raised by his book somewhat prejudiced him in the eyes of the clergy. I recall attending a great session of the legislature in Albany with him, when the late William Jennings Bryan appeared before one of the committees. It was about this time, or a short time before, that Doctor Empringham went over to the Church Temperance Society, a sleepy, dead-and-alive church organization, whose conception of "temperance" was that of a former diocesan of mine in the East who solemnly cautioned his clergy at an annual convention to use "moderation" in their drinking.

There is no doubt that Doctor Empringham put new life in the Church Temperance Society. I became an active member myself, and still consider myself a member. Indeed, he was kind enough to make me a "volunteer speaker," and my name was published in this connection in the society's organ, *Temperance*.

In 1919 an old friend of mine, Rev. Douglas Mathews, left his parish at Nutley, N. J., and became a traveling secretary for the Church Temperance Society. Doctor Empringham again visited me in Troy and urged me to follow Mr. Mathews's example. After giving the matter careful consideration I again declined to associate myself with him; and again I have never regretted my decision.

When the nation-wide campaign was put into operation, the Church Temperance Society was not underwritten and at the same time it was prevented, as all church organizations were prevented, from making special appeals. Mr. Mathews and other members of the staff were obliged to find employment elsewhere. Doctor Empringham was retained, but for the last five or six years has not been heard from.

A paper informs us that Rev. G. A. Carstensen, rector of Holy Rood Church, New York City, "who was elected president last month, indorsed Doctor Empringham's statement." The impression is conveyed that Doctor Carstensen, whom some of you will recall as having been rector of Meadville from 1878 to 1882, is president of the Church Temperance Society.

The *Living Church Annual*, which is a semi-official publication of the Episcopal Church, states on page 221 that Rev. James V. Chalmers is president and that Bishop Darlington is vice president. I assume that this is a correct statement, as I have seen no notice in the church papers either of Doctor Chalmers's death or resignation. This being the case, I am assuming that Doctor Carstensen is president of the New York Clerical Club, before which Doctor Empringham appeared, and any indorsement he may have given him was merely a personal one. Nothing is said in the Associated Press dispatch about the clergy having indorsed Doctor Empringham's findings by a resolution or otherwise. I shall be interested in reading what the New York Churchman has to say about it.

Another matter must be explained: Bishop Talbot is listed as "patron" of the Church Temperance Society. Every well-informed churchman should know that until the first of the year Bishop Talbot was presiding bishop of the American Episcopal Church, a position corresponding to that of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the Church of England; and as such he was bound to be "patron" of every national church organization. Bishop Talbot is, therefore, no more responsible for Doctor Empringham's opinion than you are.

There are two statements which the press dispatch reports Doctor Empringham as having made which I should like to analyze. First, that the subject was submitted to the membership of the Church Temperance Society, a body consisting, we are told, of 20,000 persons, in the form of a questionnaire last October. As I remarked a few minutes ago, I consider myself a member of the Church Temperance Society, yet I do not recall ever having received any such document. Furthermore, if everyone of the 20,000 voted in favor of the modification of the eighteenth amendment to our National Constitution, does Doctor Empringham presume for one instant that these "20,000" represent the registered communicant membership of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, numbering something better than a million and a quarter souls? In my opinion Doctor Empringham is speaking neither for the Church Temperance Society nor for the Protestant Episcopal Church. He is speaking for James Empringham and a small group of other foreign-born persons to whom the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment may have been a personal hardship.

Second, Doctor Empringham states he has made a "personal survey" throughout the United States during the "past 18 months." A pretty big job for one man. I wonder if Doctor Empringham really believes this statement himself? But whether he does or doesn't, we have only his word for it and what that is worth, people who have known him longer and more intimately than I have, should be able to judge.

There is this to be said, however. A dozen different individuals might make a dozen different "surveys," with a dozen different findings. Doctor Empringham says America is more drunken than France. "Pussyfoot" Johnson said the other Sunday in a lecture here in Oil City that there is less drunkenness in New York than in Paris. New York is the larger city, and Mr. Johnson gave figures. But Mr. Johnson is an American, and he would not be apt to describe his country as "drunken."

Laying aside, then, all personalities, there is this to be said: Any individual who thinks he is speaking for the whole church is taking a good deal for granted, and when anybody tells you that the Episcopal Church is not solidly behind the eighteenth amendment and its enforcement—well, tell them anything you please, but make them prove their statement. As a church we have always been the friend of regularly constituted government, for we are a constitutional church and believe firmly in the principles of democracy. Does your governor believe in law enforcement? Well, your governor is an Episcopalian. Does Senator PEPPER believe in law enforcement? Senator PEPPER has been a deputy to general convention for years.

Personally, statements similar to those Doctor Empringham is reported to have made are little less than insulting both to my intelligence and to my church loyalty. As an American churchman I resent the imputation that the Episcopal Church is in favor of legalizing the manufacture and sale of light wines and beer. It is a ghastly libel.

But we must bear witness. And there is plenty of scriptural warrant for it. "For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men."

The news story to which I referred at the beginning points out that Bishop Ward, of Erie, is one of the vice presidents of the Church Temperance Society. This is perfectly true. And does Doctor Empringham presume to speak for Bishop Ward?

As an officer of the Church Temperance Society and as an American citizen Bishop Ward may have felt that it would be just as well to officially commit the Episcopal Church on the subject of law enforcement. He may have had in mind a situation similar to that which has been precipitated in New York by Doctor Empringham. At any rate the following resolution was offered by our bishop at general convention in New Orleans last October, and, according to the *Living Church* of October 31, unanimously adopted:

*Resolved*, That, facing the danger of the spirit of lawlessness in American life, we welcome the renewed efforts of the Government of the United States to enforce strictly and impartially the prohibition and antinarcotic laws, which are so widely and cynically disregarded; and we call upon the people of our church to set a good example of obedience to law, without which no democracy can endure."

Strong words, these!

The only way that the Episcopal Church can speak officially upon any subject is through general convention. There can be no misinterpreting Bishop Ward's resolution. Its language is unmistakable. There is not the slightest reference to "modification." Nothing is said about the "exemption of light wines and beer." It speaks of enforcing

strictly and impartially the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. And his resolution was unanimously carried.

Here is something from an editorial that appeared in the New York Churchman under date of October 10, 1925. It should prove interesting reading to those who have been disturbed by the Empringham pronouncement: "One of the greatest contributions to the American churches of to-day has been made by that fact-finding section of the Federal Council of Churches, which is called the research department. In bringing out its 30,000 word report on the subject of prohibition it has once again proved the efficiency, intelligence, thoroughness, and courage of its personnel. The indifferent attitude of the Government toward sincere enforcement is roundly condemned. The only hope for the actual working of the prohibition law, the investigators state, depends upon genuine enforcement efforts by the Federal authorities and the creation of a body of public opinion to support such enforcement. The question of the right or wrong of a liquor supply for the American people does not seem to enter into the present problem. The people who had intoxicants had them before the Volstead Act, and they have them now. The present issue, the editor of the Churchman concludes, is the rapid growth of a new criminal class in the country; the widespread hypocrisy, deceit, and general disrespect for all laws, the gradual undermining of the effectiveness of our democratic system.

Nothing is said about "modification" or the exemption of light wines and beer; but this is one of the strongest indictments of American governmental laxity and insincerity that I have read anywhere.

If time would permit, I could quote the Living Church, of Milwaukee, published in the very community that was said to have been made famous by a certain brand of beer; but anyone at all acquainted with the intense Americanism of Frederick Cook Morehouse will understand what I mean when I say that nothing has ever been published over his signature that was not strictly in keeping with Bishop Ward's resolution and the attitude of American churchmen generally.

Undoubtedly those opposed to law enforcement would welcome the slightest suggestion that the Episcopal church is not squarely behind the operation of the eighteenth amendment. But they are doomed to disappointment. Officially and in the church press the church has spoken, and there can be no question as to her position. "For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men."

I have no personal grievance against Doctor Empringham nor any other man, be he priest or layman, whose opinion differs from my own on the subject of the prohibition laws. There are just two things that I would like to make perfectly clear: First, as long as the eighteenth amendment remains on our statute books as part of the Constitution of these United States it is our duty as American citizens to see that it is "strictly and impartially" enforced. Second, at best, Doctor Empringham and other "new" Americans, whatever their position in the church, speak for themselves and themselves only. The Episcopal church has spoken officially on the subject of the eighteenth amendment, and for every loyal American churchman there can be no other voice.

I consider the action of the Church Temperance Society ill-advised and harmful in its effect. While I believe much more in temperance than in prohibition, I feel strongly that so long as the Volstead Act is in effect the law should be obeyed. The Church Temperance Society, which is a voluntary organization, does not and can not speak for the church. (Bishop Joseph M. Frances, of Indianapolis, Ind.)

The church can ill afford to indulge in a discussion that must inevitably result in weakening of law enforcement. It is the business of the church to stand for the enforcement of law. It weakens its whole appeal when it joins with those who to-day are utterly heedless of their obligations to what is the duly constituted law of the land.

If the church would address itself more unremittingly to the supreme business of strengthening the moral character of the people it would gain a firmer hold upon those who to-day lightly esteem it.

Such pronouncements as those recently made have behind them nothing of authority and make no impression whatever upon public opinion. The lawmaking bodies of this country are not affected by statements that proceed from such sources. (Bishop James E. Freeman, of Washington, D. C.)

In answer to your inquiry would state that as vice president for many years of the Church Temperance Society, and one of its oldest members, I was shocked to read in the newspapers of the contemplated change in its policy from its past ardent support of the prohibition law. The society at its beginning supported high license laws, but when they were found to be almost worthless in controlling liquor excesses, its new superintendent, Doctor Empringham, published strong prohibition articles in our magazine called Temperance.

When the Volstead Act was passed, many felt that the society had accomplished its work, and so regular publication of the paper ceased

for a time, and the society advocated other reforms. Though I have paid dues to the society, I have received no notice of meetings for several years and had no knowledge of the recent meeting of the society, and so did not attend, and think that the bishops and other clergy and laity are by any great majority against exempting wine and beer, and in favor of supporting President Coolidge in the strict enforcement of the prohibition law as it now stands, as it has been so successful in the rural districts and many cities. There should be another meeting of the society held soon to reconsider and express the will of the majority of the church.

Bishop Talbot, recent presiding bishop, and I are both in favor of the present law. Bishop Colmore, of Porto Rico, told me yesterday that he held the same view. Bishop Ward, of Erie, favors prohibition, and his splendid resolution for stricter law enforcement was passed unanimously in the house of bishops in New Orleans last October.

Rescue missions know that beer drunkards are hardest to reform. When I was in Berlin to lecture at the university last July, a large vote was polled in the German Reichstag to limit the brewers' purchases of barley so starving children could have bread.

Due to the Volstead law there are now no open legalized liquor saloons from the Atlantic to the Pacific, wherein bad women and worse men, gamblers, panders, and vote buyers can meet and corrupt our youth. In former coal strikes like the present there were rioting and bloodshed, but thanks to our prohibitionist and churchman, Governor Pinchot, and our law-enforcing judges, with miners idle for six months and much poverty and distress, there has been no disorder, no law breaking. To weaken the national prohibition law, which is working so admirably when properly supported by the State authorities, would be criminal foolishness, and the plain people and business interests of the country will never submit to it. The diocese of Harrisburg, which covers a territory larger than the four States of Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Delaware, has twice in diocesan conventions voted unanimously for strict prohibition enforcement. (Bishop James Henry Darlington, of Harrisburg, Pa.)

While not opposed to light wine and beer in themselves, I am opposed to any modification of the Volstead Act or the eighteenth amendment so long as civil officers are so remiss in enforcing the law, and church members and other leading citizens show such utter disregard, not of that particular statute but of law, by persistently and openly disobeying it. (Bishop W. Blair Roberts, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.)

I heartily disapprove any action which makes more difficult the enforcement of the prohibitory law. (Bishop S. M. Griswold, of Evanston, Ill.)

Years ago I became an honorary vice president of the Church Temperance Society, as I thought it was helping the cause of temperance. No one has a right to assume that the men who were interested in this society years ago approve of Doctor Empringham's present stand. Personally, I am strongly opposed to the modification of the Volstead Act and heartily in favor of the strictest enforcement of that act and of the eighteenth amendment. I think the strict and impartial enforcement of these laws would result in the greatest economical, social, and general advance of the whole Nation. As Attorney General Sargent pointed out, the real problem is to persuade otherwise respectable and law-abiding citizens to cease bribing bootleggers to break the laws of the United States. This great task of education and conversion is part of the responsibility of all the churches. (Bishop John C. Ward, of Erie, Pa.)

Utterances by other bishops and officials follow:

The Church Temperance Society of the Episcopal Church is of small membership and has no official connection with the church. I am not acquainted with the Rev. Dr. James Empringham, its superintendent, and to my knowledge there are no members of that society in Chicago. (Charles F. Anderson, Bishop of Chicago.)

As far as I can recall, I never was asked to vote on the question, and I am quite sure that I never did vote on it. The Church Temperance Society has no authority to speak for anybody but itself. It does not speak for me or the church. (Bishop Philip Cook, of Delaware, an honorary vice president of the society.)

The Right Rev. Charles K. Gilbert, executive secretary of the Social Service Commission of the Diocese of New York and secretary of the diocese, says that the Church Temperance Society was supposed to be defunct until Doctor Empringham's announcement. Doctor Gilbert says:

I did not hear the address which Doctor Empringham made before the Churchmen's Association on February 1, in which he gave his personal views on the prohibition amendment. The Churchmen's Association is an organization of Episcopal clergy meeting for social purposes only, and one of its rules is that publicity shall never be given matters which come before it. It would therefore be unfortunate if the



impression were given that the association has in any way indorsed Doctor Empringham's sentiments.

Of course, Doctor Empringham has no right to speak in any way for the Episcopal Church. It is my understanding that the Church Temperance Society, of which Doctor Empringham is nominally the secretary, has been practically defunct since 1918. Differences arose at that time which resulted in the resignation of many members of its governing board, and the resources of the society have since been so depleted that little active work has been maintained. It is not clear to me on what ground he speaks even for the Church Temperance Society.

It is difficult to believe that this society now has 20,000 members or that it ever had that many. And if a questionnaire were sent to that number of people, it would be important to know just how many replies were received. This Doctor Empringham fails to state.

As executive secretary of the Social Service Commission in the Diocese of New York, I can state that the matter has never come before it in any way, nor have any of its members been consulted. I can also state that the same is true of the department of social service of our National Council.

The remarks of the superintendent of the Church Temperance Society, if correctly reported, seem to me not to be based upon a thorough investigation of conditions throughout the country, especially in rural districts. Whatever criticism on theoretical grounds may be made of the principle of prohibition, I believe the duty of the hour is to promote the observance of the present law among all, rather than to hazard the experiment of a modification, which we are by no means certain would diminish the evils that arrive from the defiant attitude of some people. I therefore disapprove of the attempt to modify the Volstead Act. (Bishop Benjamin Brewster, of Maine.)

For more than 100 years prohibition was intensively and extensively studied and discussed. No question ever decided by the American people was better understood. Before national prohibition went into effect 33 States, acting separately for themselves, had adopted prohibition. More than three-fifths of the people and four-fifths of the territory were under prohibition. The eighteenth amendment was submitted by a vote of more than two-thirds of both Houses of the United States Congress and has been ratified by 46 of the 48 States.

By opinion of the United States Supreme Court in 1920 both the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead enforcement code were declared to be constitutional. With prohibition and every other law the good of the people can be enforced by placing men in authority who have the inclination, courage, and ability to do what they are paid and sworn to do. For these reasons and for the fact that prohibition is succeeding, I am opposed to the new position taken by the Church Temperance Society of the Episcopal Church, if correctly stated in the press, favoring modification of the Volstead Act to legalize beer and wine. I do not agree with the sentiments expressed by the Rev. Doctor Empringham. (Bishop J. P. Tyler, of Fargo, N. Dak.)

The announcement favoring modification of the Volstead law distresses me as lining up Doctor Empringham's unofficial society with organized liquor traffic, which is impeding law enforcement. In Texas good citizens sought not to modify the law against cattle stealing, but gradually reduced the violation to a minimum by destroying offending organizations. Our church stands on the official action of the 1916 general convention and the 1917 house of bishops, as follows:

"This church places itself on record as favoring such action in our legislative assemblies as will conserve the largest interest of temperance and the repression of the liquor traffic." (Journal of general convention of 1916, p. 328.)

"And, grateful for the action of the President and of Congress in restricting the manufacture and sale of liquor, we urge all to support the authorities in enforcing the law and to set a personal example of abstinence."

Individuals or societies taking any other position repudiate the church's position and in my opinion impede righteousness. (Bishop E. Cecil Seaman, of North Texas.)

I recognize the truth of much that is said as to the increase of drinking among certain groups and classes of people, the lowering of standards, the flask carrying, and other disgusting and degrading practices which have been introduced among those who ought to know better and to have nobler ideals of life. I recognize the evil and corruption connected with bootlegging in which, let us remember, the respected members of society who patronize the bootlegger and so create him are just as reprehensible as the men whom they thus tempt and pay to violate the law.

We must remember, however, that the pictures of these violations of the law are drawn usually by those who wish to use them as an argument for the repeal or modification of the law. Other laws of our

land are difficult of enforcement and are frequently violated, but we do not, therefore, suggest their modification or repeal. We must consider this law not in its effect upon certain groups or communities who willfully choose to defy and violate it, but in its effects upon the life of our country as a whole, and so considered there is, in my judgment, no room for serious doubt as to its beneficial results.

By a great part of our people we see this law respected and obeyed. We see its observance in the country as a whole increasing and not decreasing. We see the lives and homes of our wage earners and our plain people immeasurably benefited by it. We see in many places jails closed because they are no longer needed. We see in such a situation as the present coal strike the entire absence of disturbance and disorder as a result largely of the prohibition laws. There is not the slightest likelihood that the country will ever repeal the prohibition laws, and we all know this.

#### CALLS WET PLANK IMPOSSIBLE

Neither of the two great political parties could be prevailed upon even to consider a wet plank in its platform. Any political party which adopted such a plank would sign its own death warrant.

I do not believe that the Volstead Act should be modified at this time. When the law is being so observed by all that we can be assured that its modification would not mean its practical nullification; when its modification is desired by the sincere friends as well as by the enemies of prohibition, some modification of it may and probably will be made.

The return to the sale of wines and beer which some are advocating would, in my judgment, increase and not reduce the present evils and would make any enforcement of the law impossible. I do not believe that the country as a whole would listen to this.

I see that some of our bishops and clergy say that this law can not be enforced. Instead of saying that it can not be enforced, let us do our part to arouse the spirit which will insure its enforcement and give our help more strongly to our brethren and the other authorities who are laboring far more earnestly than we to secure this.

Let me present briefly three or four of the main facts in regard to this question as I see them:

1. This law is not a wrong or evil or impious one such as we should be justified in refusing to obey. I quote the words of John G. Sargent, Attorney General of the United States, in his recent address to the New York State Bar Association: "That a traffic which for generations has been recognized and discussed, and written about by economists, sociologists, and jurists as an evil may be marked for extinction by the law-making power and agencies of the country is not only settled law, settled beyond the stage of being longer open to question, but it has been settled and rests on foundations of soundest reasoning," and our country had the full right to make that law.

The prohibition law being the law of our land, it is the duty of every good citizen to obey it. To quote the Attorney General again, "In this country the will of the people, expressed at the ballot box, creates the duty of the citizen upon the subject voted upon." The Attorney General no doubt recognizes, as I certainly do, that a law might be passed by a human tribunal so impious in its nature, so contrary to the law of God and of right that it would be our duty to defy and resist it to the death, but this is not such a law. If we are ever to resist the law in the name of personal liberty, I hope it will be in a higher cause than the right to buy and drink intoxicating liquors.

3. Those who disapprove this law have the right to say so, and to work in lawful ways for its modification, or repeal, but no citizen of our land has the right to disobey this law or to encourage others to do so, and no one can do this without reflection upon himself and injury to the life of our country. As President Coolidge has said: "It is the duty of a citizen not only to observe the law but to let it be known that he is opposed to its violation." A democracy can endure only upon the foundation of observance of the law.

4. The law has its great importance, but we must not depend only upon the law to promote temperance among our people. It is quite true that "social legislation is never a substitute for social education." In this one point, and this only, I agree with the recent statement made in the name of the Church Temperance Society. We need and should have by all the churches a continuous campaign of information and education as to the evils, physical, intellectual, economic, moral, and spiritual, which have cursed the world as the result of the use of intoxicating drinks.

#### URGES VOLUNTARY SUPPORT

5. Last, I wish that we might lift this subject up from the level of mere law enforcement to the higher level of free, voluntary, willing support of the law for the sake of the common good.

In view of what our race has suffered through the evils of strong drink, in view of the agony which fathers, mothers, and children have suffered from it, in view of the fact that its suppression means the reduction of poverty, sorrow, disease, and crime, may we not all of us be willing and glad to make such surrender of our personal liberties, or of our tastes, as the law calls for and to see prohibition fully and fairly tried.

We know that it was good for the young men of our land during the war, and we know that it is equally good for them now. We are all stirred with pride and admiration at the wonderful and heroic rescue of those in danger by Captain Fried and the officers and men of the *President Roosevelt*. That is an example which is an honor to our country and gives all of us a fresh impulse for nobler living. What a magnificent thing it would be if for the aid of those who are endangered by strong drink we should all of us give our full support to the prohibition laws. What better exhibition could there be of the idealism of America than such willing surrender of our preferences and tastes for the good of all and for the help especially of our weaker brethren? Shall we not all give our help to it?

There is no nobler spirit than that which says with St. Paul, "If meat maketh my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh forevermore, that I make not my brother to stumble."

I wish that the clergy of our church and of all churches all over our land would join in a crusade for such voluntary and noble action in support of the law, and that the people of all churches and all good citizens would unite in such a movement. Can anyone doubt that this would be for the moral and spiritual good of our country?

The Right Rev. Warren L. Rogers, bishop coadjutor of Ohio, in commenting on the Church Temperance Society's change of policy, said at Union Theological Seminary Sunday that he believed the announcement was made in sincerity, but that he did not see "how legalizing light wines and beer will help the situation any."

"That doesn't go to the heart of the problem at all," he added. "The situation is much more serious than to be solved by a solution that is in effect no solution at all."

"I am well aware of the seriousness of the situation in respect to the young people. The laborer is hardest hit, but then I do not know that the laborer is protesting very much against the Volstead Act."

Bishop Rogers said the country would never vote "wet" again, and expressed the belief that a referendum would favor the eighteenth amendment.

"Our general convention is the only body that has the right to speak for the Episcopal Church on subjects of this kind. As indicating, however, the mind of Episcopallians in the diocese of New York, I might refer to the action taken by our diocesan convention in 1923, when by unanimous resolution appeal was made to Governor Smith to withhold his signature from the bill repealing the Mullan-Gage law. Thoughtful members of the Episcopal Church will recognize the right of any man to seek by legitimate means the modification of the Volstead Act, but it by no means follows that the sentiment of the Episcopal Church favors such modification."

Canon William Sheafe Chase, of Brooklyn, says:

"I am amazed at the announcement. I am a member of the board of directors of the Church Temperance Society, and I am surprised that I received no announcement of the annual meeting at the town hall and had had no intimation from any source that such an absolute reversal of the policy of the society was even contemplated. I am exceedingly anxious to have a meeting of the board of directors and have requested Doctor Carstensen to ask for one at the earliest possible date."

"I do not for a moment believe that the board of directors would indorse the attitude taken by Doctor Empringham. I understood that the society had chiefly gone into health work and into such scientific instruction as demonstrates the wisdom of total abstinence. I certainly do not agree with the findings as reported in this morning's newspapers. They do not at all agree with the sentiments of Doctor Empringham as he has expressed himself in my hearing."

"I believe that the Volstead Act needs modification, but in such a way as not to nullify but to make it easier to enforce the prohibition amendment. Prohibition has not had a fair trial. The chief modification should be that which was promised in the last national platform of the Republican Party—to put all prohibition agents under civil service, as advocated by the Cramton bill, which also takes their appointment out of politics and gives the prohibition department full control of all industrial alcohol. The enforcement of the Volstead Act should be taken from the Treasury Department, whose business it is to collect money, not to punish crime—to put it into a department where it can be free from the interference of corrupt politics. Prohibition agents should receive more than the minimum salary of \$1,680 and a maximum of \$2,150 a year, and they should not be obliged to drink intoxicating liquor in order to obtain evidence of sale or possession."

"All aliens convicted of violation of the prohibition law should be deported. Congress should establish Federal police courts to try small prohibition law violations, such as possession and transportation of liquor. All druggists' Federal liquor-selling permits should be abolished."

"The prohibition law is succeeding as well as the laws against murder, burglary, and gambling. The mistake which Doctor Empringham seems to make is in judging the progress of prohibition by its distance from the goal of perfect enforcement rather than by its distance from

its starting point six years ago. Not prohibition but politics is failing."

Mrs. Ella B. Boole, president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, says:

"The Church Temperance Society of the Episcopal Church years ago was a moderation society. They did not have a total abstinence pledge as a condition of membership. When Doctor Empringham became the superintendent he was interested in prohibition, but did not always have the support of the members of his society in pushing it."

"For the last few years he has given his time to the Health Education Society and has not been doing very much in prohibition work. So that, while I am exceedingly sorry that he personally has changed his mind, I do not consider that the referendum he has taken shows a great change in the mind of the Church Temperance Society."

"As for Doctor Carstensen, I don't believe I have heard of him before. He has not been identified with the temperance movement as far as I know. The Church Temperance Society's definition of temperance is not the same as it is in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, where we are for total abstinence. They have the old idea."

Mrs. Boole said she did not believe there was any let down in the activities of temperance organizations as a result of prohibition.

"We are mobilizing for law observance and law enforcement. We all recognize that there has been inadequate prohibition enforcement. We all recognize that prohibition has not had as good a chance as it ought to have. But it takes time to put it over, just as it takes time to put over all reforms."

Rev. Dr. Daniel A. Pelling, of the Marble Collegiate Church, New York, and international president of the Christian Endeavor Society, makes this statement:

"I believe that Doctor Empringham very seriously misrepresents this great Protestant communion."

"I do not believe that the Episcopal Church will officially or unofficially have anything to do with a campaign for prohibition modification and law repeal. If Doctor Empringham and those associated with him were to speak for the Episcopal Church it would mean that the saddest blow of a generation had been struck against church federation and the growing spirit of Christian unity."

"Immediately after the passage of the prohibition amendment there was a decided slump in temperance education. That slump is past. In my opinion conditions, including law observance and law enforcement, are steadily improving and are immeasurably better than they were before prohibition."

The charge made by Doctor Empringham that the World League Against Alcoholism tried to bring pressure upon him to prevent the publication of the report has been denied by Robert E. Corradini of that league, who says:

"Press says Episcopal Church Temperance Society preparing to make a public admission of the failure of prohibition. Cable fact."

"I saw Doctor Empringham and he authorized the following statement, which was cabled to London within three hours after we received the first inkling of this report:

"Doctor Empringham, secretary. Society authorized following: 'Report absolutely without foundation; attitude church society unchanged.'"

"Doctor Empringham deliberately led us to believe that the report was not against the present status of prohibition. He told us that the only thing on which we might take issue would be a statement in the report, in which they regret that temperance education has been lagging since the advent of the eighteenth amendment."

"Press reports state that pressure has been brought to bear upon Doctor Empringham from 'across the Atlantic,' this pressure emanating from the 'World Alliance Against Alcoholism.' If this last-named organization is an inaccurate version of our name, the 'World League Against Alcoholism,' and if he has reference to the cablegram which I showed to him, and I have reason to believe that such is the case, then the statement is absolutely false and knowingly so. We wanted to know the facts. We could not possibly bring pressure to bear upon Empringham if we had been deceived into believing that the report would not be unfavorable to prohibition."

"No survey can possibly show that except a hand-picked inquiry. Our office has detailed data for about 700 cities, covering every State. We are not submitting to the public, but the official records are here, open to any responsible party for inspection."

"Our records do not show that intemperance is on the increase, but to the contrary, it is decidedly on the decrease."

Commenting on the announced change of policy by the Church Temperance Society, Dr. Percy Stickney Grant, formerly rector of the Church of the Ascension in New York City, said, on Sunday in his sermon at St. Mark's-in-the-Bowery:

"I am surprised to see that 18 bishops of the Episcopal Church stand by the present 'dry' laws. The reason I am surprised is that



for years it has been hard to get support financially for the Church Temperance Society, and it has been equally hard to get permission for its representatives to speak from Episcopal pulpits, so little backing did the organization have from the communion as a whole. I know what I am talking about because I was a director of the organization.

"Considering the slight interest the Episcopal Church has taken in that form of temperance I am filled with admiration for the 18 bishops who stand by the dry law.

"But wait until the 100 per cent Protestants—the Presbyterians, and Methodists, and Baptists—got hold of this question at the polls and the enemies of prohibition will see a sight to terrify them.

"Two million of dollars have been saved to the Nation under prohibition. And we have had a better industrial population. One of the main reasons why America should have prohibition is that there are few American families which have not experienced at least one ruined life from drink."

Doctor Grant preached on the Mastery of Life, a subject chosen in view of Lincoln's birthday next Friday. He eulogized Lincoln for the emancipation of millions of negro slaves.

"The Irish, the Italians, the Germans, the Jews, are here," he said, "and it is our duty to like them and to treat them as Americans. I find all races are lovable."

The following statement in reply to Doctor Empringham was made by Wayne B. Wheeler, general counsel of the Anti-Saloon League:

"It is regrettable that the report of the temperance committee of the Episcopal Church released in New York advises modification of the national prohibition act on the ground that the law is not working satisfactorily. Evidence from New York, signally failing to accept its obligation to enforce the Constitution, does not have great weight with other States which are loyal to the Constitution.

"None of the church denominations which officially supported the Anti-Saloon League in securing the eighteenth amendment have backtracked, and I believe more individual Episcopallians are in favor of prohibition to-day than heretofore.

"The report is especially ill-timed now, because Government documents recently issued testify to prohibition's observance, enforcement, and good results. The preliminary census of prisoners shows that penal commitments dropped from 521.7 per 100,000 in 1910—an average wet year chosen by the Census Bureau and not by a dry organization—to 325.1 in 1923, a decrease of 37.7 per cent, while commitments for drunkenness fell from 185.9 to 83.1 per 100,000, a decrease of 55.3 per cent. Disorderly-conduct commitments dropped 51.5 per cent; assault cases 53.1 per cent; prostitution, 28.8 per cent; and malicious mischief, 68.8 per cent in that period. These offenses are intimately associated with drink.

"The latest report on census of paupers shows the lowest pauperism ratio in our history. The Census Bureau of Vital Statistics reports decreased death rates, which compared with the average rate for the last six wet years (excluding 1918, the influenza year) shows a saving of 1,000,000 lives in the six years of prohibition. Industrial accidents dropped from 9,997 in three wet years to 7,418 in the three dry years in coal and metal mines. Railroad accidents took a death toll of 49,975 in the last five wet years, but only 33,281 in the five dry years, with 946,237 injured while the saloons were open and 739,316 since they were closed.

"Reverse Mr. Empringham's seven points to find the facts. Instead of prohibition putting an end to scientific temperance teaching it has stimulated it. The Anti-Saloon League has reemphasized the need of education. The Scientific Temperance Federation was never so active. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union maintains its historic work in this respect. The laws of 33 States commanding such instruction in the schools are being observed and better material for such instruction is now provided.

"No evidence of increased drinking among young people exists. Charles L. Chute, general secretary of the National Probation Association, says, 'The number of spectacular crimes and the total number of law violations of all kinds have steadily decreased among juveniles since the national prohibition law went into effect.' Deans of colleges and universities and high-school principals have denied the wet slander that youth is as drunken to-day as when the license system existed.

"It's only a few years ago that the drunken college student, the university beer night, the reeling youngsters around the punch bowl at the ball, the high-school boys and girls sneaking into the saloon back room, and a host of other bacchanalian scenes made the mothers of America sing, 'Where is My Wandering Boy To-night?'

"There is more kick in a clear head and a healthy body than in all the bottles of whisky or moonshine ever brewed.

"Prohibition has not only discouraged the consumption of wine and beer, as Mr. Empringham declares, but has forbidden traffic in these liquors and reduced them to a small fraction of the former amount. If Mr. Empringham recalled the 167,740,325 gallons of distilled spirits consumed under license, he would not have made the blunder of saying that it has increased the demand for these liquors.

"Disrespect for law was not created by prohibition. The American Bar Association found it existed 80 years before the eighteenth amendment went into effect.

"There is no class legislation about prohibition. It forbids intoxicants to all alike. The rich can buy more devilry of any kind, including booze, than the poor, but the law does not cause that.

"Intemperance has not increased but decreased. With all the new severity of judges, the Census Bureau finds drunkenness commitments in 1923 were 55.3 per cent lower than in 1910. Welfare societies, health bureaus, economic experts, all report a decrease in intemperance. A man is unfortunate in his associations if he finds more intemperance than formerly.

"The Volstead Act can not be modified to permit the sale of beer and wine, even though the Episcopal Temperance Commission desires it. The eighteenth amendment forbids traffic in intoxicants. No non-intoxicating wine has ever been invented, and the wets do not want beer that is really nonintoxicating.

"To legalize wine and beer, making them cheap and easily accessible, and then to educate people not to drink them is scarcely a logical or hopeful method of attaining sobriety.

"The Supreme Court recently said of the eighteenth amendment: 'Its purpose is to suppress the entire traffic in intoxicating liquor as a beverage.'

"The courts have repeatedly indicated that the purpose of prohibition legislation is to prevent the evils growing out of the use of beverage intoxicants. It is illogical to argue on the one hand that the country is suffering from alcoholic lawlessness and on the other hand to propose an amendment to the law designed to increase the alcoholic content in permitted beverages.

"As long as the eighteenth amendment is a part of the Constitution of the United States Congress can not license the sale of liquors which are intoxicating in fact. Such a law would be declared unconstitutional by the courts.

"It is equally indefensible to suggest the withholding of the penalties necessary to make the law effective. If the manufacture of beer and wine were permitted it would necessitate places for their manufacture and sale. This would mean the return of the brewery and the saloon or its equivalent. These institutions were among the most corrupting influence in American politics.

"Prohibition was not adopted as a result of a sudden impulse during the war, as Doctor Empringham suggested. Prohibition has been a gradual growth in the United States. After 50 years of agitation it gradually extended from local option to state-wide prohibition, until at the time the eighteenth amendment was adopted 33 States had adopted State prohibition and a large portion of the remaining territory was dry under local option. Ninety-five per cent of the area of the country and 68 per cent of the people were under no license laws when the eighteenth amendment was adopted.

"Resolutions proposing national constitutional prohibition were introduced in Congress and had a substantial majority for their adoption before the United States entered the war.

"Doctor Empringham says that prohibition has been a failure. It has been a failure for the brewers who have lost their billions of income, for the distillers whose spirits are no longer used, for the saloon keepers and bartenders who have had to go to work. It is a failure for the loan shark who preyed on the saloon victims, the tenement gouger who rented slums to the worker who patronized the saloon. It is a failure for the toper who wants to stupefy himself. It is a failure for all who prey upon their fellow man. For others it is a success.

"Business authorities, such as Hoover, Gary, Ford, Scott, Babson, and others, declare prohibition an essential element in our prosperity. An unobserved, unenforced law would not achieve this.

"Disrespect for law was not brought about by prohibition, as Doctor Empringham remarks. Prohibition did not manufacture any new crimes. It outlawed the most prolific cause of crime. Behind most murders and assaults there was the mind inflamed with drink. In Washington you can see a sign, 'Here John Wilkes Booth took a drink and then went to Ford's Theater, where he murdered Abraham Lincoln.' A drink-inflamed mind sent Guiteau to the assassination of Garfield, sent Czolgosz to kill McKinley. Back of countless robberies there was the ruin wrought by drink which made its unsteady victim unable to earn honestly the money he stole. Prohibition did not manufacture false crimes or pretended crimes, but it did outlaw forever the crime factory called brewery, distillery, or saloon.

"This salutary law, as the President recently called the prohibition act, should have the support of every church denomination, and any denomination which did not give its official support to securing national prohibition should hesitate to embarrass its sister denominations which did make the sacrifice to secure this great moral victory and are keeping up the fight to make its enforcement more effective year by year."

The Rev. E. W. Gamble, rector of St. Paul's Church, Selma, Ala., in a signed statement, repudiates Doctor Empringham's utterances, saying: "I noticed in the Age-Herald of February 4 and the Selma Times Journal of same date a statement purporting to be made by the Rev.

Dr. James Empringham, national secretary of the Church Temperance Society of the Episcopal Church, that the society, which had worked for the eighteenth amendment, now will work for the modification of the Volstead Act, to permit the sale of light wine and beer.

"That a nation-wide survey of the prohibition enforcement had convinced him that the Volstead Act had undone the temperance society's 50 years of educational work against the use of alcohol.

"That a poll of 20,000 members of the society showed a preponderance in favor of modification of the law.

"I wish to state as clearly as possible that there is no Temperance Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. The general convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church has no such organization appointed by the convention, which is the only national authority that could so appoint.

"The general convention has never entertained a discussion of the question. All that Dr. James Empringham represents is a small group who may be members of the Episcopal Church, organized under the name of the Temperance Society of the Episcopal Church, which is a misnomer. It is a society in the church but not of the church. I doubt not that there are 20,000 people in the Episcopal Church who are in favor of a modification of the Volstead Act—it would be a miracle if it were not so—but what right have they to speak for more than a million Episcopallians?

"It was stated in the same article that there are also 21 bishops, members of the society; but what right has Doctor Empringham to claim that these 21 bishops represent the Episcopal Church, when there are 128 bishops who are not members of that society?

"Again it is stated by Doctor Empringham that the Volstead Act had undone the temperance society's 50 years' educational work against the use of alcohol.

"To my personal knowledge, his society did not stand against the use of alcohol until they saw that the eighteenth amendment was almost an assured fact. The society's education work was for the sale of alcohol with certain restrictions. They only came out for the eighteenth amendment as the last resort.

"I venture to assert that a large majority of the Episcopal Church are opposed to any modification of our law, but are for greater enforcement. It is my opinion that the success of enforcement of the prohibition law is simply marvelous when you consider the length of time it has been in force. It has surprised even the most ardent prohibitionists in that it has accomplished so much in so short a time.

"Let us not be alarmed when any such voice is heard against prohibition. It is one of the greatest laws that has ever been passed by man, and time and experience will never weaken but strengthen it.

"Sincerely,

"E. W. GAMBLE,

"Rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Selma, Ala."

The Venerable William Poyseor, archdeacon of the diocese of Marquette, quotes the resolutions adopted by the diocesan convention, May 26, 1925, as follows:

"Whereas the Constitution and laws of the United States are in violation and the basis of our freedom and individual rights;

"Whereas the violation of any part of the Constitution tends toward nullifying the whole; and

"Whereas the Constitution and laws of the country are continually and persistently violated in certain respects by men who are otherwise honorable and upright citizens; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this convention that an appeal be made to our people to support and uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States in every respect."

[Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Virginia that if agreeable to him I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FREE] and then move that the committee rise.

Mr. HARRISON. That will be agreeable to me.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FREE].

Mr. FREE. Mr. Chairman, we have heard much discussion from the Democratic side of this Chamber recently in regard to the necessity for a reduction of the tariff. I have had occasion to investigate the tariff on a good many products of the United States, and I have come to the conclusion that if we are suffering from anything it is from the fact that we have too little tariff on many of our products. I have been investigating the subject of canned tomatoes, a subject you would not think much of, but I find that in the United States we produce 14,500,000 cases of canned tomatoes each year valued at \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000. They are produced in a goodly number of States—Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia. That shows that this is a product that is canned very largely throughout the States of the Union. I have found that all local canneries in the United States have recently been losing

their market and looking for the reason. I find that during the year 1923 the United States imported from Italy alone 26,593,502 pounds of canned tomatoes of the value of \$1,522,299, and that in 1924 we imported 45,716,497 pounds valued at \$2,207,000.

The situation is put to me in a letter which I have just received from one of the canners to-day, which says:

SAN JOSE, CALIF., February 1, 1926.

Hon. ARTHUR FREE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FREE: The writer has tried many, many times to write you on the same subject which you have written us in reference to Italian canned tomatoes and Salsina.

The Italian canned tomatoes and Salsina are the biggest competition that California, and maybe all the United States, has. In the first place, California has the most competition because California tomatoes come in quality that means color, flavor, and taste next to Italian tomatoes. For an illustration, before 1925 we were selling in New York market about 150,000 cases of standard California tomatoes and a large block of Salsina. Now we are shut off from the New York market.

The writer in 1923 traveled all over Europe, and went to Italy for the purpose of investigating how the canning industry was carried on, and found that men were working for 10 lire a day, equal to 40 cents of American money, and women for 8 lire per day, equal to 32 cents in American money; in addition, they were working about 14 hours per day. Furthermore, the freight from Naples to New York is cheaper than Baltimore to New York, and even from Naples to San Francisco for about 45 to 50 cents per 100 pounds on tramp steamers. For this reason the competition is so keen that the Italian canners can sell in all eastern markets 3-pound solid-pack cans for much less than we can sell 2½-pound standard grade.

The growing of tomatoes and all expenses that are required from planting the seed to a finished product ready for the market is accordingly cheaper when you compare them with us. In the condition under which we are working there is no comparison between ourselves and the Italian tomatoes. As you know, Mr. FREE, we are paying from 40 to 60 cents an hour for unskilled labor during the canning season, and according to California law the minimum wages that a female cannery worker must make is \$16 a week, and if she makes less than that we must add the difference. In our cannery the average wage during the canning season is between \$45 to \$50 a week.

Now, Mr. FREE, I hope that you will take all these matters into consideration, because if the Congress will not raise the tariff up to 40 to 50 per cent ad valorem, the tomato industry in the Western States will be killed.

We have one of the largest canneries in California, and we have been packing a very large quantity of tomatoes. We have spent a tremendous amount of money on machinery, and all that is required to handle such a large quantity of same, and if Congress will not come to our aid we are in a very bad shape. If this order of things lasts very long, we are compelled to move a part, if not all, of this tomato machinery to Italy and start a cannery; and, in fact, we have our brother in Italy now studying the situation, to make such a move if Congress does not help us.

We do not wish to disturb you with more writing, because we feel we have said enough. Trusting you will give this matter your best consideration.

The tariff to-day is but 15 per cent ad valorem; it must be increased to at least 40 per cent ad valorem or the canned-tomato industry of the United States is doomed.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 8917, the War Department appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### THE SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION AT PHILADELPHIA

Mr. SNELL, chairman of the Committee on Rules, reported for printing under the rule a resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, providing for the participation of the United States of America in the sesquicentennial celebration in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., and authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Has the gentleman determined when this matter will be called up?

Mr. SNELL. No. I was going to talk with the floor leader about that. It will have to be called up very soon.

Mr. TILSON. I did not know until a few moments ago that there had been a favorable report upon that. I should think that we could get time by Saturday morning.

Mr. SNELL. We will let the gentleman know to-morrow.



## CHILD LABOR AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Secretary of State, which was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, February 9, 1926.

Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sir: The following resolution with reference to a report on the proposed so-called child labor amendment has been received in the Department of State:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 40

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

January 5, 1926.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to transmit to the House of Representatives a statement showing what States have, through their respective legislatures, as certified to his office, taken action upon the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the regulation of the labor of persons under 18 years of age by the Congress, and what such action has been, giving in each instance, where available, the votes in the several legislatures that have acted.

Attest:

WM. TYLER PAGE, Clerk.

In response to this request there is attached herewith a report which is based on all the official information which has been received from the various States.

The number of the affirmative and negative votes have been given in the accompanying report in each case where this information has been officially supplied to the department, and the report is so phrased as to indicate, in so far as is known to the department, the exact nature of the votes taken in the State legislatures.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

FRANK B. KELLOGG.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I shall later ask that this be printed as a public document.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, can not the gentleman ask that that be printed now? We are having calls for this from all over the country.

The SPEAKER. It has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. May I ask the gentleman from Texas from whom he is receiving these inquiries?

Mr. BLANTON. From school children and school-teachers.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. From school children? Are school children against the child labor amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. The school children are against the child labor amendment—lots of them—in my State. We protect the children down there.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 11, 1926, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for February 11, 1926, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

## COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(10.30 a. m.)

To repeal and annul certain acts of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, known as the 5-cent fare bill. (H. R. 3805). Subcommittee on Public Utilities.

To establish a board of public welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes (H. R. 346 and H. R. 5045). Subcommittee on Welfare Laws.

To abolish capital punishment in the District of Columbia (H. R. 349 and H. R. 4498). Subcommittee on the Judiciary.

(7.30 p. m.)

To provide for the election of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (H. R. 58). Subcommittee on Elective Franchise.

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10.15 a. m.)

For the acquisition or erection of American Government buildings and embassy, legation, and consular buildings, and for other purposes (H. R. 6771).

## COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(10.30 a. m.)

For the amendment of immigration act of 1924 (H. R. 9086, H. R. 7089).

Regulating immigration and naturalization of certain veterans of the World War (H. R. 7968).

## COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Department of National Defense.

## COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Consideration of a five-year program for the Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department.

## COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

(10 a. m.)

To prevent fraud, deception, or improper practice in connection with business before the United States Patent Office, and for other purposes (H. R. 5811).

## COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

(10.30 a. m.)

Ice piers in Ohio River.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

345. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Interstate Commerce Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, amounting to \$119,847.78 (H. Doc. No. 248); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

346. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Charleston Harbor and Cooper River, S. C. (H. Doc. No. 249); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

347. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting report on the proposed so-called child labor amendment to the Constitution of the United States in compliance with House Resolution 40, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, "Directing the Secretary of State to transmit to the House of Representatives information as to which States have acted upon the child labor amendment" (H. Doc. No. 250); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. HILL of Washington: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 6884. A bill to amend the acts of June 7, 1924, and March 3, 1925, granting certain public lands to the city of Phoenix, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DRIVER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7911. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain public lands and the establishment of an aviation field near Yuma, Ariz.; with amendments (Rept. No. 235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5013. A bill extending the time for the construction of the bridge across the Mississippi River in Ramsey and Hennepin Counties, Minn., by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway; with an amendment (Rept. No. 234). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 132. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 153, a resolution providing for the participation of the United States of America in the sesquicentennial celebration in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., and authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 236). Referred to the House Calendar.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8977) granting an increase of pension to Deillah Potter, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9167) to modify and amend the act creating the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 9108) to amend an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 9169) to authorize certain changes in homestead allotments of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 9170) to create a board of industrial adjustments and to define its powers and duties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 9171) to amend section 2 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stats. L. p. 653), as amended by the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stats. L. p. 1127), entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STROTHER: A bill (H. R. 9172) for the prevention of floods in the Ohio River at Huntington, W. Va.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 9173) providing for the revision and printing of the index to the Federal Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9174) providing for the preparation of a biennial index to State legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 9175) for the adjustment of water-right charges on the Shoshone irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9176) granting an increase of pension to all Mexican War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 9177) admitting to citizenship the rescuers of the *Antinoe*, who were seamen on the steamship *President Roosevelt*; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 9178) to amend section 12 of the act approved June 10, 1922, so as to authorize payment of actual expenses for travel under orders in Alaska; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9179) for the prevention of floods in the Ohio River at Catlettsburg, Ky., and Ashland, Ky.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 9180) to recognize seniority of service in promotions and assignments of clerks in first and second class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 9181) to grant extensions of time under oil and gas permits; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9182) further to assure title to lands designated in or selected under grants to the States, to limit the period for the institution of proceedings to establish an exception of lands from such grants because of their known mineral character, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 9183) to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis," approved June 5, 1920; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KINDRED: A bill (H. R. 9184) to provide for regulating traffic in certain clinical thermometers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 9185) providing for the protection of public health and the prevention of fraud and deception by prohibiting the manufacture, the sale, or the having in possession with intent to sell, of adulterated or deleterious butter, and prescribing the penalty for the violation thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PARKER: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) for the printing of 15,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the President's Aircraft Board on matters relating

to aircraft, including the report of the said board; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FURLOW: Resolution (H. Res. 131) to pay Daisy Maxwell, daughter of Burr Maxwell, late an employee of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months' salary and \$250 for funeral expenses; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SNELL: Resolution (H. Res. 132) providing for consideration of House Joint Resolution 153, providing for the participation of the United States of America in the sesquicentennial celebration in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., and authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the Provincial Board of Tayabas, Lucina, P. I., urging the passage of legislation which will result in independence of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Memorial of the Municipal Government of Orani, Province of Bataan, P. I., opposing the giving of more power to the Governor General of the Philippines; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GARBER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida, requesting the establishment of military schools or camps for the purpose of training aviators upon the present Government fields of Dorr and Carlstrom, located near Arcadia, in De Soto County, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEEDY: A bill (H. R. 9186) granting an increase of pension to Carrie M. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 9187) to provide for the retirement of ex-Cadet Jay Ernest Schenck as second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORT: A bill (H. R. 9188) granting a pension to Lydia Condit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 9189) granting a pension to Margaret E. McCarthy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 9190) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Keeseey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JEFFERS: A bill (H. R. 9191) granting a pension to Martha L. Houston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 9192) granting an increase of pension to John W. Ferris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 9193) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Malloy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KUNZ: A bill (H. R. 9194) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Herrmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 9195) for the relief of William S. Keary; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9196) granting an increase of pension to Anna D. Magee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 9197) granting an increase of pension to Tena Allard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAGEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9198) to reinstate Victor Iago Morrison as a major in the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAJOR: A bill (H. R. 9199) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLS: A bill (H. R. 9200) for the relief of Riverside Contracting Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9201) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Roe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9202) granting a pension to Susan Dover; to the Committee on Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

633. By Mr. ARENTZ: Memorial of Reno (Nev.) Stock Exchange, expressing its disapproval of provisions of House bill 52 to regulate the sale of stock and other securities by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



634. Also, memorial of Reno Stock Exchange, expressing its disapproval of revenue stamp taxes on corporation stock and indorsing the amendment to the tax bill proposed by Senator HARRISON providing for the repeal of said stamp taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

635. By Mr. CELLER: Petition of the Kings County Republican Club, of New York City, urging reward to the aliens of the steamship *Roosevelt* with United States citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

636. Also, resolution adopted by the American citizens of Polish descent, 569 East Fifth Street, New York City, seeking to amend the immigration act of 1924 so that the wives, husbands, unmarried minor children, and parents of citizens of the United States, and of permanent residents who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, may be admitted as nonquota immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

637. By Mr. DARROW: Memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, opposing the enactment of Senate bill 2289, to stimulate commerce in agricultural products, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

638. By Mr. GARBER: Letter from the Chamber of Commerce, Fort Dodge, Iowa, protesting against Senate bill 575, known as the Gooding long-and-short-haul bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

639. Also, report of the committee of the Northwestern Baptist Association in regular annual session at Buffalo, Okla., October 15, 1925, opposing any change in the prohibition law, the Volstead Act, or eighteenth amendment to our National Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

640. Also, resolution by the Ohio Wholesale Grocers' Association Co. relating to Federal legislation legalizing resale-price maintenance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

641. Also, petition by Fort Whipple Chapter No. 3, of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, suggesting amendments to World War veterans act of 1924; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

642. Also, resolution of the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, indorsing Senate bill 595, known as the Gooding long-and-short-haul bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

643. Also, resolution by the Associated Traffic Clubs of America, stating that the Congress should pass a law charging the Interstate Commerce Commission with the regulation of motor vehicles when engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

644. Also, resolution of the National Preservers' Association, authorizing the officers and executive board of their association to oppose the enactment of Senate bill 481 and House bill 39; to the Committee on Agriculture.

645. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of the Evansville Parent-Teachers' Association, resolving that the education bill before Congress should be enacted into law; to the Committee on Education.

646. Also, petition of the Willmar Branch Railway Mail Association, Tenth Division, resolving to go on record as expressing their approval of the following bills: Lehlbach retirement bill, Kelly bill (H. R. 4476), Kelly bill (H. R. 4477), Kelly bill (H. R. 5697), Griest bill (H. R. 3838), Mead bill (H. R. 3508), Schneider bill (H. R. 14); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

647. Also, petition of the Alexandria Commercial Club, favoring the establishment of a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

648. Also, a petition of Business Forum of Minneapolis, for the construction of the St. Lawrence ship canal for the bringing of ocean shipping into the Great Lakes, by providing a channel around the rapids of the St. Lawrence River between Montreal and Lake Ontario; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

649. Also, petition of several farmers to secure the passage of an amendment to the present immigration laws that will protect their interests in the event of the development of a shortage in the supply of farm laborers; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

650. Also, petition of representatives of 60 country members of the Federal reserve system in central and northern Minnesota relative to Federal reserve system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

651. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Upper Bushwick Civic Association of Brooklyn, N. Y., requesting the Congress to bring the coal strike to a settlement and to put an end to the existing deadly tragedy, the privations and hardships of the very poor people being frightful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, February 11, 1926

(Legislative day of Monday, February 1, 1926)

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate resumes the consideration of House bill No. 1.

## TAX REDUCTION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, 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:

Ashurst	Fernald	King	Robinson, Ind.
Bayard	Ferris	La Follette	Sackett
Blease	Fess	Lenroot	Sheppard
Borah	Fletcher	McKellar	Shipstead
Bratton	Frazier	McLean	Shortridge
Brookhart	George	McNary	Simmons
Broussard	Gerry	Metcalf	Smith
Bruce	Gillett	Moses	Smoot
Butler	Glass	Neely	Stanfield
Cameron	Goff	Norbeck	Stephens
Capper	Hale	Norris	Swanson
Copeland	Harrell	Nye	Trammell
Couzens	Harris	Oddie	Tyson
Cummins	Harrison	Overman	Wadsworth
Curtis	Heflin	Pepper	Walsh
Dale	Howell	Phipps	Warren
Deneen	Johnson	Pine	Watson
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Weller
Edge	Kendrick	Reed, Mo.	Willis
Ernst	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	

Mr. SHEPPARD. The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. MAYFIELD] is absent on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate turn to page 135 of the bill. At the request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the amendments on that page, in line 5, line 18, and line 22, involving the insertion of the words "without assessment," were passed over. The Senator from Nebraska has made an examination of the reasons why the words were inserted, and he has no objection now to the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 135, line 5, after the word "court," insert the words "without assessment."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 135, line 18, after the word "court," insert the words "without assessment."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 135, line 22, after the word "court," insert the words "without assessment."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] to submit a report from the Committee on Appropriations.

## URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 8722) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1926, and June 30, 1927, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 165) thereon. I give notice that I shall seek to call up the bill immediately on the conclusion of the consideration of the revenue bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

## PER CAPITA PAYMENT TO CHIPPEWA TRIBE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President, the bill (H. R. 183) providing for a per capita payment of \$50 to each enrolled member of the Chippewa Tribe of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States is before us now in the form of a favorable report from the Committee on Indian Affairs. I ask unanimous consent for