

the illegality of which he does not and cannot know. To hold him liable under such circumstances is grossly unjust.

2. In illustration: The foreman of a factory printing department orders an employee therein to print a new label according to the copy given to him. Such employee did not prepare the label; he knows nothing about its legality; and he is not positioned to secure that knowledge. His job is simply to operate the printing press and if he declines to do so he is subject to discharge. It subsequently develops that the label violates the act and the corporation is successfully prosecuted accordingly. Under section 18 (b), as now drawn, this employee would be equally liable for such violation. And that is plainly a wrong state of the law.

ANNEX

1. The officers of the Associated Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., are Paul S. Willis, New York, N.Y., president; B. E. Snyder, R. B. Davis Co., Hoboken, N.J., first vice president; R. L. James, Libby, McNeill & Libby, Chicago, Ill., second vice president; R. W. Snow, Canada Dry Ginger Ale, Inc., New York, N.Y., third vice president; H. D. Crippen, Bon Ami Co., New York, N.Y., treasurer; Charles Wesley Dunn, New York, N.Y., general counsel.

2. The directors of the Associated Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., are W. C. Arkell, Beech-Nut Packing Co., Canajoharie, N.Y.; W. R. Barry, Gold Medal Foods, Inc., of General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.; C. F. Baumgart, Kellogg Co., Battle Creek, Mich.; J. F. Brownlee, General Foods Corporation, New York, N.Y.; D. F. Bull, Cream of Wheat Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; C. L. Connor, Wheateana Corporation, Rahway, N.J.; H. R. Drackett, the Drackett Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; L. J. Gumpert, B. T. Babbitt, Inc., New York, N.Y.; F. A. Harding, Wm. Underwood Co., Watertown, Mass.; P. G. Kinzer, Carnation Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; James Knox, Chas. B. Knox Gelatine Co., Johnstown, N.Y.; John H. Kraft, Kraft-Phenix Cheese Corporation, Chicago, Ill.; W. F. Mohan, Scott Paper Co., Chester, Pa.; H. J. Mountray, Borden Co., New York, N.Y.; Henry Mueller, C. F. Mueller Co., Jersey City, N.J.; W. T. Nardin, Pet Milk Co., St. Louis, Mo.; D. F. Norton, Nestle's Milk Products, Inc., New York, N.Y.; T. J. Reynolds, the Diamond Match Co., New York, N.Y.; J. P. Spang, Jr., Swift & Co., Chicago, Ill.; R. Douglas Stuart, the Quaker Oats Co., Chicago, Ill.; Ralph S. Stubbs, American Sugar Refining Co., New York, N.Y.

3. The membership of the Associated Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., includes:

California: California Animal Products Co., Oakland; California Packing Corporation, San Francisco; Jell Well Dessert Co., Ltd., Los Angeles; Los Angeles Soap Co., Los Angeles.

Connecticut: C. B. Dolge Co., Westport; G. F. Heublein & Bro., Hartford.

Delaware: Richardson & Robbins, Dover.

Illinois: Angelus-Campfire Co., Chicago; the John B. Canepa Co., Chicago; Champion Chemical Works, Chicago; Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co., Chicago; College Inn Food Products Co., Chicago; Fitzpatrick Bros., Inc., Chicago; Fortune-Zerega Co., Chicago; Kitchen Art Foods, Inc., Chicago; Kraft-Phenix Cheese Corporation, Chicago; Libby, McNeill & Libby, Chicago; Northwestern Yeast Co., Chicago; Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co., Chicago; Price Flavoring Extract Co., Chicago; the John Puhl Products Co., Chicago; the Quaker Oats Co., Chicago; the Shotwell Manufacturing Co., Chicago; the S.O.S. Co., Chicago; Staley Sales Corporation, Decatur; Stein Hall Manufacturing Co., Chicago; Swift & Co., Chicago; Tenderon, Inc., Joliet.

Indiana: The Indiana Condensed Milk Co., Indianapolis; Little Crow Milling Co., Inc., Warsaw.

Iowa: American Pop Corn Co., Sioux City; Robb-Ross Co., Sioux City.

Maine: Burnham & Morrill Co., Portland.

Maryland: Cloverdale Spring Co., Baltimore; Crosse & Blackwell, Inc., Baltimore; Fruit Pudding Co., Baltimore; McCormick & Co., Inc., Baltimore; Sea Gull Specialty Co., Baltimore.

Massachusetts: Bakers Extract Co., Springfield; Boston Food Products Co., Boston; Joseph Burnett Co., Boston; Dwinell-Wright Co., Boston; Gorton-Pew Fisheries Co., Gloucester; C. M. Kimball Co., Everett; Lever Bros. Co., Cambridge; Sawyer Crystal Blue Co., Boston; D. & L. Slade Co., Boston; Wm. Underwood Co., Watertown.

Michigan: The J. B. Ford Co., Wyandotte; Gerber Products Division, Fremont Canning Co., Fremont; Kellogg Co., Battle Creek; LaChoy Food Products, Inc., Detroit; McKenzie Milling Co., Quincy.

Minnesota: Airy Fairy Foods, Inc., Minneapolis; The Cream of Wheat Corporation, Minneapolis; The Creamette Co., Minneapolis; Luther Ford & Co., Minneapolis; General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis; The Hilex Co., Inc., St. Paul; Geo. A. Hormel & Co., Austin; Pillsbury Flour Mills Co., Minneapolis; Sanitary Food Manufacturing Co., St. Paul.

Missouri: F. B. Chamberlain Co., St. Louis; Faultless Starch Co., Kansas City; Loose-Wiles Biscuit Co., Kansas City; Pet Milk Co., St. Louis; Ralston Purina Co., St. Louis.

Nebraska: Skinner Manufacturing Co., Omaha.

New Jersey: J. W. Beardsley's Sons, Newark; Edgar Brick & Son, Crosswicks; H. C. Brill Co., Inc., Newark; Campbell Sales Co., Camden; R. B. Davis Co., Hoboken; Dif Corporation, Garwood; Flako Products Corporation, New Brunswick; Thomas J. Lipton, Inc., Hoboken; Mechling Bros. Chemical Co., Camden; Metal Textile Corporation, Orange; C. F. Mueller Co., Jersey City; Paas

Dye Co., Newark; G. Washington Coffee Refining Co., Morris Plains; The Wheateana Corporation, Rahway.

New York: American Kitchen Products Co., New York; American Maize Products Co., New York; the American Sugar Refining Co., New York; B. T. Babbitt, Inc., New York; Beech-Nut Packing Co., Canajoharie; Bon Ami Co., New York; the Borden Co., New York; Brillo Manufacturing Co., Inc., New York; Edward & John Burke, Ltd., Long Island City; Canada Dry Ginger Ale, Inc., New York; Church & Dwight Co., Inc., New York; Comet Rice Co., New York; Corn Products Refining Co., New York; Dannemiller Coffee Co., New York; the Diamond Match Co., New York; Duffy-Mott Co., Inc., New York; Durkee Famous Foods, Inc., Elmhurst; estate of Edward Pritchard, New York; Far Eastern Manufacturing Co., Inc., Brooklyn; Fred Fear & Co., Brooklyn; General Foods Corporation, New York; Good Luck Food Co., Inc., Rochester; Christian Hansen's Laboratory, Inc., Little Falls; Hecker H-O Co., Inc., Buffalo; the Hills Bros. Co., New York; Chas. B. Knox Gelatine Co., Johnstown; Lea & Perrins, New York; Liebig Products Co., Inc., New York; Enoch Morgan's Sons Co., New York; My-T-Fine Corporation, Brooklyn; National Biscuit Co., New York; the National Sugar Refining Co. of New Jersey, New York; Nestle's Milk Products, Inc., New York; Oakite Products, Inc., New York; Pal Products Co., Brooklyn; Park Tissue Mills, New York; Parsons Ammonia Co., Inc., New York; Penick & Ford Sales Co., New York; Pure Food Factory "Hansa", Mamaroneck; Runkel Bros., Inc., New York; J. Hungerford Smith Co., Rochester; Southern Rice Sales Co., Inc., New York; Standard Brands, Inc., New York; Teco Foods, Inc., Cortland; Joseph Talley & Co., Inc., New York; C. J. Van Houten & Zoon, Inc., New York; the Wayne County Produce Co., Brooklyn; the Welch Grape Juice Co., Westfield; Wilbert Products Co., Inc., New York; Wood & Selick, Inc., New York; Worcester Salt Co., New York; Yeasties Products Corporation, New York; A. Zerega's Sons, Inc., Brooklyn; Virginia Dare Extract Co., Inc., Brooklyn.

Ohio: The Climaline Co., Canton; The Colonial Salt Co., Akron; The Drackett Products Co., Cincinnati; The Frank Tea & Spice Co., Cincinnati; The Harbauer Co., Toledo; The Heekin Co., Cincinnati; The Hygienic Products Co., Canton; The Ohio Match Co., Wadsworth; The Palmer Match Co., Akron; The Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati; Snow King Baking Powder Co., Cincinnati; The Union Salt Co., Cleveland; The Zanol Products Co., Cincinnati.

Pennsylvania: P. Duff & Sons, Inc., Pittsburgh; The Franklin Sugar Refining Co., Philadelphia; Jersey Cereal Co., Cereal; Keystone Macaroni Manufacturing Co., Lebanon; The W. J. McCahan Sugar Refining & Molasses Co., Philadelphia; Scott Paper Co., Chester; F. G. Vogt & Sons, Inc., Philadelphia; Stephen Whitman & Son, Inc., Philadelphia.

Rhode Island: Rumford Chemical Works, East Providence.

Texas: Gebhardt Chill Powder Co., San Antonio; Walker's Austex Chill Co., Austin.

Vermont: Malted Cereals Co., Burlington.

Virginia: The Cobb Manufacturing Co., Inc., Richmond; Larus & Bro. Co., Inc., Richmond; Rich Maid Manufacturing Co., Inc., Richmond.

Washington: Roman Meal Co., Tacoma.

West Virginia: The Bloch Bros. Tobacco Co., Wheeling.

Wisconsin: Carnation Co., Milwaukee.

RECESS

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 27, 1934, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1934

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

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

O Thou, who coverest Thyself with light as with a garment, so fill us with Thy radiant Spirit that we may see and magnify the good in the lives of others. May we honor it; may we rejoice in it and try to imitate it. Teach us, Heavenly Father, however turbulent outward conditions may be, to maintain inward calm. O ever keep us conscious of our birthright as Thy children, that our actions and purposes may be filial, fraternal, and loyal to Thee. This day may we so put our trust in Thy fatherhood that old hurts will be relieved, anxious forebodings will be dispelled, self-assurance will be merged into the Divine will, and self-direction will yield to Thy leadership, and Thine shall be the praise forever. In the name of Jesus, our Savior, we pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

- H.R. 191. An act for the relief of William K. Lovett;
 H.R. 210. An act for the relief of Anne B. Slocum;
 H.R. 232. An act for the relief of Anna Marie Sanford;
 H.R. 233. An act for the relief of Florence Hudgins Lindsay and Elizabeth Lindsay;
 H.R. 264. An act for the relief of Marguerite Ciscoe;
 H.R. 323. An act for the relief of Harvey M. Hunter;
 H.R. 408. An act for the relief of William J. Nowinski;
 H.R. 470. An act for the relief of the city of Glendale, Calif.;
- H.R. 507. An act for the relief of John Thomas Simpkin;
 H.R. 520. An act for the relief of Ward A. Jefferson;
 H.R. 526. An act for the relief of Arthur K. Finney;
 H.R. 666. An act for the relief of Charles W. Dworack;
 H.R. 719. An act for the relief of Willard B. Hall;
 H.R. 768. An act for the relief of William E. Bosworth;
 H.R. 879. An act for the relief of John H. Mehrle;
 H.R. 880. An act for the relief of Daisy M. Avery;
 H.R. 909. An act for the relief of Elbert L. Grove;
 H.R. 1301. An act for the relief of M. Aileen Offerman;
 H.R. 1362. An act for the relief of Edna B. Wylie;
 H.R. 1398. An act for the relief of Lewis E. Green;
 H.R. 1404. An act for the relief of John C. McCann;
 H.R. 1418. An act for the relief of W. C. Garber;
 H.R. 2040. An act for the relief of P. Jean des Garennes;
 H.R. 2041. An act for the relief of Irwin D. Coyle;
 H.R. 2074. An act for the relief of Harvey Collins;
 H.R. 2169. An act for the relief of Edward V. Bryant;
 H.R. 2337. An act for the relief of Harry L. Haberkorn;
 H.R. 2512. An act for the relief of John Moore;
 H.R. 2818. An act for the relief of Katherine G. Taylor;
 H.R. 3542. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dedicate to the city of Philadelphia, for street purposes, a tract of land situate in the city of Philadelphia and State of Pennsylvania;
- H.R. 4423. An act for the relief of Wilbur Rogers;
 H.R. 4542. An act for the relief of Frank Wilkins;
 H.R. 4609. An act for the relief of Augustus Thompson;
 H.R. 4784. An act to reimburse Gottlieb Stock for losses of real and personal property by fire caused by the negligence of two prohibition agents;
 H.R. 4792. An act to authorize and direct the Comptroller General to settle and allow the claim of Harden F. Taylor for services rendered to the Bureau of Fisheries;
 H.R. 4959. An act for the relief of Mary Josephine Lobert;
 H.R. 5397. An act to authorize the exchange of the use of certain Government land within the Carlsbad Caverns National Park for certain privately owned land therein;
 H.R. 5936. An act for the relief of Gale A. Lee;
 H.R. 6166. An act providing for payment of \$25 to each enrolled Chippewa Indian of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;
 H.R. 6638. An act for the relief of the Monumental Stevedore Co.;
- H.R. 6676. An act to require postmasters to account for money collected on mail delivered at their respective offices;
 H.R. 6690. An act for the relief of certain officers of the Dental Corps of the United States Navy;
 H.R. 6862. An act for the relief of Martha Edwards;
 H.R. 7060. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near The Dalles, Oreg.;
- H.R. 7200. An act to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park in the States of Tennessee and Georgia;
 H.R. 7425. An act for the inclusion of certain lands in the national forests in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7488. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to acquire a site for a lighthouse depot at New Orleans, La., and for other purposes;

H.R. 7748. An act regulating procedure in criminal cases in the courts of the United States;

H.R. 7801. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near The Dalles, Oreg.;

H.R. 7803. An act authorizing the city of East St. Louis, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near a point between Morgan and Wash Streets in the city of St. Louis, Mo., and a point opposite thereto in the city of East St. Louis, Ill.;

H.R. 8040. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Iowa State Highway Commission and the Missouri Highway Department to maintain a free bridge already constructed across the Des Moines River near the city of Keokuk, Iowa;

H.R. 8237. An act to legalize a bridge across Black River at or near Pocahton, Ark.;

H.R. 8429. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing D. S. Prentiss, R. A. Salladay, Syl F. Histed, William M. Turner, and John H. Rahilly, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the town of New Boston, Ill.," approved March 3, 1931;

H.R. 8438. An act to legalize a bridge across St. Francis River at or near Lake City, Ark.;

H.R. 8477. An act authorizing the State Road Commission of West Virginia to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Potomac River at or near Shepherdstown, Jefferson County, W. Va.;

H.R. 8516. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi;

H.R. 8834. An act authorizing the owners of Cut-Off Island, Posey County, Ind., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge or causeway across the old channel of the Wabash River;

H.R. 8853. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Wabash River at a point in Sullivan County, Ind., to a point opposite on the Illinois shore; and H.J.Res. 315. Joint resolution granting consent of Congress to an agreement or compact entered into by the State of New York with the Dominion of Canada for the establishment of the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority with power to take over, maintain, and operate the present highway bridge over the Niagara River between the city of Buffalo, N.Y., and the village of Fort Erie, Canada.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 211. An act for the relief of John A. Rapelye;

H.R. 276. An act to authorize the placing of a bronze tablet bearing a replica of the Congressional Medal of Honor upon the grave of the late Brig. Gen. Robert H. Dunlap, United States Marine Corps, in the Arlington National Cemetery, Va.;

H.R. 328. An act for the relief of E. W. Gillespie;

H.R. 473. An act for the relief of Irene Brand Alper;

H.R. 916. An act for the relief of C. A. Dickson;

H.R. 1197. An act for the relief of Glenna F. Kelley;

H.R. 1211. An act for the relief of R. Gilbertsen;

H.R. 1212. An act for the relief of Marie Toenberg;

H.R. 2439. An act for the relief of William G. Burress, deceased;

H.R. 3345. An act to amend section 198 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States", approved March 4, 1909, as amended by the acts of May 18, 1916, and July 23, 1916;

H.R. 3900. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay certain subcontractors for material and labor furnished in the construction of the post office at Las Vegas, Nev.;

H.R. 5284. An act for the relief of the Playa de Flor Land & Improvement Co.;

H.R. 6871. An act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney; and
H.R. 7356. An act to provide, in case of the disability of senior circuit judges, for the exercise of their powers and the performance of their duties by the other circuit judges.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

- S. 99. An act for the relief of Francis Gerrity;
- S. 113. An act for the relief of Hans Dahl;
- S. 164. An act for the relief of Joseph Gould;
- S. 236. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Queets, Wash., in the construction of a public-school building to be available to Indian children of the village of Queets, Jefferson County, Wash.;
- S. 250. An act for the relief of Fred Herrick;
- S. 309. An act for the relief of Willard Heath Mitchell;
- S. 333. An act for the relief of Clarence Leroy Witham;
- S. 367. An act for the relief of Hugh Flaherty;
- S. 379. An act for the relief of Frederick G. Barker;
- S. 380. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of catastrophes of Nature;
- S. 417. An act for the relief of Marino Ambrogi;
- S. 426. An act for the relief of Robert H. Wilder;
- S. 427. An act for the relief of Edgar Joseph Casey;
- S. 618. An act to amend the act of May 25, 1926, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes";
- S. 790. An act for the relief of Charles B. Arrington;
- S. 819. An act for the relief of S. N. Kempton;
- S. 822. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend section 217, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States', approved March 4, 1909", approved January 11, 1929, with respect to the use of the mails for the shipment of certain drugs and medicines to cosmetologists and barbers;
- S. 865. An act for the relief of Michael J. Budzinski;
- S. 887. An act for the relief of Lucy B. Hertz and J. W. Hertz;
- S. 1198. An act for the relief of Louise Fox;
- S. 1214. An act for the relief of Zinsser & Co.;
- S. 1231. An act for the relief of A. H. Marshall;
- S. 1338. An act for the relief of John F. Patterson;
- S. 1358. An act to provide for the improvement of the approach to the Confederate Cemetery, Fayetteville, Ark.;
- S. 1362. An act for the relief of Uldric Thompson, Jr.;
- S. 1595. An act extending the benefits of the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act of May 24, 1928, to provisional officers of the Regular Establishment who served during the World War;
- S. 1633. An act for the relief of Emma Fein;
- S. 1690. An act for the relief of the Bowers Southern Dredging Co.;
- S. 1725. An act for the relief of Robert Emil Taylor;
- S. 1779. An act authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Colony of Connecticut;
- S. 1794. An act to authorize Vernon C. DeVotie, captain, United States Army, to accept a certain decoration tendered to him by the Colombian Government;
- S. 1797. An act authorizing the removal of rock from the submarine and destroyer base reservation at Astoria (Tongue Point), Oreg.;
- S. 1826. An act for expenditure of funds for cooperation with the public school board at Poplar, Mont., in the construction or improvement of public-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.;
- S. 1972. An act for the relief of James W. Walters;
- S. 1992. An act for the relief of Arthur R. Lewis;
- S. 1998. An act for the relief of the estate of Martin Flynn;
- S. 2044. An act to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended;

S. 2046. An act to provide relief for disbursing officers of the Army in certain cases;

S. 2112. An act for the relief of W. H. Key and the estate of James R. Wilson;

S. 2130. An act to authorize an appropriation for the purchase of land in Wyoming for use as rifle ranges for the Army of the United States;

S. 2204. An act for the relief of James Johnson;

S. 2207. An act for the relief of Sarah Lloyd;

S. 2227. An act for the relief of Harold S. Shepardson;

S. 2367. An act for the relief of Emilie C. Davis;

S. 2431. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Y. Underwood;

S. 2455. An act to increase the efficiency of the Medical Corps of the Regular Army;

S. 2553. An act for the relief of the Brewer Paint & Wall Paper Co., Inc.;

S. 2623. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the erection of fire escapes in certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved March 19, 1906, as amended;

S. 2671. An act repealing certain sections of the Revised Code of Laws of the United States relating to the Indians;

S. 2674. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to relieve the existing national economic emergency by increasing agricultural purchasing power, to raise revenue for extraordinary expenses incurred by reason of such emergency, to provide emergency relief with respect to agricultural indebtedness, to provide for the orderly liquidation of joint-stock land banks, and for other purposes", approved May 12, 1933;

S. 2681. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to make available to the municipality of Aberdeen, Wash., the U.S.S. *Newport*;

S. 2692. An act relating to the record of registry of certain aliens;

S. 2720. An act for the relief of George M. Wright;

S. 2748. An act to authorize an appropriation for the reimbursement of Stelio Vassiliadis;

S. 2752. An act for the relief of the legal beneficiaries and heirs of Mrs. C. A. Toline;

S. 2794. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act with respect to rates of compensation, and for other purposes;

S. 2817. An act to amend the act relating to contracts and agreements under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved January 25, 1934;

S. 2825. An act to provide for an appropriation of \$50,000 with which to make a survey of the old Indian trail known as the "Natchez Trace", with a view of constructing a national road on this route to be known as the "Natchez Trace Parkway";

S. 2864. An act for the relief of Weymouth Kirkland and Robert N. Golding;

S. 2875. An act for the relief of Margoth Olsen von Struve;

S. 2883. An act for the relief of Mike L. Sweeney;

S. 2899. An act establishing certain commodity divisions in the Department of Agriculture;

S. 2909. An act for the relief of Augustus C. Hensley;

S. 2919. An act for the relief of Cornelia Claiborne;

S. 2922. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the circulation of reading matter among the blind", approved April 27, 1904, and acts supplemental thereto;

S. 2969. An act for the relief of the Mary Black Memorial Hospital;

S. 2972. An act for the relief of John N. Knauff Co., Inc.;

S. 3007. An act to authorize an extension of exchange authority and addition of public lands to the Willamette National Forest in the State of Oregon;

S. 3016. An act for the relief of the Dongji Investment Co., Ltd.;

S. 3023. An act to amend section 4878 of the United States Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to burials in national cemeteries;

S. 3026. An act for the relief of Lucy Cobb Stewart;

S. 3044. An act granting a pension to Eleanora Emma Bliss;

S. 3046. An act creating the Sistersville Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, hold, and operate a highway bridge across the Ohio River at or near Sistersville, W.Va.;

S. 3047. An act to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of George Lawley & Son Corporation, of Boston, Mass.;

S. 3085. An act relating to the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes;

S. 3099. An act authorizing the city of Wheeling, a municipal corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at Wheeling, W.Va.;

S. 3114. An act to extend the times for commencing the construction of certain bridges in the State of Oregon;

S. 3128. An act to pay certain fees to Maude G. Nicholson, widow of George A. Nicholson, late a United States commissioner;

S. 3211. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay between Baltimore and Kent Counties, Md.;

S. 3230. An act creating the Florence Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Florence, Nebr.;

S. 3269. An act relating to the construction, maintenance, and operation by the city of Davenport, Iowa, of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Tenth Street in Bettendorf, State of Iowa;

S. 3272. An act for the relief of the city of Baltimore;

S. 3275. An act for the allowance of certain claims for extra labor above the legal day of 8 hours at the several navy yards and shore stations certified by the Court of Claims;

S. 3287. An act to authorize national banks situated in a Territory or possession of the United States to establish branches;

S. 3290. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Indeterminate Sentence and Parole for the District of Columbia and to determine its functions, and for other purposes", approved July 15, 1932;

S. 3303. An act to provide for the expeditious condemnation and taking of possession of land by officers, agencies, or corporations of the United States authorized to acquire real estate by condemnation in the name of or for the use of the United States for the construction of public works now or hereafter authorized by Congress;

S. 3335. An act for the relief of Joanna A. Sheehan;

S. 3346. An act to amend the naturalization laws with respect to records of registry and residence abroad; and

S.J.Res. 36. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1934, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S.Con.Res. 13) to authorize the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the special committee appointed to investigate air- and ocean-mail contracts.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2999) to guarantee the bonds of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPUBLICAN POLICY

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech I

delivered last evening over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by myself over Columbia Broadcasting Co. network, Wednesday, April 25, 1934:

At the beginning of this session of Congress I made certain statements in behalf of the Republican minority in the House of Representatives. I invite attention to the policy of the minority as then outlined. It has been observed to the letter in the eventful session now approaching its end.

We declared that we would gladly cooperate with the administration in restoring prosperity and would support any policies that would contribute to the common welfare, without regard to the political fortunes of either party.

At the same time, we declared that we would oppose any policies which were destructive of our form of government, or alien to the basic ideals of the American people, or economically unsound, or as threatening the Nation with fiscal bankruptcy, and that we would hold the administration responsible at the bar of public opinion for promoting such policies.

The Republican minority has been faithful to that pledge. It has voted for sound legislation calculated to hasten recovery. It has stoutly opposed unsound, un-American legislation.

The record of this Congress will be submitted to the verdict of public opinion; I urge all citizens to study it. I court a rigid scrutiny of the position taken by representatives of the Republican Party on all the questions that have arisen.

It will be found that the Republican Party as represented in Congress, has sought to defend this Nation against the forces of disintegration. It has championed the personal liberties of the individual as guaranteed by the Constitution. It has defended the cause of honestly conducted business and has opposed unwarranted interference of government with such business. It has fought for the integrity of our currency and for national solvency through honest balancing of an honest budget. It has supported generous relief of destitution and full assistance to all agencies of recovery; but it has opposed extravagant appropriation of public money and reckless expenditure of appropriations which were made.

Notwithstanding the great confusion resulting from unprecedented conditions and the astounding assortment of contradictory legislation proposed by the administration, the Republican Party has kept to the clear path of constitutional government and sound economic policies. It has refused to plunge blindly ahead in search of imaginary short cuts to the millennium. It has preferred the wisdom and safety of experience to the hazards of experimentation.

We are opposed to any further tinkering with the currency. It must be stabilized on an honest basis for the protection of the individual and the honor of our Government. Those who go into the market places must know not only what our dollar is worth today but what it will be worth a month, a year, or 5 years from today. Ordinary business contracts cannot be made or long-time investments planned so long as there is continual experimentation with the circulating medium of exchange.

As a corollary to this, we must have a solvent Government. Promises upon the part of this administration to balance the Budget must begin to be fulfilled, instead of the time of their redemption being still further postponed. That cannot be if there is a continuation of public expenditures on the present vast scale. Such expenditures only create demand for still greater ones.

The present expenditures were authorized upon the plea of an emergency, to tide over public and private business until the backbone of the depression could be broken and business and industry had time to recuperate. The period of emergency is over. Private enterprise is now ready to go ahead. Nothing is retarding it except the harassing laws enacted by this administration and the even greater harassment incident to their administration by an army of bureaucrats.

A great contributing cause to the retardment of recovery is the growing competition by the Government with private industry. Officers of this administration have taken out articles of incorporation in several States authorizing them, in their capacity as representatives of the Federal Government and using Federal funds, to enter into practically every known field of private enterprise—manufacturing, fabricating, the real-estate business, the building trades, wholesaling, and retailing of merchandise of all kinds.

No real or prospective investor has any certainty that tomorrow he may not find himself engaged in a losing fight with some Federal bureau incorporated to invade his particular line of activity and operating with Federal funds. The business of the people of the United States belongs to them and not to the Government, except and unless we are ready to embark upon a career of state socialism. To transfer millions of men now idle to permanent pay rolls in productive industry and business it is essential the Government withdraw from private business. The Republican minority will stand against voting any further appropriations to finance this unwarranted intrusion into the field of private endeavor.

We also stand steadfast against any attempt to make the various emergency measures and set-ups permanent. The Republican

minority gave unanimous support to these extraordinary measures a year ago because they were designed to meet the extraordinary needs of the hour. Moreover, the administration in asking the passage of these measures pledged its honor they were only emergency measures. Since that time the public has been informed that it is the intent of this administration to make this emergency legislation permanent.

To do this would make permanent the vast system of bureaucracy which has been set up to administer these laws. It would make permanent increased expenditures of billions of dollars annually. To support such a program the Republican minority would not only be breaking faith with the people but it would be contributing to the overthrow, not only of our present economic system but our constitutional form of government. To that program we will not subscribe.

The Republican Party is not willing to assist in wrecking the economic system upon which our country is erected, by reason of which we have developed as a nation and prospered as a people to a degree not equaled by any other people of any other time or place. We do not admit that a Federal bureaucracy can excel the people in the wise direction of their own affairs. As between bureaucrats who never created an industry or developed one; met a pay roll or created productive employment for a single wage earner; built up a business in the face of competition in the marts of the world or risked a dollar of their own money in pioneering an idea; plowed a furrow, planted a crop, or reaped a harvest, and those of our private citizens who have done all this, and done it so successfully that they have made America the outstanding Nation of the world, the Republican minority takes its stand by the side of the private citizen.

Dangerous as is the threat of the new deal's philosophy and policies to America's economic structure and the material welfare of our people, the threat it carries to America's political institutions and the liberties of our citizens is even more dangerous. For the first time in our history an administration in power at Washington has challenged our form of government and those occupying high official and advisory positions in this administration are making a concerted and persistent attack upon American ideals and institutions.

When, in answer to an appeal of this administration, the American Congress vested extraordinary powers in the Chief Executive to meet an emergency, it expected and the American people expected there would be no transgression of the fundamental principles of our Government. The American people were faithful to the American Constitution and they expected the administration to be just as faithful.

No economic emergency could possibly equal the emergency created by an attempt to foist upon this country a system of government which will exercise the powers of life or death over not only all agricultural, industrial, and business operations, but over the liberties and fortunes of American citizens.

The political philosophy of this administration is that nothing must be left to the individual citizen. His freedom of action is to be denied. His individual judgment is to be suspended. He is to be brought under the dictatorship of a Federal bureau and regimented by Federal officers.

This constitutes not only a denial of the citizen's economic rights but a denial of those political liberties which are guaranteed him in our Constitution. The Republican Party stands where it has always stood, for a constitutional government. It holds the powers of our Government under our Constitution are sufficient to cope with any emergency. It holds that where these powers are usurped either by a dictator or by a bureaucracy, they thrust upon the American people an issue which must be met if the form of this Government is to continue as it has existed since its establishment.

This issue may be met squarely by applying the philosophy of one of our earliest Americans, Thomas Jefferson, who said: "I am not one of those who fear the people. I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves. I would rather be exposed to the inconveniences attending too much liberty than those attending too small a degree of it."

DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, this administration is launching some of the most important development work and plans ever undertaken by our Nation.

There is a far-sighted intelligence manifest in the program; also there is a determination that some of these great basic resources shall remain wholly within the control of the people at large.

I am pleased with the opportunity of contributing to the movement and sharing the work that makes such a program possible. It is my conviction that the name of our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, will go into history as a leader who has inaugurated principles which will stand high on all of the future records of our people. That I should have the opportunity of joining him in this work, that this Congress

should be a part of the historic program, and that this period when there is so much distress and uneasiness at large, should have been marked by inauguration of this movement is most gratifying to me.

We are in the midst of a new conservation principle advocated by our President. It is the development and use and production of our matchless natural resources. There is a movement not to seal certain potential assets for an indefinite period in the future, but rather to get orderly, intelligent action in their uses, so that they may be made to serve the highest purpose and, at the same time, be replenished or conserved with the highest possible, modern intelligence.

In approaching the water resources of our Nation, which are conceded of enormous value, this administration is taking positive, forward steps which are blazing a trail for a new field in national development. These resources are both wasteful and destructive when not controlled. Our President's program is planned to control the flood waters in order to check their present destructive influences and also to harness this energy to the Nation's industrial and domestic use. Instead of proceeding in the haphazard program of the past, the order of the day is for a great systematic program balanced with care in respect to location and time.

When the Tennessee Valley Authority was before this Congress we voted it with enthusiasm, I deeming it an honor and an opportunity to join. This Authority has the statutory right to undertake the most far-reaching and scientific work that has ever been laid down in respect to the treatment of any American watershed. The more effective application of agriculture, the industrialization of a rural people, the reforestation of the mountains, the impounding of flood waters, navigation of streams, and the development of power is all within the range of this effort.

WILL ADD TO HOME COMFORTS

In the Tennessee Valley power has been and will be for long years the outstanding feature of the development program. Waters of this stream and its tributaries that formerly ran to the sea in idleness are now to be put to the effective use of man. All of the more modern conveniences and comforts of home are to be offered to the people of this region at living prices, and the rates of the power are to be such as to encourage the maximum use of electricity. Industrial uses of this power are to be directed and encouraged by this Federal Authority, in order to give the people opportunities for employment and a means of establishing themselves on a more profitable, comfortable basis of life. This experiment is to be a gigantic commercial laboratory in social economic plans. It will undoubtedly reflect its influence throughout the Nation.

On the St. Lawrence River the administration also stands for the harnessing of that mighty stream with Canadian cooperation. In this work navigation developments for the great producing and industrial elements tributary to the Lakes territory is to be accompanied by a power development under the control of the New York State Authority. Here we have two cardinal principles bearing on the life of the northern region of our country presented by our President with the insistence that they shall be recognized through treaty, and later appropriation by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in the Columbia River Watershed of the Pacific Northwest, we have another mighty program inaugurated through the forceful action of President Roosevelt. He has designated sites and allocated funds for the inauguration of work at both Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects. The Grand Coulee is planned as the beginning of the greatest irrigation development the Nation has ever undertaken in any one project, and, in fact, almost equals the total of Federal reclamation work since another President Roosevelt started this program. It will prove a monument going down through history, affecting a large number of people and making possible the development of productive farms by the thousands for that time when American agriculture is called upon to feed our growing population, and also in that program wherein the farmer is to be put on a profitable basis of operation. With the Grand Coulee

will be a large offering of power, which may, as in the Tennessee Valley, be used for domestic consumption in cities and the country tributary there for industrial operations.

I am more directly connected with the Bonneville development on the Columbia. This is in my immediate territory. It is laid out for the inauguration of a program embracing the most perfect navigation conditions and the generation of power in heavy blocks at very low cost, beginning with a tidewater dam.

BONNEVILLE DAM OUTSTANDING UNIT

I hope this House and the country at large will better understand the Bonneville project. To me it is the outstanding, single unit in our President's mighty national program. It is the beginning of work to harness the great resources of the Columbia River on a plan which the engineers themselves regard the most effective that could be adopted.

Will you indulge me for a moment to study the Bonneville layout? Picture the country as a whole. Observe the Columbia River as the second greatest stream on the North American continent and third in the Western Hemisphere. Note that its discharge into the sea is nearly as large as that of the Mississippi into the Gulf of Mexico; that is, about 200,000,000 acre-feet of water annually.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, make further note of the fact that this stream has a watershed only one fifth the size of the watershed of the Mississippi. The effect of this inevitably must be accepted as an ideal condition for the generation of power; that is, tremendous volume of water flowing from the highest levels of the continent a very short distance to the sea, swift waters, cascades, many gorges hewn through the rocks, limited development and population down next to the stream, proximity of the first developments to the sea, an easy deep-sea channel to the first and second dams, ideal climatic conditions for industrial operations and human comfort, and on top of it all, the background of the beautiful, outstanding, scenic Pacific Northwest.

More than 150,000,000 acre-feet of the Columbia's flow comes from east of the Cascade Mountain Range. This rugged and picturesque uplift has an average elevation of 6,000 feet and parallels the Pacific Ocean shoreline from British Columbia to Mexico, only about 150 miles away. But one cut has been made through this great mountain range by waters of the interior, and that is the gorge of the Columbia.

At the point where tidal influence ceases is located the Bonneville Dam. Barge navigation requiring drafts from 9 to 15 feet is now available, and with the expenditure of but \$5,000,000 more, a deep-sea channel may be cut to the dam. With another two and a half or three million dollars, deep-sea locks may be put through the dam enabling deep-sea ships to operate up to The Dalles, Oreg., better than 200 miles from the Pacific Ocean.

HAS NO PARALLEL IN THE WORLD

There is no other parallel to this project anywhere in the world. Volume of flow, economy of development, tidewater location, perfect transportation conditions, and the combined influence of economic opportunities make this the gem of the power projects which either private capital or the Federal Government has yet undertaken to develop.

About 600,000 horsepower of energy may be generated at this dam, more than 50 percent of the same prime power under the present flow conditions of the river. With further reservoiring in future developments upstream the prime power will steadily increase until practically the total energy now discussed will be of that type.

Mr. Speaker, this dam is but 40 miles today from a 35-foot channel to the sea. It is within 40 miles of a great population center in and around Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash. In transmitting the energy for use of the people the shortest line yet proposed for any major project will be found sufficient. For those industries that desire to locate at the dam site our country can easily make it possible for the deep-sea ships to reach that point without breaking cargo of raw materials brought in until unloaded at the

factory warehouse, and taking the finished products out to all parts of the world. There are two railways and two highways serving the site where transportation advantages are more perfect than may be found elsewhere.

This great storehouse of energy is being opened to the people of Oregon and Washington. Control of the power is solely and wholly with the Federal Government, which agency is putting up all of the funds for development. As the people of the two States approach the Federal authorities with plans for the use of this energy, the same as is being done in the Tennessee Valley, they will be met in a responsive, cooperative way, and every possible encouragement will be given to the extension of the use of this power throughout the region where there may be a market.

The two other great Federal developments on the Pacific seaboard now under way are the Boulder Canyon Dam and the Grand Coulee. Each of these are much further from tidewater than Bonneville. Boulder Canyon energy will be transmitted from 200 to 300 miles to reach its major market. Grand Coulee can find an industrial market of any magnitude only over lines of from 200 to 250 miles length. Bonneville is on tidewater, on perfect navigation channels, and in a large population center. These relative locations will indicate to us the enormous value of Bonneville in comparison with any other Federal or private project of size that has been undertaken on the American Continent.

RECAPTURE OF INDUSTRY TO RESULT

In addition to serving the people adjacent to such developments as that at Bonneville for their greater human comfort and advancement with the lowest possible cost of electric energy, Bonneville is the tangible, living bid of these United States to recapture industry which has been driven to foreign lands. It is the logical economic procedure in laying foundations for revival within the United States of the pulp-paper, chemical, and metallurgical lines of industry. It is the nearest bid this country has yet made in meeting the great competitive program which the Soviet Republic is inaugurating for industrial supremacy. It is the lowest bid so far made within the United States to meet the low cost of power in Canada. It will, Mr. Speaker and my fellow colleagues in the House, be accepted by the experts of this and coming generations as the beginning of a real, virile industrial period for the Pacific coast wherein our country will start the building on our western seaboard of a vastly greater industrial empire for our safety and prosperity in war and peace.

In the Canadian hydroelectric program a marvelous combination of conditions was presented by nature. You have the great glacial lake regions north of the St. Lawrence and Lakes Ontario and Erie. Here we see vast natural reservoirs provided at no cost to man. We also find a rough terrain between the northern lakes and the St. Lawrence drainage system which enables the power plant to secure an advantageous head at a low cost of construction. These power sites are near the marvelous transportation system of the Great Lakes and that which will be provided on the St. Lawrence. With nature offering the reservoirs and very satisfactory dam sites, Canada has forged ahead in her power development in a remarkable manner.

Mr. Speaker, with the development of hydroenergy in Canada has gone marvelous increase in her industrial expansion. I note from recent reports that \$276,000,000 of American capital has been invested there to produce pulp-paper products. I also observe that more than \$400,000,000 of our capital has been used in the development of public utility enterprises for Canada, much of this being water power. I further observe that the pulp-paper industry of the North American Continent has rapidly shifted to our neighbor on the north until we pay her approximately \$150,000,000 a year for products of this character which we import and use within the United States. It is also to be noted that the great Aluminum Company has built at Arvida a superb, modern plant for the reduction of bauxite ore into this newest and most useful metal. Other chemical and metallurgical operations have been attracted to Canada.

CANADA'S HEADWAY REMARKABLE

While Canadian industrial progress was being recorded in an amazing manner, we also were making headway, but not in the same proportion. We did not have the low rates for electric energy which Canada possessed. We had not approached our greatest unit developments of hydropower because of their magnitude and the difficulties of private capital in financing such projects and carrying them until there was a market for the energy created there.

Due to this combination, the most rapidly expanding line of American industry, termed electrochemical and electro-metallurgical, which is commanding the greatest attention of any single field in world effort, was not holding its proper place within the United States. We were falling behind in the race, and were due, under that program, to become a relatively light industrial factor.

Our people were prone to hold that fuel-generated power, conveniently located for industrial purposes would protect our position. I recognize that amazing progress has been made in the efficiency of fuel uses for power production. However, every expert who has ever testified before congressional committees admits that there is a basic, enduring advantage to the industry using hydroenergy. When the great dam is written off as a capital charge and when only the parts of a hydroelectric plant which deteriorate through use and age are calculated for stated renewals, the hydro-plant has an advantage which can never be attained through fuel-generated power.

I have another observation to make in this respect. Coal, the chief source of fuel energy for all time is becoming every year more and more an essential raw material in industrial operations. Science is using coal with a diversity and a completeness for manufacturing a great variety of products that is amazing to all of us. Coal within another generation or two has in prospect a greater value as a raw material than for fuel. Coal cannot be reproduced within any historic period. When it is exhausted another crop will not be available for millions of years.

ARTIFICIAL RESERVOIRS COST MONEY

Mr. Speaker, water power is perpetual, at least, so long as the present climatic conditions prevail. Water running to the sea unused is a waste. Unused water power throwing the burden of industrial energy upon coal violates a fundamental principle of the present conservation program. Although in the use of coal the fuel requirement has been cut 50 percent within quite recent years for the same unit of energy, still this fuel is being exhausted. Prices will inevitably become higher. Mining conditions in the coal mine are unwholesome. Increased depths involve greater costs, and in every respect I say that substitution of fuel-generated energy by water power is one of the most farsighted and fundamental conservation efforts that the Nation can indulge today.

Except for the Great Lakes, which constitute probably the world's most perfect reservoiring system for equalizing the flow of Niagara and the St. Lawrence, there is no great natural reservoir condition found within the United States. Where the stream's flow is not naturally equalized artificial reservoirs must be created. These cost money. The flood-control program being urged by our President and accepted by the Congress as fair and proper is a step in the great national work of restraining our flood waters at proper intervals, preventing destructive erosion, safeguarding against channel silting, and equalizing the flow so that these waters will serve navigation, irrigation, and power.

Three great projects now under construction in Montana, Oregon and Washington, Nevada and Arizona are the initial steps for the control of flood waters, harnessing the vast latent energy previously wasted there and making the channels carry an additional flow during the usual low season to accommodate navigation. As these initial steps are expanded, as each additional reservoir is built, and as each new project is brought in, man's hand will by slow and inevitable degrees provide the storage capacity which nature has failed to leave in the major watersheds of the United

States and which have been so admirably furnished in Canada in the Great Lakes system.

I mention general physical conditions in order to point the argument in support of the President's splendid program of development. I hope that every Member of Congress, from whatever part of the country he may come, will recognize that each of these developments has a national significance and cannot be termed local in any sense of the word. I further hope that the wisdom of our great leader, who is writing economic history in flaming letters, will never be the target for the charge of "pork barrel", provincialism, or localized vision. If there ever was a time when the Congress should get the inspiration of his view it is now. If there ever was a period when coordination of the forces in different parts of the country should govern our work it is now.

At a cost of something like \$50,000,000 a 35-foot deep-sea channel has been provided between the Pacific Ocean and Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash. About half this total outlay has been paid out of local taxes, the other half being a Federal charge.

SAVING TO MANKIND COMPENSATES COST

Bringing deep-sea ships 100 miles interior from the Pacific has given low rates of transportation for producers of the soil and industry that no other human efforts could have provided. It has been a heavy outlay, but the saving to mankind is so great that the annual net returns compensate many times over the cost involved.

In our program on the Columbia for further improvement, which is marked by the first big navigation power unit at Bonneville, we shall take when the work is finished, deep-sea ships another 100 miles into the interior beyond Portland. This will give to the upper reaches as far as The Dalles deep-sea terminal rates. Ships going on this route will be able to reach Bonneville first, where 600,000 horsepower of energy may be generated. By providing deep-sea locks through the dam constructed and provision for which is made in the plans now being executed, deep-sea ships may proceed another 47 miles to the foot of the greatest potential power development in any one unit of the American continent.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, engineers could not create a more perfect setting for tremendous industrial operations than may be provided at a very low cost on the Columbia. Not to exceed \$5,000,000 will be needed to dig the deep-sea channel as far as the Bonneville Dam. About \$2,500,000 more than is needed for a barge canal will be necessary to convert these locks into a deep-sea type. After passing through the Bonneville locks, the ships then have a pooled area 47 miles in length, with a minimum depth of 35 feet or better, in reaching The Dalles. At The Dalles a high-dam type of construction could be made to generate from four to six million horsepower of energy, perhaps even more as the flow of the Columbia is regulated above.

After The Dalles project is developed, again there is pooled water provided to the next site which may be selected by the engineers. Thus, starting downstream and working up, the Columbia offers the ideal opportunity for carrying cheap transportation to the power sites of the greatest energy stream on the North American Continent and perhaps even greater than will be found in South America. It has been estimated that the trunk and tributaries of the Columbia have a potential of approximately 22,000,000 horsepower. With deep-sea ships and barges penetrating through the very heart of this, and with all climatic and other conditions favorable, industry is bound to hail this storehouse of energy and this marvelous transportation system as one of the greatest industrial centers the Nation has known.

WASTED ENERGY TO BE CONSERVED

With coal at \$3 a ton and with the most modern practices known to the largest fuel-generated plants, the wasted energy of the Columbia River watershed is today practically equivalent to 100,000,000 tons of our precious fuel supply. If you saw 100,000,000 tons of coal being burned each year, would you not feel it your duty as a patriot and a true conservationist to stop the appalling waste? Why not, then,

with equal effectiveness, save the equivalent of 100,000,000 tons of coal per year in water power and put it to the use of man in this most modern and progressive age?

The Columbia Basin, so far as existing records prove, is without any appreciable supply of commercial coal or petroleum. Deprived of these important factors, we must turn to our "white coal", that is, water power. Using this water power with the most advanced methods of science, our industries will thrive. Nature has given us compensations, but they are valueless until developed. Our President has started the development program. Our Nation in due course will write this plan down as the beginning of a most important era. All people in different parts of the country will hail this as one of our greatest forward steps. The man who today shouts "pork barrel" and "provincialism" at the expense of the whole people will be ashamed that he ever uttered such words.

Mr. Speaker, we of Washington, Oregon, and California are on the Pacific seaboard. That is your western front. We look out upon about half the population of the world. Trade is steadily growing there and is intensely competitive. The United States cannot take its proper share without our natural facilities on the Pacific coast being used. Distance is in our favor in seeking Pacific-country trade. We can reach those consumers in a shorter mileage than Europe. If you undertake to haul through the Panama Canal American products intended for that market, distances are against you. From an American viewpoint, whether indulged in the North, East, South, or West, this program is national in scope and purport. We want to establish all of our people on the firmest possible footing. We want our seaboard strong and invulnerable, either from an economic or an invasion viewpoint. We want American population in industry balanced. A top-heavy, centralized industry is not healthy. Trade within our own country is soundest when markets for our products may be widely distributed. You of the East and the South will find the West a superb market for your products when you encourage our development. You of this region should and will be happy to know that your western front is strong and impregnable in any event.

LOW COST OF POWER MAKES MARKET

We hear much of rates in connection with the Presidential power-development program. Taking the same basis of computation for all projects, Bonneville offers the lowest cost of energy yet determined by the engineers in their preliminary estimates. It is this low cost that will make the market. It is this advantageous situation, combined with the low cost found at Bonneville and plants upstream as navigation is taken to each, which will give us the competitive strength to meet Canadian and other foreign operations.

Mr. Speaker, America will in due course be proud of this work, and a careful study of the situation will command general admiration. I ask you, my colleagues in this House, to become more intimately acquainted with this program and believe with the fervor of patriotism that it is of benefit to every American.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—M'ANDREWS *v.* BRITTEN

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 362

Resolved, That James McAndrews was not elected a Representative to the Seventy-third Congress from the Ninth District of the State of Illinois and is not entitled to a seat therein.

Resolved, That Fred A. Britten was duly elected a Representative to the Seventy-third Congress from the Ninth Congressional District of the State of Illinois and is entitled to retain his seat.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following substitute for the resolution which the gentleman from Georgia has just sent to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. PARKER. I do not. I understand that I am to be recognized for 1 hour. If any gentleman in the House wants time on this resolution, I shall be glad to yield him time; but I do not yield the floor, and I do not yield to anyone to offer any amendment or substitute for the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia refuses to yield and is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The gentleman refuses to yield to me to offer a substitute. I know many instances where recognition has been accorded Members to offer a substitute in similar matters and, therefore, I feel that the precedents permit the offering of a substitute, regardless of whether the Chairman of the Committee on Elections yields or not. That is a right which every Member has, and of which he cannot be deprived. For that reason I feel that my substitute for the resolution is in order.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois has not conferred with the chairman of this committee, nor with any member of the committee, with reference to this proposed amendment. We do not know what it provides, and I think the gentleman is entirely out of order. He has shown the committee no courtesy whatsoever in coming here and offering a substitute without letting us know he had it in mind.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why not have the substitute read and let the gentleman from Georgia reserve his objection?

Mr. SABATH. That is satisfactory. I ask unanimous consent that my substitute be read for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the substitute be read. Is there objection?

Mr. ELTSE of California. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. PARKER. How much time does the gentleman from Illinois desire?

Mr. SABATH. Usually the time is divided equally.

Mr. PARKER. I shall be glad to yield the gentleman from Illinois 10 minutes if he wants it.

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman cannot divide the time equally, or yield me 30 minutes, I will content myself with 20 minutes.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to yield time to any Member who wants to speak on this resolution. I do not want to yield time to any Member to speak out of order.

Mr. SABATH. I assure the gentleman my remarks will not be out of order.

Mr. PARKER. I shall be glad to yield half the time to Members opposing the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the resolution.

Mr. PARKER. How much time do gentlemen on the minority side desire?

Mr. HOLLISTER. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. SNELL. We would like to reserve 15 minutes. As I understand, the whole hour is under the control of the gentleman from Georgia, and that he may yield to anyone he sees fit a certain length of time without yielding the floor.

Mr. PARKER. I want to take into consideration the time the minority members of the committee may need. I wish to yield such time as may be needed on the minority side.

Mr. HOLLISTER. Under the circumstances it would be best for the minority to reserve half the time.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLISTER].

I am glad to yield 15 minutes, half of my time, to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], which he may use himself or apportion to other members of his delegation as he sees fit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I greatly regret that it is my unpleasant duty today to oppose the resolution before this House, namely, the resolution that would seat my colleague, Mr. Britten. I wish to sincerely assure the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Britten], and the Membership of this House, that there is absolutely nothing personal in this matter; but, as the ranking Democratic Member from the State of Illinois, and chairman of the Illinois Democratic delegation, I have a plain duty to perform, and I shall try to perform it to the best of my meager ability, notwithstanding I have had no time to properly prepare to present matters with which I feel the House should be acquainted.

James McAndrews, the contestant, was the Democratic nominee from the Ninth Congressional District in the election of November 8, 1932, and he claims he received the majority of the votes cast in that election and he has filed a contest charging irregularities and that he was deprived of the certificate of election due to fraud and other reasons he has assigned. Obviously 15 minutes is not sufficient time within which to properly present the contestant's side of the case.

Shortly after the contest was filed testimony was taken in the city of Chicago. Approximately nine witnesses were heard and a transcript of the testimony was submitted to the Clerk of the House in accordance with the law. Later, oral arguments were made before the Elections Committee by attorneys for the contestant and the contestee. On March 15, the Committee on Elections No. 1, which had jurisdiction of this case, voted to recount the ballots cast in that election. The former Chairman of the Committee on Elections No. 1, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK], having been assigned to the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARKER] became Chairman of the Committee on Elections No. 1, and a day or two later he introduced House Resolution 335 asking that \$2,500 be appropriated for the purpose of defraying the expense of recounting the ballots in the city of Chicago. Although Mr. PARKER appeared before the Committee on Accounts a day or two later, for some unknown reason the Committee on Accounts did not act upon the resolution; and, if I am correctly advised, the resolution has been withdrawn.

The contestee, my colleague, Mr. Britten, appeared with Republican Members, as I am informed, although I had no notice, nor did the other Democratic Members from the State of Illinois have notice, that the request would be made that morning for this authorization by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution asking for this authorization was introduced upon the vote of the Elections Committee ordering the recount, and the Committee on Accounts met the following day. Being informed that the Committee on Elections No. 1 would have a meeting—not knowing the reasons for the meeting, but believing they might desire some information—I, with five or six other Democratic Members, appeared before it. To my great surprise, my colleague, Mr. Britten, was present. After about 45 minutes the Democratic Members from Illinois were permitted to appear before the committee. We were obliged to listen to unjustifiable and inappropriate attacks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Britten]. The gentleman attacked the Democratic National Committeeman from Illinois, attacked me, and attacked the contestant [Mr. McAndrews]. Later I, too, was given the privilege of addressing the committee; and I stated that these charges were unjustifiable, unfair, unfounded.

The gentleman from Illinois tried to convince the committee that these ballots had been tampered with, stating that he had received a telephonic communication from a friend of his, whose name I shall not mention because the name was given in confidence, to the effect that this friend

was informed by some other friend that if the ballot boxes were opened and the ballots recounted, beyond any doubt Mr. Britten would be unseated.

I stated to the committee in behalf of the Democratic Members from Illinois who were present that notwithstanding there was a Democratic board and the county judge having jurisdiction in the matter was a Democrat, they were honorable, trustworthy men, who would not tolerate, permit, sanction, or be a party to the perpetration of any fraud. Not only did I assure the committee that I felt but I assured the committee that I was satisfied—and I am still satisfied—that the ballot boxes had not been tampered with. Whereupon my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] telegraphed to Judge Jarecki and received an answer, which was handed to me this very minute.

The telegram reads as follows:

HON. JAMES J. O'BRIEN,

House of Representatives.

Charges that ballots in Ninth Congressional District have been tampered with are absolutely baseless. On the contrary, they have been since election, and are today, in sealed vaults. Access to them in local contests has even been denied by the courts.

EDMUND K. JARECKI,
County Judge.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. As I understand the parliamentary situation, the gentleman from Illinois has been denied the right to offer a substitute resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. We are, therefore, going to be asked to vote on a resolution presented by the committee seating Mr. Britten.

I think it would be to the gentleman's advantage if he would tell us just what evidence of fraud has been presented in this case and why he thinks we should vote against the resolution that has been offered by the Chairman of the Elections Committee. I am a member of the Committee on Accounts and we received absolutely no information of fraud when money was asked to count the ballots. Therefore, I should like to hear what evidence of fraud has been presented, if the gentleman has the information.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman will get it.

The mere fact that the Elections Committee, originally, after long deliberation, ordered the opening of the ballots should satisfy any Member of this House that there must have been justification and evidence on which to base its action. That was the vote of that committee on March 15. Why, after two of the Members have gone to other committees from that committee, the new chairman and the members of the committee have rescinded the action without giving the contestant or any of his representatives a chance or opportunity to be heard, I cannot understand; but the mere fact that the ballot boxes have been ordered opened and the ballots recounted should suffice to show that the report before the House today should be voted down and the Elections Committee instructed to proceed with its original action to recount the ballots. The ballots have been protected and are protected.

The statement of my colleague before the Committee on Elections No. 1 that some of the election judges in Chicago have been convicted of fraud might have influenced some of the members of the Elections Committee, but may I say right here that it is the practice and the things that my colleague did during the election that bring about and are responsible for the frauds committed by the election judges and the clerks of election. The evidence discloses that my colleague [Mr. Britten] offered prizes of \$250 in each ward to the captain and the workers of the precinct that would give Mr. Britten the largest vote in the precinct. It is because of that fact and because of the desire on the part of these election judges and some of the political workers to obtain this large sum of money, namely, \$250, that Mr. McAndrews believes that frauds were committed. The tally sheets have been changed and the votes have not been properly counted.

May I say to the Democrats as well as to the Republicans that I would not vote against this resolution or against my colleague [Mr. Britten] if I thought for one single minute that justice would not prevail. I harbor no ill will against my colleague [Mr. Britten], with whom I have served long, despite the fact that he has, for a reason I do not know, charged me with pressing this contest. I have made a few inquiries of two members of Elections Committee No. 1 and urged that some action be taken, as there was a continuous demand from the Democratic leaders and the Democrats in general that a Democratic House give Mr. McAndrews an opportunity to prove that he and not Mr. Britten was elected.

Therefore, I repeat that I have no personal interest, that there is no animosity, and that all I desire, even now, is that Mr. McAndrews be given the merited opportunity of a recount.

In view of that fact and the manly position assumed by contestant, Mr. McAndrews, the recklessness and unworthiness displayed by my colleague, Mr. Britten, and his lawyers in attacking the character of the contestant is deplorable. Mr. McAndrews for six terms served honorably and ably in this House, and who, contrary to the charges, has resided for many years in that district and, in fact, has spent more time therein than has my colleague, the contestee. Mr. McAndrews was born and reared in the city of Chicago, and has held many important positions of trust, is honored and respected by all who know him; no one is held in higher esteem than he, and long before my colleague, Mr. Britten, or I reached the city of Chicago, Mr. McAndrews was favorably known to a majority of the people of that district.

The charge made by the contestee against the county judge and the election board, before the Elections Committee, was willful and malicious. The same can be said as to the attacks Mr. Britten has made against the Illinois Democratic leader, Mr. Nash, and, surely, the wise-cracking remark as to myself, though undeserving of attention, caused me to remark, or counter, that I may not have such a luxurious residence in my district, nor such a mansion in Washington as he has.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] suggested what evidence there was to justify the opening of the ballot boxes or for a recount. In answer to his query, I wish to say that, in addition to the witnesses who testified as to the \$250 prizes or rewards offered to precinct captains and workers for the highest votes for Mr. Britten, Mr. Arthur G. Murray, who has served in many election contests, and who is considered an expert, testified that the split vote given was so unreasonably high in favor of the contestee that they were three to five times greater than the usual split vote. This is shown by the vote in the precincts in every one of the wards. The following table shows the disproportionate vote in many of the precincts:

In the forty-second ward:

Precinct	Straight vote	Split vote	Vote credited to Britten
5.....	69	207	276
7.....	87	280	367
19.....	75	202	277
23.....	55	244	299
25.....	53	200	313
26.....	48	234	282
31.....	56	139	195
49.....	88	181	269

And in the forty-third ward:

Precinct	Straight vote	Split vote	Vote credited to Britten
21.....	75	247	322
36.....	50	229	279
38.....	58	241	299
41.....	55	210	265
42.....	44	222	266

Likewise, in the forty-fourth ward:

Precinct	Straight vote	Split vote	Vote credited to Britten
1.....	49	168	217
3.....	57	259	316
4.....	49	215	264
5.....	71	227	298
11.....	41	209	250
12.....	61	196	257
14.....	80	265	345
15.....	61	149	210
16.....	104	244	348
29.....	57	203	260
31.....	90	230	320
36.....	80	274	354
38.....	21	219	240
41.....	83	219	302
43.....	51	151	202
44.....	43	167	210

Also, in the forty-sixth ward:

Precinct	Straight vote	Split vote	Vote credited to Britten
18.....	79	213	290
31.....	60	255	315
32.....	84	276	360
33.....	63	227	290
43.....	61	139	200
44.....	90	189	279
45.....	32	127	159
46.....	72	254	326

It is upon this evidence that the contestant, a gentleman of splendid reputation, who served in this House five or six terms with marked fidelity and ability, believes that if the ballots are recounted it will clearly show that the judges and the clerks of elections, due to the temptation and in the desire of winning the rewards offered, changed the tallies and credited Mr. Britten with many votes that were not cast for him.

In view of this disproportionate vote and the testimony given, and in view of the fact that the ballot boxes are certified as intact, I feel that there should be a recount, and, if I were in my colleague's position, I would not oppose that motion. I repeat, that is all I ask in the resolution which I have offered as a substitute for the committee's resolution, and which I feel, in justice to the contestant, the sanctity of the ballot, and the House, should have prevailed. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas Committee on Elections No. 1, on March 15, 1934, ordered a recount of the votes cast in the election held November 8, 1932, in the Ninth Congressional District in the State of Illinois; and

Whereas a subcommittee was authorized to recount the ballots and to obtain a determination of the actual votes cast for contestant and contestee; and

Whereas notwithstanding said action of said committee, and without said recount having been made, the committee reported on April 23 to the House recommending the adoption of a resolution entitling contestee to retain his seat; and

Whereas the action of the committee was taken without notice to the contestant, and thereby nullified its own previous action without due procedure or formality of notice to contestant: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Elections No. 1, or a subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to recount the ballots cast in said election and to report to the House the number of votes received by the contestant and the number of votes received by the contestee.

The Chairman of the Elections Committee, who acted in a most unfriendly manner, and who under the rules of the House refused to yield to me, precludes the obtaining of a vote on my substitute resolution.

In conclusion, I cannot refrain from stating that this arbitrary action, as well as the action of the gentleman of the Elections Committee who first moved that the ballots be recounted and who some weeks later moved to rescind the action of the committee, is difficult for me to comprehend. There is a great deal more that I could say which I shall refrain from saying at this time; but when the opportunity presents itself I will name the Members and some non-members of this House who may be responsible for the re-

consideration of the first action of the committee and for its refusal of the recount.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have never, since I have been a Member of the House, objected to a request of this kind; however, I can see in a delicate matter such as an election contest the opportunity to lodge in the hands of the gentleman from Illinois a weapon that might do irreparable damage to my colleague, Mr. BRITTEN. I do not believe it is fair under the fiction of revision and extension of remarks to permit 35,000 copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to go out setting forth a statement of the case by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], which my colleague, Mr. BRITTEN, has not the opportunity to properly answer. Therefore I am constrained to object, as much as I am reluctant to do so.

Mr. SABATH. Would the gentleman object to the real honest facts and truths going before the people?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection to the gentleman making his presentation on the floor of this House where there is adequate opportunity to answer him, but I do not believe it is fair to grant the gentleman's request under the circumstances to extend all this information and material in the RECORD, which cannot be answered, and therefore I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am in the embarrassing position of coming before this honorable body defending the Republican side rather than the Democratic side. I am one of the Democratic members of Election Committee No. 1, to which committee was assigned this case of McAndrews against Britten.

The charges involved in this case were, first, that Mr. Britten, the Republican candidate, offered prizes to the various precinct captains whose precincts voted the largest votes in proportion to the Republican votes that were given in these precincts. The evidence is that he offered \$150—some say \$200—to the precinct captain in whose precinct the largest proportionate vote was turned in. To the second precinct captain he offered \$100, and to the third precinct captain receiving the highest proportionate vote he offered \$50. There is some dispute as to the exact amount that was offered. Some of the testimony is that he offered \$250 to the precinct captain in whose precinct the highest vote was recorded. It is immaterial whether it was \$250 to the first man or \$150. The principle is the same. It is a question as to whether or not his conduct in offering these prizes was a violation of the Corrupt Practices Act. If it was a violation of the Corrupt Practices Act, it is immaterial as to the amount offered.

The evidence in the case is undisputed that Mr. Britten offered these prizes to the precinct captains. There is no dispute as to that fact, and, in fact, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Britten] admits it himself. The record in the case so indicates. What the committee had to decide was whether or not the offering of these prizes was in fact a violation of the Corrupt Practices Act.

Section 150 of title 2 of the United States Code, Annotated, reads as follows:

It is unlawful for any person to make or offer to make an expenditure or to cause an expenditure to be made or offered to any person either to vote or withhold his vote or to vote for or against any candidate, and it is unlawful for any person to solicit, accept, or receive any such expenditure in consideration of his vote or the withholding of his vote.

Now, the charge in relation to that is that during the campaign the said Britten, for election to the Congress of the United States, offered to make expenditures to certain persons to vote for him, the said Britten, by offering to make an expenditure in the sum of \$250 to the precinct captain whose precinct would give Britten the largest vote and by offering to make an expenditure of \$100, and so on.

It was the unanimous opinion of the committee that the action which the Republican candidate took, and which is admitted, did not fall within—

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. As I say, the question is whether or not the admitted conduct of Mr. Britten came within the terms of the Corrupt Practices Act, section 250, which I have just read.

It was the unanimous opinion of the committee, the Democratic members as well as the Republican members, that the conduct of Mr. Britten did not constitute a violation of this section.

It was argued in the brief for Mr. McAndrews that this was an expenditure to influence votes.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. I should like to ask the gentleman in how many precincts these prizes were offered and about what was the total amount in prizes offered in the congressional district?

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. I have not the information before me as to that.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. If the gentleman will permit, is it not the gentleman's recollection that three prizes were offered to the precinct captains making the best showing on election day, and that there were 172 precinct captains eligible to receive these prizes? Of course, their identity was not known until long after the election when the votes had been canvassed, and if anyone can be said to have been bribed, he certainly did not know he was bribed and could not have known it until about 3 months after the election was over.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. I may say to the gentleman and to the House that there were two prizes offered in two wards of my district, each of them consisting of \$250, divided, \$100 for the first, \$75 for the second, \$50 for the third, \$25, and \$15, and the total amount of prizes in the entire district was \$500.

Mr. BRENNAN. Will the gentleman from Arkansas yield?

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. BRENNAN. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that Mr. Britten and his attorney appeared before the committee and consented and agreed that these ballot boxes should be opened?

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. One of the questions is whether or not they did consent, and I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. BRENNAN. May I ask one further question? If they did consent, did such consent have any bearing on the actions of the committee?

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. The apparent consent did have a bearing on the actions of the committee.

I think the Members of the House who will read section 250 of title II, will readily appreciate the fact that the conduct which Mr. Britten admits does not come within the provisions of this section.

It seems to me that probably the law should be changed to provide that prizes should not be given. In some States the law is that money cannot be expended to influence votes. This is the law in my State; but so long as the law remains as it is, your committee did not feel it could hold any other way than it did in this respect.

Another point that was raised as showing corruption was the fact that Mr. Britten, the Republican candidate, used franked stationery in connection with his campaign. The committee was of the opinion that this does not come within the purview of this election contest.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. The testimony on this point was that 2 months or more after the election Mr. Britten used his stationery and franked envelopes to write to Chicago

to ascertain the names of the precinct captains who were entitled to these rewards.

The evidence shows that probably not more than 25 were franked for this purpose. Whether or not this was reprehensible conduct was not within the province of the committee to take into consideration in an election contest.

The third ground, and the principal ground, of contest was based upon the fact that Mr. Britten obtained an unusually large number of split votes.

There was not one iota of testimony, direct or indirect, to show that there was fraud in the counting of these ballots, and the only evidence that was in the case on the part of the contestant was that a witness from Chicago testified that he had participated as an election clerk or an official in a good many contests and that the proportion of split votes that Mr. Britten received was unusually large. Upon this ground the committee was asked to hold that there was fraud in this election.

It was testified in the case that Mr. Britten had resided in his district for more than 20 years; that he was active in matters concerning the Naval Affairs Committee; that he was active in obtaining the location of the Great Lakes Naval Training Station there; that he was thoroughly at home in that district, was well known there, and had conducted an active campaign.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that that was the statement of the attorney for Mr. Britten? There was no such evidence as to the residence of Mr. Britten or the short residence of Mr. McAndrews. That was the statement of Mr. Britten's attorney.

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. The gentleman may be correct; I was under the impression that that was in the testimony—at any rate, the statement was not denied.

But I want to say that the committee, taking the split vote alone, in its opinion would not have justified it in holding that there was fraud in the election or in the counting of the votes. That was the principal reason urged for the unseating of Mr. Britten.

Now, the question came up as to the agreement that a recount should be made. It is true that in the argument made by the counsel for Mr. Britten there was no transcription made of the argument, but in the course of his argument, in answer to a question, he contends that he said that he would not be afraid of a recount. Some of the committee felt that his statement was in the nature of an agreement for a recount, and some of them felt that even though there was no evidence that would justify it in the record that if the two contestants mutually agreed for a recount the committee could see no harm in granting one.

Mr. BRENNAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. BRENNAN. Am I correct in stating that the committee agreed to a recount?

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. At one time the committee voted that there should be a recount.

Mr. BRENNAN. Has there ever been any other action taken by your committee up to the present time?

Mr. PARKER. The committee afterward reconsidered that action.

Mr. BRENNAN. I was at the hearing, and the agreement was that the ballots should be opened, and there was no objection.

Mr. PARKER. The gentleman is mistaken. There was no such agreement.

Mr. BRENNAN. No agreement, but after the meeting it was agreed by your committee that the ballots should be opened.

Mr. PARKER. We went into executive session after the meeting, and the committee rescinded its former action.

Mr. BRENNAN. Since the determination to open the ballots, has there been any hearing on the matter since that time?

Mr. PARKER. We did have an open hearing, at which the gentleman was present.

Mr. BRENNAN. Who appeared?

Mr. PARKER. Judge SABATH and the gentleman—

Mr. BRENNAN. I was not present.

Mr. PARKER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I thought he was Mr. O'BRIEN.

Mr. BRENNAN. I should like to know what happened to warrant a change in the decision of the committee.

Mr. PARKER. If no other gentleman tells you, I will tell you in a minute. Mr. Speaker, I want to withdraw the statement I made that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRENNAN] was present. I thought he was Mr. O'BRIEN.

Mr. HOLLISTER. I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

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

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is this a unanimous committee report?

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. Yes; it is a unanimous committee report.

Mr. BLANTON. And the committee is composed of a majority of Democrats and a minority of Republicans, and yet reports this unanimously, deciding the case in favor of the Republican?

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Then what is all this fuss about?

Mr. TERRY of Arkansas. I shall not take up any more time of the House, except to say that I am a new Member, having come here last January. I was put on this Elections Committee. I feel that when one takes his place on an Elections Committee he thereby assumes a quasi-judicial position, and when he goes into the Elections Committee room he should leave behind him any question of partisanship, and he should decide the cases that come before him between Democrats and Republicans the same as though there were no party lines. [Applause.] And that is what the Democrats and the Republicans did in this case, and I appeal to Members of this House to sustain the action of the committee.

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

Mr. HOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I fear that if I let this opportunity pass without saying something the Committee on Accounts, after the happenings of yesterday, might sink still further in the estimation and esteem of the House. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]—and this is the occasion for my saying something, called attention to the fact that a resolution for funds for a recount was presented, and a hearing was held before the Committee on Accounts. That is correct. I granted a very quick hearing upon the understanding and assurance that the Elections Committee was unanimous in its opinion that there should be a recount. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARKER], the chairman of the committee, was notified, as was the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Britten] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and other gentlemen appeared. We have felt in the Committee on Accounts that when we report out a resolution to the House we must have something with which to back it up. Not one single charge of fraud in this contest was presented to us, not one earthly reason was given why there was even a necessity for a recount, and I am safe in saying that that committee, composed of 7 Democrats and 4 Republicans, was unanimous that no case had been made out so far as a recount was concerned. We later heard that the Elections Committee reconsidered and by a unanimous vote decided against a recount.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I know nothing whatever about this case. I am not a member of the Elections Committee. I do know that up until a few days ago one of the greatest lawyers in this House was the chairman of that committee. I speak of my colleague, Mr. CLARK of North Carolina. He is one of the ablest and fairest and squarest men I have ever known in my life. I know that a few days ago our friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARKER], who likewise has the confidence and esteem of this House, succeeded Mr. CLARK as chairman of that committee.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Not now. I know that the Elections Committee is composed of 6 Democrats and 3 Republicans and that they now come in with a unanimous report that there is nothing to this contest.

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

Mr. WARREN. In just a minute. Mr. Speaker, I am a partisan down-the-line-organization-caucus Democrat, if you please. [Applause and laughter.] But I am not so partisan that I am going to cast a vote in this House to steal a seat from another Member when nothing has been shown to warrant it. We have had enough of that in times past, and the Republican Party has been much more responsible for such occurrences than we have, probably because they have been in power longer. We know all of the outrages that happened here following the Civil War and on down. I think one of the most flagrant cases, one of the greatest outrages ever perpetrated on this floor, was when, in the expiring hours of a Congress, 3 hours before the Congress died, my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEAVER], was unseated by a majority of 1 here in this body and 2 years' salary and other emoluments were voted to the man who contested that seat, Mr. WEAVER having been overwhelmingly elected to take the new seat which the contestant warmed for 3 hours.

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

Mr. WARREN. Not now. I know that recently, because I was on the committee that heard the cases, in the case of our friend, Mr. PALMISANO, of Maryland, a recount was ordered, and it was in that case that the deadly social lobby tried to get in its work.

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

Mr. HOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. WARREN. In the Palmisano case, I went with Mr. Speaker Garner to the late Speaker of the House, Mr. Longworth, when Mr. Garner exposed to him the rottenness that was being concocted when friends of the contestant were knocking at our doors, using their social influence with every Member of the House to seat him. I am hoping that those days have gone and we will no more decide election cases on such things as that. I agree with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY], who has just spoken, that we ought to sit as solemn judges in these cases and cast our vote according to law and evidence and free ourselves from any feeling or spirit of partisanship. Mr. Britten should be unanimously seated. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina yields back 1 minute.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman yields to me now; he has a minute left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has yielded back his time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, in the very beginning let me state that I am in hearty accord with the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY], a member of the committee. When the gentleman from Arkansas tells you that no member of Elections Committee No. 1 has considered any action in any of these election contests along partisan lines he is telling the unvarnished truth. While, the committee has voted to seat 3 Republicans in this House, it did so because it believed these 3 Republicans were elected to membership in this body.

We Democrats on the committee are partisan, yes, every one of us. We come from Georgia, from Arkansas, from Texas, and from Louisiana. It is needless for me to say that we are partisan Democrats; but I believe every member of this committee is an honorable gentleman. There is not a thief in the crowd, and I am sure there is not a man holding membership on the committee who would vote to steal an election from anybody regardless of political affiliation.

With respect to the victim in this case, my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Britten] we recognize that he is partisan. As a matter of fact, he came before the committee and told us that he was partisan. I would not have any respect for him if he were not partisan; I think he ought to be partisan; and I think we ought to be partisan. But I do not believe we ought to be partisan when we go into a committee room and undertake to decide between man and man as to which one of them was elected to a seat in the House of Representatives.

I have had some experiences along this line myself. I was elected to office in a State-wide election and had the office stolen from me, stolen from me by Democrats, too. [Laughter.] I went into a Democratic convention after I had gotten the vote of the people in the primary, and the delegates to that convention from 21 of the counties in Georgia which I had carried, voted against me and I lost the office I had won at the hands of the people. You would not expect me, after having had such an experience, to be in favor of doing anything but justice to a man who has waged a campaign and has offered himself as a candidate for office. I mention this merely that you may know that there is not any remote possibility that I would try to steal any election from anybody. I feel too strongly on the subject.

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

Mr. PARKER. For a question; yes.

Mr. SABATH. Did anyone attempt, or was any effort made, to steal the election from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Britten]? Is it not a fact that the only thing Mr. McAndrews ever urged and requested was that a recount be had so that the committee would have before it evidence on which it could act?

Mr. PARKER. I cannot answer the gentleman's question, because I do not know the facts in the case.

Mr. SABATH. And is it not a fact that the committee originally voted to order a recount to satisfy itself whether Mr. Britten had been elected or whether Mr. McAndrews had been elected?

Mr. PARKER. I shall address myself to that proposition right now, and I shall answer your question fully.

Mr. Speaker, on March 14 the committee had a hearing; I believe that was the day. In the course of his argument to the committee, counsel for the contestee, Mr. Britten, made the statement that he had nothing to fear from a recount. The committee understood from what Mr. Britten's counsel had said that the gentleman from Illinois did not object to a recount being ordered. One of the Democratic members of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], suggested that if nobody objected to the recount, he thought the committee might go ahead and order it. We took no action in the case that day, but when the committee met again the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] made the motion that the recount be ordered, believing, as he did, that neither the contestant nor the contestee had any objection to a recount. This resolution was adopted by the committee and placed on the minutes. Five or six weeks elapsed, and nothing was done except that the chairman of the committee tentatively appointed two members of the committee, one Republican and one Democrat, to go to Chicago and count the ballots.

Some time thereafter the chairman of the committee was designated as a member of the Rules Committee and gave up his appointment to the Committee on Elections No. 1. After his resignation from the committee, the incumbent took over his duties as chairman. There was that resolution on the minutes, and no arrangements had been made whereby it could be carried into effect.

The first thing I did after I became chairman of the committee was to introduce a resolution asking for funds with which to conduct the recount. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Accounts. I appeared before the Committee on Accounts as did a number of other Members of Congress. When I appeared before that committee, I wanted to know on what evidence our committee had authorized this recount. I told them very frankly that in

my opinion the recount had been ordered by the Elections Committee because it believed that neither party to the contest objected to the ballots being counted.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Britten] stated that he had violent objections and that he had already told the former chairman of the committee, my predecessor, that he wanted to be heard. He said he understood that the committee believed he had no objection to this recount, and he wanted to appear before the committee and correct this impression. After I became chairman of the committee he made the same statement to me. I called the committee together and laid the facts before it and asked the members if they wanted to hear Mr. Britten. The committee voted unanimously to have another hearing and to permit Mr. Britten to come in and tell us how he felt about the recount. Several Members of the House from Illinois attended that hearing. We did not shut anybody off. I think the committee was in session some 2 hours or more.

I let everyone talk who wanted to talk. It was an informal, open hearing. There was nothing secret about it. After this hearing was over, and after Mr. Britten had stated he had never agreed to the recount and that he did not want one, we went into executive session, and the committee voted unanimously to reconsider the action it had taken in ordering the recount. Mr. Britten stated he did not believe a recount would hurt him, but he said he could not afford to make any such agreement.

At that meeting every member of the committee was present. After Mr. CLARK was transferred from the committee there was a vacancy and there were only 5 Democrats and 3 Republicans present at the meeting, but all 8 of them voted to reconsider the action, and the motion to reconsider was made by the same Democrat, Mr. BAILEY, of Texas, who had made the motion in the first place to authorize the recount.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BLANTON. After moving to reconsider, then did the committee vote not to have the recount?

Mr. PARKER. Not that day. Two or three days later we had another meeting in executive session, at which time we considered all the evidence in the case and every Democrat and every Republican member of the committee decided that there was absolutely nothing in the contest and that there was absolutely no ground for unseating Mr. Britten or for even asking for a recount.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN. In the gentleman's opinion, and in the opinion of the other members of the committee, there was no evidence of collusion or fraud that would warrant spending thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money sending people out there?

Mr. PARKER. Absolutely none. If it had not been for the fact that the committee believed all parties to the contest were willing to have the recount, none would have been suggested by the committee in the first place.

The charges against Mr. Britten were that he violated the Corrupt Practices Act. We heard the evidence and we decided that there was absolutely no evidence to substantiate this charge.

The second charge was a reiteration of the first charge with some additions but it too fell flat. There was absolutely no evidence to substantiate it. The third ground was that there should be a recount because Mr. Britten had received a disproportionate number of split ballots.

In all fairness, I want to state that if the fact that a Republican ran ahead of his ticket in the elections of 1932 is any ground for a recount, I think we would have to recount the ballots in the districts from which everyone of you gentlemen on this side of the aisle come. I do not know a Republican Member of this House who did not run ahead of his ticket in 1932. If they had not run ahead of the ticket they would not be here, and it is only natural that Mr. Britten, who has been in this House for 22 years, would run ahead of his ticket in Chicago.

As I understand it, Mr. Britten is the senior Republican in the House. He has been here longer or as long as any other Republican Member, and I was not willing—and no other member of the committee was willing—to subject him to a recount 2 years after the ballots were cast and perhaps cause him to lose his seniority in the House, his committee assignments, and all the other prerogatives that go with long Membership in the House of Representatives without good and sufficient reasons substantiated by evidence. The committee did not believe there was anything to the contest.

We have been frank and honest about the matter. We have brought our report to you. It is a unanimous report. It has the concurrence of every Democrat on the committee as well as the Republicans, and I had hoped when the report was submitted to the House it would not be necessary to take up any of the time of the House. I know of nothing further that I care to say, and I do not believe it is necessary to say anything more.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. [Applause.]

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I yielded the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I understand the gentleman desires to use only 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DOUGLASS. That is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. At the conclusion of the 5 minutes I shall move the previous question.

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the action of the Committee on Rules in giving this legislation the right-of-way at this time. Large expenditures of public money are made from time to time by the Congress of the United States, but at no time can we as public servants render a greater service than in the expenditure of the people's money for the development of education.

This proposed legislation, Mr. Speaker, will reach and benefit every section of our common country. In times of depression, want, and distress I know of no program or action that this House could take that would mean more to the common citizenry of the country than a liberal appropriation for vocational training. It reaches the homes of the great masses of the common people in every section of the country. The resources of the people have been depleted and in many States and in many sections, except for the strong arm of the Federal Government reaching out in an effort to help the citizenship, vocational education would not be available in many sections.

Every man is entitled to an equal opportunity in life, and the advantages of education should be available to every citizen in this country. By this appropriation of \$3,000,000 we make an investment throughout the United States that will declare dividends for all time. No man or woman has ever been enabled to adequately appraise the value of one human life. No statistician will ever be able to calculate the worth of a Washington, a Jefferson, or a Jackson. So in making this contribution to help the forgotten men and women of this country we truly are playing the part of the good Samaritan.

Many reckless expenditures characterize our deliberations from time to time. My only criticism of this legislation is the fact that only \$3,000,000 is proposed by the bill. If the opportunities were such and the resources of the country were adequate, I would favor a greatly increased appropriation at this time. I am glad to say that many of the appropriations of a reckless character have not characterized this administration as have characterized former administrations.

No man could rise in his seat on the floor of this House and justify an expenditure of \$11,000,000 in the erection of one public building for nine Supreme Judges or \$46,000,000

in the erection of another public building down the Avenue and then undertake to say that only \$3,000,000 should be available to forward human destiny and build character in this country.

Vocational education and training by reason of this appropriation will reach every part and section of the country. It will afford an opportunity for young men and women in the country to receive special and technical training that would not otherwise be available to them. It gives the farmers' sons and daughters an opportunity for vocational training. It affords them an opportunity in life to which they are so justly entitled. Every father and mother is anxious to give their children the best training and most advantages possible. This appropriation will afford them equal opportunities with those in more favored industrial centers. It gives to the farmers' sons special schooling in agriculture and farm life. It extends to his daughters an opportunity to make a special study of home economics, domestic science, and kindred subjects so helpful to them. The safety of our Government rests in the contented homes of America. No nation will ever be great that does not have an educated, trained, and patriotic people. The birthplace of liberty is in the homes of the farmers. It is in the country where freedom has its birth. The money being appropriated in this bill is an investment in future citizenship. We are investing in young men and women of America.

There should not be a single vote in opposition to this measure. It has been well said that "education is a debt due from present to future generations." We should encourage and educate the young men and women, the boys and girls of today, for upon them soon the responsibility of government will rest. We should prepare them by training and education for this great responsibility. The only investment worth while in this country is in the development of character and spiritual value. It is in the making of men and women. It is in the proper training and development of the mental, physical, and moral man.

Let us continue in our efforts to render service to those so deserving and so worthy as the sons and daughters of the farmers of America.

It has been well said that man made the city, but a kindly and All-Wise Providence made the country. When the only sinless man who ever lived was on earth He dwelt in the open places. He selected his disciples and teachers from the shepherds on the hills and the fishermen on the banks of the rivers and streams.

Let us continue in our efforts to better conditions and improve opportunities in the country homes of our people.

Only by doing this can we measure up to the responsibility expected of us by those who send us here and whose servants we are honored to be, and for whom I am proud to speak.

Let us keep in mind that he lives the most who serves the best. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, before moving the previous question I think it might be proper for me to make the announcement that at the conclusion of the consideration of this bill it is the purpose to call up the rule for the consideration of the Dockweiler bill affecting the compensation of rural carriers, and we hope to dispose of that measure before adjourning this afternoon.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Will that probably conclude the work for the afternoon?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should think so, but in the absence of the majority leader I should not like to make that as a definite statement.

Mr. SNELL. I believe earlier in the day the majority leader said to me he believed that would be the program.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think that is a reasonable assumption, but I should not like to make such a statement in his absence.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. When do we take up the Johnson bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I stated to the gentleman in private conversation yesterday, of course, we are amenable entirely to the suggestions of the majority leader as to when that bill shall be called up.

Mr. RANKIN. Will it be called up this week?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I cannot tell the gentleman. Of course, the Committee on Rules is ready to go ahead and present the rule for its consideration whenever it is put on the program.

Mr. RANKIN. The rule has been reported?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; and is on the calendar.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7059) to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7059, with Mr. ROBERTSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ELLZEY].

Mr. ELLZEY of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in the year 1917 Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act. This authorized an appropriation of money for the purpose of cooperating with the States in promoting training in trades and industries, vocational agriculture, and home economics.

The first year the authorization carried \$1,660,000 for this purpose. This amount was increased until it reached its peak in 1926, carrying, at that time, \$7,167,000 for this purpose. This continued until 1929, when the George-Reed Act was passed. The George-Reed Act was for the purpose of further providing vocational education and it carried an authorization of \$500,000 the first year and was effective for a period of 5 years, adding each year an increased amount of \$500,000, making, therefore, for the present year an authorization of \$2,500,000.

Under the first Economy Act during the Hoover administration this allocation for Smith-Hughes funds was reduced from \$7,167,000 to \$6,450,300, and then under the present administration it was further reduced to \$5,940,000, making a total reduction in the Smith-Hughes funds for vocational education of \$1,227,000.

Under the George-Reed Act the allocation reached as high as \$1,500,000 for the year ending June 30, 1933. Then the Economy Act of this administration reduced that to \$1,275,000, making a reduction of said funds of \$1,225,000, or a total reduction of Smith-Hughes and George-Reed funds of \$2,502,000.

I repeat these facts: The total authorization at the peak for the Smith-Hughes appropriation was \$7,167,000, plus the George-Reed appropriation of \$2,500,000, making a total of \$9,667,000. With the passage of the pending bill, Mr. Chairman, the George-Reed Act expiring in June of this year, an additional \$3,000,000 will be added, which, with the present funds under the Smith-Hughes Act, would make a total of \$10,167,000, or an increase of \$500,000.

The bill under consideration carries an appropriation of \$3,000,000, and of this amount \$1,000,000 is for vocational agriculture on the basis of farm population; \$1,000,000 for trades and industry on the basis of nonfarm population; and \$1,000,000 for home economics on the basis of rural population. In addition thereto it provides for an equalization fund of \$84,603, which would guarantee each State a minimum of \$5,000.

You will be interested in data given below, viz:

Smith-Hughes Act

Year	Total allotted	Agriculture	Trade-industry (20 percent home economics)	Teacher-training
1930 (June 30).....	\$7,167,000	\$3,027,000	\$3,050,000	\$1,090,000
1931 (June 30).....	7,167,000	3,027,000	3,050,000	1,090,000
1932 (June 30).....	7,167,000	3,027,000	3,050,000	1,090,000
1933 (June 30).....	6,450,300	2,724,300	2,745,000	981,000
1934 (June 30).....	5,940,000	2,520,000	2,510,000	910,000

NOTE.—Authorization for year 1933 was \$7,157,000, reduced by Economy Act to \$6,450,300; authorization for year 1934 was \$7,167,000, reduced by Economy Act to \$5,940,000; total reduction, year 1934, \$1,227,000.

George-Reed Act

Year	Total allotted	Agriculture	Home economics
1930 (June 30).....	\$500,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$250,000.00
1931 (June 30).....	962,808.43	478,428.02	484,379.40
1932 (June 30).....	1,483,000.00	737,000.00	746,000.00
1933 (June 30).....	1,500,000.00	750,000.00	750,000.00
1934 (June 30).....	1,275,000.00	637,500.00	637,500.00

NOTE.—Authorization for year 1933 was \$2,000,000, reduced by Economy Act to \$1,500,000; authorization for year 1934 was \$2,500,000, reduced by Economy Act to \$1,275,000. Total reduction year 1934, \$1,225,000 (George-Reed funds); total reduction year 1934, \$1,227,000 (Smith-Hughes funds); total reduction year 1934, \$2,502,000.

Total authorization at peak:			
Smith-Hughes Act.....			\$7,167,000
George-Reed Act.....			2,500,000
Grand total.....			9,667,000
With passage of this bill for next year you will have.....			3,000,000
Smith-Hughes Act next year you will have.....			7,167,000
Total.....			10,167,000
Increase of.....			500,000

It seems to me that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MITCHELL] was entirely correct in his splendid statement in behalf of this worthy cause.

In 1917 the first appropriation was made by the National Congress for vocational education. I feel that the whole program has been well justified. I wish each Member of the House could have heard the testimony of Bobby Jones, of Ohio, who happens to be a good friend and neighbor of my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER].

This young gentleman is a product of vocational education, and he thoroughly demonstrated to our Committee on Education that he had not only been trained as a true American citizen but as a practical farmer. I think he

clearly convinced the committee that the appropriation had been wholly justified in his case.

I remember that our good friend from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who has been such a loyal friend of education, told the committee that a vocational class had once visited his farm. He testified that their knowledge of agricultural facts convinced him that they had been taught very practical information.

Then the bill carries another worth-while feature, and that is the provision with reference to trade and industry. Before our committee Miss Betty Hawley, vice president of the New York State Federation of Labor, testified. I shall read you a portion of what she said:

We feel we are living in the interests of America, and just because we are a little bit better off financially than perhaps some other urban and rural centers, that we have no less responsibility, and particularly those of us who are leaders of labor do care what is happening to Bobby Jones and to the future farmers and his brother Jim O'Rourke from Tenth Avenue. One is the future farmer and the other is the future industrialist, and they are the future America.

May I say in conclusion that in 1917, when the Federal Government made the appropriation to foster vocational education throughout this Nation, the school authorities of the little red schoolhouse on the hill, and wherever they taught vocational agriculture and home economics, appropriated a lot of money for laboratories for agriculture and for home economics. At this particular time it seems wise to continue the appropriation, and I, therefore, hope that this bill will pass.

Summarizing, let me state again that the bill carries \$3,000,000 per year for a period of 3 years—\$1,000,000 for vocational agriculture, \$1,000,000 for home economics, and \$1,000,000 for trade and industry. Add this amount to the \$7,167,000 Smith-Hughes funds and you will have for vocational education the total amount of \$10,167,000. I am convinced that this amount is extremely small, when we take into consideration the fact that this administration has appropriated for national recovery \$3,300,000,000; and another act provided \$500,000,000 for relief; and still an additional act \$950,000,000 for relief. Before we adjourn this term another billion dollars or more will probably be appropriated. Ten million dollars seems to me a pitiful sum to contribute to this worthy cause of vocational education, and I think it should be given careful consideration by the House. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a breakdown of this set-up showing how the \$3,000,000 is to be distributed.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to follows:

Allotments for vocational education by States and Territories

Allotment of \$1,000,000 on the basis of farm population for vocational agricultural education; of \$1,000,000 on the basis of nonfarm population for vocational trade and industrial education; and of \$1,000,000 on the basis of rural population for vocational home-economics education; and additional amounts required to insure minimums of \$5,000.

State or Territory	For vocational agricultural education		For vocational trade and industrial education		For vocational home-economics education	
	Allotment of \$1,000,000 on the basis of farm population	Additional amount required to insure minimums of \$5,000	Allotment of \$1,000,000 on the basis of nonfarm population	Additional amount required to insure minimums of \$5,000	Allotment of \$1,000,000 on the basis of rural population	Additional amount required to insure minimums of \$5,000
Total.....	\$1,000,000.00	\$31,019.66	\$1,000,000.00	\$32,191.61	\$1,000,000.00	\$21,391.65
Alabama.....	43,759.65		14,181.82		35,194.35	
Arizona.....	3,232.16	1,767.84	3,654.98	1,345.02	5,286.94	
Arkansas.....	36,550.17		7,981.17		27,230.72	
California.....	20,259.34		54,912.30		28,064.34	
Colorado.....	9,234.22		8,176.60		9,546.43	
Connecticut.....	2,833.02	2,166.98	16,507.46		8,791.91	
Delaware.....	1,519.19	3,480.81	2,083.34	2,916.66	2,132.30	2,867.70
Florida.....	9,108.65		12,914.11		13,108.92	
Georgia.....	46,314.07		16,180.15		37,249.02	
Idaho.....	6,150.06		2,787.20	2,212.80	5,838.51	
Illinois.....	32,625.19		72,011.89		36,914.34	
Indiana.....	26,544.44		26,338.99		26,694.23	
Iowa.....	31,928.34		16,213.18		27,601.59	
Kansas.....	23,089.74		12,746.58		21,301.28	
Kentucky.....	38,413.16		15,616.25		33,595.37	
Louisiana.....	27,119.04		13,801.93		23,464.33	
Maine.....	5,582.94		6,802.52		8,805.42	
Maryland.....	7,732.87		15,138.51		12,150.85	

Alloiments for vocational education by States and Territories—Continued

State or Territory	For vocational agricultural education		For vocational trade and industrial education		For vocational home-economics education	
	Allotment of \$1,000,000 on the basis of farm population	Additional amount required to insure minimums of \$5,000	Allotment of \$1,000,000 on the basis of nonfarm population	Additional amount required to insure minimums of \$5,000	Allotment of \$1,000,000 on the basis of rural population	Additional amount required to insure minimums of \$5,000
Massachusetts	4,024.24	975.76	44,809.04		7,738.19	
Michigan	25,544.94		44,087.69		28,500.95	
Minnesota	29,232.88		18,119.74		24,172.60	
Mississippi	44,496.42		7,025.68		30,919.82	
Missouri	36,387.58		27,309.66		32,756.86	
Montana	6,679.93		3,616.25	1,383.75	6,598.01	
Nebraska	19,122.97		8,603.34		16,503.00	
Nevada	536.79	4,463.21	810.28	4,189.72	1,047.22	3,952.78
New Hampshire	2,052.03	2,947.97	4,370.22	629.78	3,556.75	1,443.25
New Jersey	4,280.35	719.65	42,462.14		12,991.55	
New Mexico	5,179.26		2,874.28	2,125.72	5,856.57	
New York	23,505.47		128,878.71		38,231.59	
North Carolina	52,236.85		17,052.86		43,677.63	
North Dakota	12,971.53		3,079.14	1,920.86	10,501.80	
Ohio	33,081.63		61,175.07		39,586.31	
Oklahoma	33,435.59		14,898.53		29,132.11	
Oregon	7,302.66		7,928.52		8,586.65	
Pennsylvania	27,970.81		95,285.92		57,322.74	
Rhode Island	537.97	4,462.03	7,286.75		963.47	4,036.53
South Carolina	20,922.51		8,929.47		25,307.79	
South Dakota	12,740.08		3,286.48	1,713.52	10,398.23	
Tennessee	39,684.15		15,214.90		31,827.39	
Texas	76,800.99		37,708.02		63,568.39	
Utah	3,778.00	1,222.00	4,258.27	741.73	4,470.28	529.72
Vermont	3,686.28	1,313.72	2,679.05	2,320.95	4,456.62	543.38
Virginia	31,041.94		15,974.94		30,278.53	
Washington	9,949.57		13,668.06		12,561.64	
West Virginia	14,653.44		13,900.79		22,902.55	
Wisconsin	28,766.16		22,347.75		25,631.20	
Wyoming	2,388.39	2,611.61	1,655.09	3,344.91	2,876.80	2,123.20
Alaska	111.92	4,888.08	606.49	4,393.51	951.83	4,048.17
Hawaii	5,870.52		2,047.32	2,962.68	3,153.08	1,846.92

Mr. CARTER of California. Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Education. I think it is a very necessary and splendid piece of legislation. So far as I know, there is no opposition to the bill from any Member of the House. Therefore, I shall make no extended speech in its behalf, as I do not consider it necessary.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this bill which really is to extend the life of the so-called "Reed-George Act." Some years ago, when the farm situation was becoming rather acute, a commission of business men was appointed to study the situation as it related to agriculture throughout the country. After the commission had made a very exhaustive study of the farm situation throughout the United States, a joint report was published by two organizations, one the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the other the National Industrial Conference Board. I quote briefly from that report the portion which relates to rural education:

[From the Condition of Agriculture in the United States and Measures for its Improvement]

EDUCATION OF THE FARM YOUTH

It is certain that the task of transmitting to the rank and file of the farmers the results of agricultural research work must largely be attacked through improvements in education of the rural youth. * * * The rural schools can be of great help in transmitting better methods to our future farmers. In the opinion of the commission this phase of rural education has not yet received the necessary attention. At present the rural schools consider it their main task to dispense a type of education which seems ill suited to the probable needs of the pupils. Little consideration is given to the fundamentals of agriculture, and the curriculum seems to be shaped almost completely to meet the requirements necessary for entrance into high school or college. It is not suggested that the rural school become a training ground solely for the vocation of agriculture, but the fact remains that most of the children who stay in the locality will pursue that calling, and it therefore seems that a curriculum which does not completely ignore this fact might be more beneficial than that now normally pursued.

The prosperity of the American farmer depends upon his efficiency relative to foreign competitors. To attain and preserve an American standard of living he must constantly keep several steps in advance of those competitors. This can be adequately done only through education. A well-conceived program of education, moreover, will not only help to provide the means of living well

but will in itself contribute to better living and working conditions. Its benefits will not be rapidly attained nor spectacular, but they will work out their results in a thousand devious but effective ways, and education will thus be one of the most important means for improving conditions on our farms and giving American agriculture the standing which it must have if the Nation is to maintain its proper place in the progress of mankind.

Above all, the commission wishes to emphasize the importance of giving to our rural education in large degree a character and a quality which will help to conserve and improve rural life. If we are to preserve some of the fundamental characteristics of farming as a way of life and a noble calling, our farm youth must be brought to a clearer realization of its intangible values and its advantages in contrast to urban activities, and the farmer himself must in larger measure be brought to conceive of his occupation not as a temporary makeshift in which he may well be content to accept lower returns for his labor than his city fellow in the hope of speculative returns on his land values, but as an opportunity for a rich, well-rounded life in which his intelligence and culture and all the resources of community life may find full scope for development.

After that report was made there was formulated before the Committee on Education, of which I then had the honor of being chairman, a program, calculated to meet the recommendations of this committee. As I recall it at that time there were some 11,651 rural high schools in the country, but only 29 percent of those high schools were giving any training whatever in vocational agriculture. The purpose of the Reed-George Act was to reach, so far as possible, the other 71 percent of the over 11,000 rural high schools in the country.

If there ever was a time when we needed this legislation it is now. You gentlemen who have recently read the report of Mr. Hopkins realize that there are some 400,000 farm families on the relief roll. The one ambition of the average father and mother is to see that their boys and girls have an opportunity to get an education. They are willing to suffer almost any sacrifice in the interest of their children, and the only hope that many of these farm families now have in the rural districts for their children to receive an education and to prepare them for life is through vocational work that is made possible by the Federal aid that comes through this bill.

We have poured money in great volume into every kind and type and description of public works, but there is nothing more important to America than the education of the youth of the land. It is a condition precedent to the safety

of a republic that the rank and file of the boys and girls have an opportunity to at least receive the fundamentals of an education. Daniel Webster once said:

If we work upon marble, it will perish; if we work upon brass, time will efface it; if we rear temples, they will crumble to dust; but if we work on men's immortal minds, if we imbue them with high principles, with a just fear of God and love for their fellow men, then we engrave on these tablets something which no time can destroy and which will brighten to all eternity.

The purpose of this legislation is to make more effective an instrumentality for achieving the ideals of education so ably enunciated by the great defender of our Constitution.

We have over 11,000 rural high schools in the United States. We are reaching only part of them, but under the Reed-George Act we have narrowed down the percentage, and more boys and girls are having an opportunity to get an education. At this particular crisis, where in many communities rural high schools have been built, it is utterly impossible for those communities to support those schools unless assured of some aid from the Government. We have assisted about everything imaginable in this country, and I want to see this legislation enacted today to underwrite the future of the farm youth of this land. [Applause.]

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this bill. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein letters from President Roosevelt, Mr. Farley, and Mr. Byrns.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to give a brief summary of the achievements of the Seventy-third Congress and tell in a few words the story of the new deal inaugurated by President Roosevelt. My remarks are in a measure a summary of a recent radio address I delivered at the invitation of the Columbia Broadcasting System from Washington on April 20, 1934.

A little over a year ago our Nation had sunk to the lowest point ever reached in the morale of a people. Business, trade, and industry were at a low ebb, and the number of unemployed increased to an extent never before experienced in our history. March 4, 1933, was more than a mere change in administration. It was the beginning of a new social order. No modern state has undertaken an experiment which even remotely compares with the adventure upon which President Roosevelt has embarked. He is the first statesman who has sought systematically to use the power of the Federal Government to benefit the individual.

On March 5, 1933, the calling of a Nation-wide bank holiday was immediately followed by the passing by Congress of emergency legislation permitting the gradual reopening of sound banks.

Through the Public Works Administration and the Civil Works Administration and other agencies of the Government more than 4,000,000 of the 11,000,000 unemployed have been given work during the past winter, thereby eliminating much hardship and suffering.

The National Industrial Recovery Act gives effect to ideas which have been fought for in Congress for over a quarter of a century. This act abolished child labor. The codes of fair competition give a national status to the regulation of hours and wages, increasing employment and raising the general price level of commodities.

The Public Works Act provided for the expenditure of \$3,300,000,000 on public works or public-benefiting private works. It has brought forward many projects such as Federal buildings, waterways, and civic improvements that will mean much to all communities throughout the Nation.

FARM RELIEF

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration has attempted to raise agricultural prices by curtailing production. It provides a plan to pay farmers for crop cuts and a method to raise necessary funds by taxing processors.

From 1921 to 1929 buying power that should have stayed with the farmers became concentrated in the great money

centers. Overproduction in agriculture reduced the consumer's buying power even more than it reduced the prices of what he needed to buy. By March 1932 farm incomes in the Nation had dropped from \$16,935,000,000 in 1919 to \$5,250,000,000 in 1932. Farm prices were the lowest ever recorded. The Agricultural Adjustment Act was built upon the principle of price parity for farmers. In other words, fair-exchange value for farm products as measured by their buying power in the pre-war period of normal agricultural stability. While the National Recovery Administration has succeeded in raising wage levels and the price of manufactured articles, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has not been so successful as yet in raising the general price level of farm produce. I am hopeful, however, that in due time the general price level of farm produce will keep pace with the rising price level of wages and articles of manufacture.

The special session of the Seventy-third Congress granted the President broad powers to control currency and sanctioned a temporary departure from the gold standard and abrogated gold clauses in Federal and private contracts.

The Federal Trade Commission has been authorized to pass on all new security issues sold in interstate commerce, through the "truth in securities act", which imposes severe liabilities on sellers of stocks and securities, who fail to furnish prospective buyers with complete information. This legislation is most fair to the rank and file of the American public because of the long history of terrific losses taken by innocent investors over a period of years.

Legislation has been passed providing a system of licensing sound banks and instituting far-reaching bank reforms, including separation of investment, private and commercial banking, and setting up a way of insuring bank deposits. Our banking and currency systems are now on a sounder basis than they have been for many years. Today, owing to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, people may put their savings in a bank with the assurance that their money will be there when they wish to withdraw it.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was created to operate Government properties at Muscle Shoals, Ala. I am confident that this huge undertaking will contribute much in the fight for recovery. The railroads of our Nation had been hard hit by the depression, and legislation was passed creating the Federal Coordinator of Transportation. Much relief has also been extended to the railroads through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The regular session of the Seventy-third Congress, beginning January 3, 1934, enlarged and expanded the forces of recovery given birth during the special session ended June 16, 1933.

The Emergency Farm Mortgage Act provides for the establishment of a corporation to aid in refinancing farm debts and other purposes. It provides for the handling and refinancing of farm mortgages on liberal terms.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

During the present session of the Seventy-third Congress several bills have been introduced to provide for old-age pensions. People who have passed the years where they are expected to work hard should have security. They should not be compelled to compete in the markets for the relatively few jobs. I favor a Federal pension system whereby the aged and destitute can remain at home and spend their last days in peace and contentment.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation bonds heretofore guaranteed by the Government for interest only will now be guaranteed as to principal. This will be of much assistance to the home owners throughout the Nation in view of the fact that many mortgagees had declined to accept the Home Owners' Loan Corporation loan bonds. With this guarantee there should be no more hesitancy on the part of any mortgagee in accepting the bonds of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

I have made two recent speeches on the floor of the House in reference to veterans' legislation. During my entire service in Congress I have at all times been a consistent

friend of the veterans in my district. I voted for the immediate cash payment of the bonus when the matter came before the House, and I also voted for the Independent Offices Appropriation Act with its provisions for increased benefits to veterans.

I have received letters from Hon. John Thomas Taylor, vice chairman of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, and Hon. James E. Van Zandt, national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, expressing appreciation and approval of my efforts in behalf of veterans. The North Carolina organization of Veterans of Foreign Wars has officially endorsed my candidacy for renomination and reelection to Congress, and have asked all veterans to support me as an appreciation of my services.

All new-deal legislation has had as prime essentials, first, to give immediate aid to those in dire distress and, second, to create a purchasing power among the masses and to eventually bring back prosperity.

I favor a measure now pending before the Congress providing a plan to pay off depositors of closed banks in full and thereby turning over all sound assets of these banks to the Government to be liquidated over a period of 10 years.

Another measure under consideration provides unemployment insurance whereby the employer in good times will contribute a small percentage of the total pay roll to create a fund to provide a small income for those temporarily out of work.

I favor legislation whereby the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be enabled to give relief directly to private industry.

There is much legislation I have not been able to discuss in the time allotted to me. I can safely say, however, that more real work has been crowded into these last two sessions of the Seventy-third Congress than in any like period of time in the past. It has been my privilege to contribute my share in helping our President in his fight for recovery.

I strongly favor a continuance of the new deal, and I think no half-way measures should be adopted. I believe in doing the job well while we are at it, and there is strong evidence that we are definitely on the road to recovery and that good times are ahead.

A PERSONAL APPEAL TO MY FRIENDS AT HOME

Mr. Chairman, I am a candidate for renomination in the Democratic primary in my district on June 2, 1934; and although I have seen many hundreds of my friends on recent trips to my district, most of my time between now and June 2 will be required at my post of duty in Washington; therefore I ask the privilege of making a personal appeal to my friends at home.

During 12 years of service the interests of my congressional district have always been paramount with me. I have a sense of honor; and if I did not know that I had given good service and did not know that I was in better position than ever before to accomplish things for my district, I would not ask to be returned as their Congressman.

My many years of seniority in the Congress, my position on the Appropriations Committee, the friendships I have made in my years of work at the Capitol, and my close personal association with the present administration enables me to accomplish things for my district now that I would have had to fight for unsuccessfully years ago. I feel certain that I have accomplished more for my district during my last two terms than ever before. President Roosevelt, in the midst of his new-deal program, needs members of Congress with years of seniority and experience to help him at this time. A new member of Congress would need long experience in Federal affairs to give assistance in a crisis like this.

In view of the fact that so many unfair and false reports have been deliberately circulated in the district in an effort to secure my defeat in the coming primary on June 2, 1934, and for the benefit of my friends who have manifested an interest in me and for all those in the district who believe in fair play, I wish to give the opinions of others than myself as to the service I have rendered.

I quote letters from outstanding leaders of our Nation sent to me, unsolicited and voluntarily, in a spirit of sincere

appreciation of my efforts. The first letter is from Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, our President, received while I was home for a few days during the Christmas holidays. The second letter is from Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of our National Democratic Executive Committee, Postmaster General, and chief spokesman of the present administration. The third letter is from Hon. JOSEPH W. BYRNS, former Chairman of the Appropriations Committee (of which I have been a member for several years) and the Present Democratic floor leader of the House of Representatives.

HON. CHARLES L. ABERNETHY,

New Bern, N.C.

MY DEAR MR. ABERNETHY: It is with keen regret that I learn that you have been ill this summer and trust that you may soon be fully recovered. I want you to know how grateful I am for your untiring efforts in support of the administration's policies during the grinding weeks of the special session of the Congress. While we are all looking forward to and counting on this same fine helpfulness during the coming session, I do hope you will pay attention first to your health. Do not let anything stand in the way of your doing this.

When you do come to Washington, be sure to come in to see me.

Many thanks and best wishes for a happy holiday season to you.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, December 12, 1933.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,

NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING,

Washington, June 16, 1933.

HON. CHARLES L. ABERNETHY,

House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want you to know that I greatly appreciate the support you gave the administration's program during the session just closed. I feel certain the people of the country generally realize that more beneficial legislation was passed at this session of Congress than ever before in the Nation's history.

For the part you played in these remarkable accomplishments I want you to know that I am personally grateful.

With best wishes, I am, sincerely,

JAMES A. FARLEY, *Chairman.*

OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,

SEVENTY-THIRD CONGRESS,

Washington, D.C., June 24, 1933.

HON. CHARLES L. ABERNETHY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CHARLES: May I take this opportunity to express to you my deep appreciation and gratitude for your kindly consideration to me personally during the trying days of the session. Your service and your loyalty to the party made possible the splendid record written by our Democratic Congress at this session.

With best wishes, I am, sincerely your friend,

JO BYRNS.

These letters show conclusively that I have been of real service, not only to President Roosevelt in helping him put over his great recovery program, but also to the Nation and district.

I have at all times kept in constant touch with the affairs of my district. I am carrying on for my constituents as I always have.

When Democrats are privileged to contest in a primary, a spirit of chivalry should prevail. I promise the district that regardless of any unfair and underhand tactics used against me, and regardless of any false reports that may be spread about in the district, I shall say no unkind or harmful word against anyone. I ask to be renominated to Congress on the basis of my record.

As in years past I am personally available to my constituents at all times. I shall continue to try to answer every call made upon me, and the poorest person in my district can now, as in the past, always command my every effort in his or her behalf.

I am deeply grateful for every consideration extended to me by my constituents during my long years of service; and if I am privileged to continue as their Representative in Congress, I promise that I will make every effort in my power to prove worthy of the trust and confidence reposed in me.

As long as the great majority of my constituents want me for their Congressman and encourage me personally and tell me that I am doing well by them, and as long as they continue to write me letters of commendation and approval, I shall carry on.

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. McCARTHY].

Mrs. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, when we realize that a large part of our Federal tax dollar is spent for national defense and roads, then we should surely make no objection to spending an infinitesimal part of that dollar for education. I think few of us realize the crisis in education at this time, except those who have been in close contact with the schools. It is true that education has suffered in all countries during the present depression, but it is a sad commentary that education in America has suffered more during this period than in any other country. Of course, industry and agriculture have suffered, but education has suffered more than either of these, and of course vocational education, along with the other kinds of education, has been greatly hampered on account of finances. When expenses were to be cut, some of these vocational courses were the first to suffer, regardless of the necessity for them and the demand from the general public.

Briefly, I shall go into some of the merits of vocational education. The pending bill authorizes an appropriation to aid these States in paying the salaries of teachers of agricultural, home economics, and industrial education. In many cases these teachers could not be employed for these projects without the benefit of Federal aid.

In the courses on agriculture, instruction is given in the rotation of crops, marketing, soil chemistry, poultry raising, dairying, and animal husbandry. In the home-economics courses, the girls learn how to make their own clothes, which is a very important matter during this time when incomes are so drastically reduced. These courses also include instruction in the care of infants, child development, and home nursing. In these days there are many families which must depend upon home care in case of illness, for they cannot afford to incur hospital bills. This education is practical along other lines. When the clothes are made at home it is important that the seamstress know something about the fabrics that will be used; and the students are taught how to test fabrics used in garments, draperies, and table linens. I am stressing these things that you may know the practicability of this work.

Then, also, to a family with a reduced budget it is important that a well-balanced diet continue regardless of the reduction of income. These classes are instructed that the cheaper cuts of meat, for instance, can be utilized and made just as tasty as the more expensive cuts through proper preparation. This training has enabled many families to have meat on their tables who would not have had it otherwise.

I bring out the fact, also, that too many schools have already closed; and more of them are going to close unless Federal aid continues; a separate bill covers such an appropriation. The pending bill continues the George-Reed Act. Federal aid to vocational education will terminate in July if this bill is not enacted. At this time there are 316 schools in my own State of Kansas already closed. Federal aid money will be of great benefit in paying teachers' salaries.

As we have been told by members of the committee, education is of extreme importance in a representative government. The children of today cannot wait for the passing of the depression to receive their education; they are growing to manhood and womanhood. Federal aid must be given at this time if it is to be of any advantage to them. Vocational education aids not only the youth of the country, but serves also to provide adult education. Many of the older people who attend these vocational schools had no opportunity during their childhood to receive an adequate education. [Applause.]

Mrs. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, perhaps few of our citizens, with the exception of the school men and women, who are in touch with the situation, realize the magnitude of the calamity which has fallen upon the schools and children of America. In order to fully appreciate the crisis it is necessary to quote some statistics in regard to losses recently sustained by education. While it is true that retrenchment has come about throughout the world because of economic con-

ditions, yet in the United States it is a sad commentary when we find that education has suffered more during the depression than in any other country.

Hundreds of rural schools in the various States failed to open last fall because of lack of funds, and by the first of the year 2,600 schools were closed to the 140,000 children in attendance. It is estimated that by April 1, 20,000 rural schools had closed, affecting over 1,000,000 children. While the pupils in the primary and secondary schools are of first importance, the tragedy that has come to the school teachers cannot be overlooked. More than 200,000 of these teachers, or one fourth of all public-school teachers, are receiving less than \$750 per year, which is the minimum provided for unskilled labor under the blanket codes of the President's reemployment agreement. Of this number, approximately 85,000 teachers are receiving less than \$450 per annum. The teachers, by sacrificing a great part of their salaries to keep the schools open, are thereby bearing a greater portion of the tax burden than any other group.

The seriousness of the situation cannot be overemphasized. The success of a representative government depends upon an informed and enlightened citizenry. In civilization and government we are a democracy, and governments are designed to be the agents of a free society. The first public schools emphasized the need of giving solidarity to a new government. Solidarity through education was an urgent necessity to protect the United States from enemies within as well as from enemies without. Today our Government is threatened more by the danger of internal strife than by the possibilities of invasion by a foreign foe. Agitators spreading their propaganda for revolution and communism find ready listeners among the ignorant and uneducated. Prejudices are easily aroused in such groups.

LOSS OF SCHOOL REVENUE

The present financial condition of the school is due to several causes, chief among which are the shrinkage in property values, inability to pay taxes, lower tax rates, and loss or freezing of school money in closed banks. It is clear that many small taxing units can no longer maintain the present educational opportunities unless there is adjustment of the taxing systems of the country. It is most important that each State put its own house in order and tap every available source of revenue before appealing to the Federal Government for aid. The States may complain that the Federal Government has monopolized the revenues of the Nation through the income tax and other Federal levies but many commonwealths have met the situation by imposition of a sales tax, a State income tax, and license taxes.

TEMPORARY EMERGENCY AID

The Civil Works Administration has been the good fairy for a great many Cinderella American schools that were in dire need. The funds of this emergency bureau received from the Public Works Administration were used for repair of school buildings, payment of teachers' salaries, and income to students who were dependent on their own earnings. The Federal Emergency Relief Administration has provided \$2,000,000 per month which is furnishing 40,000 teachers employment. Through the Public Works Administration funds for defraying the cost of constructing school buildings are made available, 30 percent as a gift and 70 percent as a loan, and provision is made in other cases for the Federal Government to pay the cost of construction and lease the building to the school district. About \$30,000,000 was allotted to schools up to the first of the year.

PENDING FEDERAL LEGISLATION

The use of Federal funds for the schools is not an innovation and is not unconstitutional. As early as 1785 the Confederation set aside land for schools, and these general grants were continued as the various States came into the Union. The act of 1862 known as the "Morrill Act" marked definite changes in Federal policy from general grants to specific appropriations for specific types of education. This was followed by the Hatch Act in 1887, giving Federal aid to agricultural education and initiating the policy of annual subsidies to the States. In 1914 came the Smith-Lever Act for Federal aid for diffusion of information on subjects

related to agriculture and home economics. In 1917 the Smith-Hughes Act, designed to promote vocational education, was enacted, and the work in vocational education was further developed under the George-Reed Act of 1929. In 1920 the Federal Board for Vocational Education was given an appropriation for vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry.

The agitation of many school leaders for permanent Federal aid for our educational system has been a deterring factor in meeting the present crisis. It is not questioned that the present emergency is most acute and the fact that Federal aid is the only remedy is unchallenged. Nevertheless, the danger of paternalism and of surrendering the educational system to Federal control, to become a part of political controversies and campaigns, threatens the traditional functions of government.

Due to the many demands which already have been made upon the Federal Government, further expenditures should be curtailed as much as possible; however, even in this national emergency no child of school age should be denied the opportunity of receiving at least a rudimentary education. These children of today are the leaders of tomorrow, and lawmaking and enforcing are conditioned by the existing level of public intelligence and character. Solution of the problem cannot wait and provisions must be made for keeping the school child at his studies.

The Committee on Education has held extensive hearings on the Federal aid bills before it. The data compiled by the Bureau of Education, the National Committee for Federal Emergency Aid for Education and other interested groups indicates that an appropriation of some ninety to one hundred million dollars is necessary. The conditions in some States has been brought about through the elements of nature, that is drought, flood, and the like. In several States the industrial situation is responsible. In others, mismanagement may be said to be the leading factor, due to an overemphasis on providing elaborate school buildings and equipment rather than giving due consideration to the type and methods of instruction. A bill to authorize Federal aid to primary and secondary schools should be enacted before Congress adjourns without fail.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The first appropriation by Congress in aid of vocational education was passed in 1917, and provided for allotting \$500,000 to the States for paying salaries of teachers of agricultural subjects and \$500,000 for teachers of trade, home economics, and the industrial subjects, these sums to be increased annually until a maximum of \$6,000,000 should be reached in 1926.

H.R. 7059 contains two important improvements over the initial legislation. The provision for limiting expenditures for salaries of teachers of home economics to 20 percent of the appropriation is eliminated. The present bill cuts in half the allowance for administration of the act by the Office of Education. During the present school crisis many of the high schools and colleges would find it impossible to continue their present courses in agricultural, home economics, and industrial education were it not for the assistance given by the Federal Government. The Ellzey bill for vocational education distributes the \$3,000,000 annual appropriation on the basis of one third to agriculture, one third to home economics, and one third to industrial education, whereas heretofore industrial education and home economics were lumped together and the entire allowance for both was the same as for agriculture. As the committee report states, this is emergency legislation for a period of 3 years, and the States are to take over the program of vocational education as soon as they are able to carry it on.

The present unemployment situation has resulted in a demand for industrial education which can only be met by assistance from the Federal Government.

For those who are not familiar with the courses of study for which Federal aid is given for teachers' salaries, it might be well to describe some of the courses. For example, home economics is not merely cooking and sewing—training is given in home nursing, dietetics, infant care, child develop-

ment, home dressmaking, testing of fabrics for garments, draperies, and so forth, consumer education, and practical demonstrations in the value of the cheaper foods which can be used in a balanced diet during the present conditions of reduced incomes. The value of the courses in agriculture is well known and covers a variety of subjects, including crop rotation, marketing, animal husbandry, soil chemistry, seed testing, dairying, poultry raising, and so forth. The courses in industrial education cover manual training, drafting, craftsmanship, and industries which fit each particular locality.

Federal aid has enabled the schools having these courses to have better qualified teachers with higher degrees or more experience. The States, by being relieved of part of the salary expense, are thereby enabled to spend more for laboratory equipment and supplies which are so necessary in these courses.

In the State of Kansas a vast majority of the graduates of high schools and colleges go back to farms, or take up the occupation of housewives, and the value of the courses mentioned cannot be overestimated. During this emergency, when there is such a scarcity of "white-collar" jobs, many of the college-trained young men and women find that there is dignity and inspiration in making homes more livable and in relieving their parents of needless drudgery through the use of improved methods. The vocational courses do not direct the student away from the farm or home environment but increase his interest in them.

As long as we pursue a policy of Federal aid to the States for any purpose, this type of assistance which is so valuable should be given a preference, as it is just as important as good roads, or other beneficiaries of Federal donations. Surely the education of the youth of a country under a representative government is of the utmost importance.

Mr. CARTER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order; and I propose to address my remarks to the bills H.R. 8495 and H.R. 8496.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, recently, on the 6th of March of this year, there were introduced in the House of Representatives two bills, H.R. 8495—

To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to repossess certain mineral lands ceded by Mexico to the United States of America by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and to provide for the national defense, and for other purposes—

And H.R. 8496—

To withdraw from "disposition and sale" under the public-land laws all lands lying within the exterior boundaries of "alleged" or "duly asserted" Spanish or Mexican land grants, and for the protection of bona fide homesteaders, settlers, and/or innocent purchasers thereon, and for other purposes.

Both of these bills were introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS], and, by the way, were introduced by request.

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

Mr. EVANS. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. Did the Member who introduced these bills come from California? Is the author of the bills familiar with the situation?

Mr. EVANS. I may say to the gentleman from California that the Member of Congress who introduced these bills is not a member of the California delegation. He is a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania. I have consulted him with reference to these bills. He told me that he had introduced these bills at the request of one H. N. Wheeler, who, to my personal knowledge, has been carrying on a real-estate racket in the State of California for several years, and who, within the past 3 or 4 months, was convicted of a felony in that connection and is now out on bail under a 5-year penitentiary sentence.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. EVANS. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. Was the gentleman from Pennsylvania aware of the character of this real-estate racket that has been worked in California and through which many of our citizens have been defrauded?

Mr. EVANS. I had not finished my statement as to the gentleman's conversation with me with reference to the bill.

Mr. COLDEN. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. EVANS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania stated to me that he had introduced these bills as requested, but he did not know at the time he introduced the bills that the man who requested him to do so had been tried and convicted in the United States courts in California. He further said that at the proper time he proposed to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the bills. I called the gentleman's office on the telephone, but he was not in his office. I told his secretary that I proposed to ask permission to say a few words with regard to these bills and that I hoped he would be present when I made my remarks. This, I may say to the gentleman, is the extent of my knowledge as to the connection of the author of these bills with the California land situation.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose and purport of both these bills impeach the integrity and the validity of the title of two thirds of the homes of the people of California. These bills were introduced at the request and instance of a bunch of racketeers who have been carrying on a racket in California for several years by which operations they have taken from innocent people hundreds of thousands of dollars. The members engaged in this scheme have been indicted from time to time. Just recently three or four of them were tried in the United States court, two convictions being obtained. There were several acquittals, and then one of them was convicted and is now serving time for failing to report in his income tax large sums of money he had obtained from innocent people through the fraud he was carrying on. I am familiar with land titles in California, and I consider the operations of these racketeers the most vulgar sort of fraud I have ever witnessed.

They carry on this racket in a very clever manner. Some of them are attorneys. They have a plan of locating would-be homesteaders on property situated anywhere in the State of California, which properties are a part of the old Spanish or Mexican grant. These properties have been in adverse peaceful possession of their owners for more than 60, 70, or 80 years, following the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, through which treaty all of this territory was ceded to the United States Government.

A commission was appointed by an act of Congress in 1851 to survey and investigate these Mexican and Spanish grants and pass on their validity. The commission functioned, and the act creating the commission provided an appeal would lie from the decision of the commission to the courts of the United States, and in the absence of an appeal the decision of the commission would be res adjudicata as against the questioning of these titles forever. Thereafter, I may say, the Supreme Court of the United States has in no less than half a dozen decisions held that all those titles were in the first place valid; and if any question could have been raised as to their validity, such questions were settled by the decision of the commission which was authorized by Congress to pass on the same.

Furthermore, the United States Senate in 1929 appointed a subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee of the Senate to go to California and investigate the claims of these so-called "homesteaders." The committee was headed by Senator NYE. Senator Sam Bratton, of New Mexico, one of the ablest land-title lawyers in the country and now on the United States district court bench, was a member of this subcommittee. Senator Dale, of the State of Vermont, an able lawyer, now dead, was also a member of the committee. This committee went to California and held sessions for weeks. They made an exhaustive investigation. They brought before them these very men themselves, these pirates, and it was shown through this investigation that there was not a semblance of merit in the claims of these so-called "homestead locators." Of course, the home-

steads themselves may have been acting in good faith, but the men who led them to file on these lands were not acting in good faith in any instance.

The Senate committee made a report in 1931, and I have before me a copy of the report. It was a unanimous report. I will read a few paragraphs at the conclusion of the report.

NO FACTS INDICATING FRAUD

Although, for the reason stated, it is the belief of the committee that the confirmation of the several grants in the manner previously stated with the subsequent issuance of patent, forecloses further inquiry into the antecedent facts, it may be appropriate to say that the committee's inquiry has disclosed nothing substantial indicating that such grants were not in fact made, or that they were made with attending fraud. Aside from a meager showing that no record of such grants could be found in the archives of the Mexican Government recently, there is nothing to indicate any facts tending to support, even remotely, the charges to which Senate Resolution 291 refers.

CONCLUSIONS

It is the judgment of the committee that the grants in question are separately and severally valid; that their confirmation in conformity with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1851, constitute res adjudicata and cannot be reviewed; that no fraud in connection with its issuance being shown, the patent in each case is conclusively binding with respect to the quantity of land conveyed; that such confirmation of title and issuance of patent present a perfect case of repose of title and foreclose further question; that the attacks being made upon such titles are without substance or foundation and are inspired and furthered by persons seeking to profit financially at the expense of well-intentioned but grossly misled applicants for homestead entry.

Your committee is unanimously of the opinion that those now claiming the lands in question, as successors in interest under the original grants, confirmed as hereinbefore stated, are the unqualified owners thereof and have an unquestioned legal title thereto, and that there is no foundation in fact or in law for the charges which Senate Resolution 291 directed this committee to investigate.

Approved by subcommittee:

GERALD P. NYE.
PORTER H. DALE.
SAM G. BRATTON.

Approved by committee:

GERALD P. NYE.
REED SMOOT.
PETER NORBECK.
TASKER L. ODDIE.
PORTER H. DALE.
BRONSON CUTTING.
FREDERICK STEIWER.
ROBERT D. CAREY.

KEY PITMAN.
JOHN B. KENDRICK.
THOMAS J. WALSH.
HENRY F. ASHURST.
ROBERT F. WAGNER.
C. C. DILL.
SAM G. BRATTON.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 8 additional minutes.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, when these bills were introduced a few days ago the newspapers of Los Angeles had quite a little to say about the purpose behind these bills. I ask the Clerk to read in my time an excerpt from the Los Angeles Times, issued March 2, 1934, which gives in quite correct detail an interview with the United States district attorney's office in Los Angeles as to the effect of these bills.

The Clerk read as follows:

LAND-GRANT BILL RAPPED—BOOST TO RACKET ASSERTED—LOCAL FEDERAL PROSECUTORS SAY PROPOSED MEASURE MEANS HEAVY COSTS—SCHEME PROVIDES PAYMENTS BY HOLDERS FOR BENEFIT OF CLAIM FILERS

Federal authorities in Los Angeles sharply disagree with the statement of Washington correspondents that the bill introduced recently in Congress by Representative EDMONDS, of Pennsylvania, and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, would end the Spanish land-grant racket.

In the opinion of local Federal land officials and United States Attorney Hall and Assistant United States Attorney Thomas, the Edmonds bill would not end the racket, but would continue it, and would pile up mountains of "needless and ridiculous expense" on the Government landowners and the taxpayers.

CITE "SETTLEMENTS"

The "catch" in the Edmonds bill, according to Thomas, is disclosed wherein it provides that the Secretary of the Interior would be empowered to negotiate settlements with the California Homesteaders, an organization whose applications were rejected and their filing fees returned to them, and refer all disagreements over fair prices to a mediation board of three members.

Thomas declared that the California Homesteaders had no legal claim to the property they sought to file on as their applications had been rejected.

"The title originating in the Spanish-Mexican land grants has been many times affirmed by the courts as a good and valid title", said Thomas. "The applicants all seem to believe that by the mere attempt to make an application for a homestead the Gov-

ernment would owe them the duty of helping them take from the present owners some highly developed valuable land."

Many of the rejected applicants were reported to have believed that they would, in the end, if some such a bill as is proposed were adopted by Congress, receive huge sums of money in exchange for their ambitions to become possessed of some of the old land-grant acreage. Most of them tried to file for 160 acres, tendering a fee of \$1 an acre. These fees were returned to them when their applications were rejected.

Many of the would-be homesteaders, as soon as their applications were rejected by local Federal land officials, acting under instructions from Washington, paid retainer fees ranging from \$100 to \$1,000, averaging \$500, to carry their appeals from the rejected applications to Washington. If they could not get the land they tried to file on, they apparently believed, it was declared, that they could later collect the money value of the land denied them.

The bill provides the present owners of the old grants would receive a new patent for their lands on payment of \$1.25 an acre, with a minimum fee of \$10. This would mean that the owners of the Irvine Ranch, encompassing about 47,000 acres of land, would have to pay a fortune for land which has been in their legal possession for many years, and the owners of other grants a sum of money proportionate to their acreages. From this sum of money, so collected, the "California Homesteaders" would be paid the present market value of the land, according to the bill's provisions.

"The bill is so utterly ridiculous that I hesitate to believe any Congress Member will take it seriously, especially those who possess intimate knowledge of the racket, and who are informed as to the findings of the commission and committee reports", Thomas said.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. As I understand the gentleman, the proponents of this bill, having been beaten in the civil and criminal courts, are coming here and asking Congress to give them title to something that does not belong to them.

Mr. EVANS. They come here and ask Congress to consider a bill which will in a way create a background that will support them in continuing a racket which they have carried on for years and also create an atmosphere that there is after all a question as to the validity of these titles and that that question is of such consequence that Congress has taken a hand. This will sound good to the people they have robbed.

Mr. CULKIN. They are asking corrective legislation for a racket?

Mr. EVANS. Yes; the worst kind of a racket. The lands involved in these grants are the highest developed lands in southern California. A score of cities occupy these lands, including part of the city of Los Angeles. There may be a 12-story building on some of this land. There are orange and lemon groves 20 to 40 years old on them. The title to these lands is as good as is the title to land whereon this Capitol stands.

Mr. FREAR. What is the status of the bill?

Mr. EVANS. It was introduced by request and referred to the Public Lands Committee and a hearing requested.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include two more short editorials from Los Angeles papers on this subject. They are very short editorials.

Mr. CARTER of California. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman withdraw the request to include the editorials?

Mr. EVANS. They are very short. I do not care to withdraw the request.

Mr. CARTER of California. I may say that I am constitutionally opposed to the insertion of editorials.

Mr. EVANS. The gentleman just heard one of them read.

Mr. CARTER of California. If the gentleman wants to read them and can get the time to read the editorials, that is a different thing. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVANS. Will the gentleman allow me time to read them?

Mr. CARTER of California. I regret I have no more time to yield the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, the time is limited and there are a large number of Members, I understand, who

want to talk on the subject of vocational education which we are now considering, and I do not want to take up much of the time, but I should like to have unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include some statistical information in addition to what I may say on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, it should not be necessary to produce many arguments to convince Members of the House of the necessity for this legislation.

Occupational changes everywhere are affecting the opportunity of the individual to adjust himself to his environment, which makes it very essential that we provide this legislation for increasing vocational education.

Some phases of education are being criticized today because much of the education in the high schools is for the purpose of preparing young folks to enter college, and there has not been enough education preparing young folks to enter life direct from high school. A large percentage never even enter college. This is the most practical kind of education at this time, especially in view of the fact that the N.R.A. makes it impossible for young folks under 18 to enter industry, and because of the 40-year or middle-aged deadline employment policy in so many industries. The earning capacity period of the average man is very limited.

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

Mr. FLETCHER. My time is very limited, but if I have any time after I make this statement, I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

The bill now before the House for consideration, H.R. 7059, vocational education, authorizes to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, the sum of \$3,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, the sum of \$3,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, the sum of \$3,000,000.

In 1917, for the purpose of promoting vocational education in the field of agriculture, home economics, and industry, Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act providing for aid by the Federal Government under a match-fund agreement to the several States. In 1918, \$500,000 was appropriated for home economics, trade, and industrial education, and of this amount only 20 percent was decoted to home-economics education, and an additional sum of \$500,000 was appropriated for agricultural education.

It was provided that \$500,000 was to be added each year until 1926, at which time the total sum appropriated reached \$6,000,000.

It was originally intended that this should continue as permanent legislation, but under the so-called "Economy Act of 1932" the appropriation was reduced 10 percent, or \$600,000, and a further reduction of approximately \$400,000 was authorized March 20, 1933, by an act designated "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government."

As a result of these reductions, agricultural education in 1934 received \$2,270,250, while industrial vocational education received \$1,830,000, and the amount allocated to home economics was \$457,500. The amount, \$1,000,000, which, under the Smith-Hughes Act, is annually allotted for maintenance of teacher training was in 1934 reduced to \$910,000.

The purpose of the George-Reed bill passed by Congress in 1929 was to add to the amount which the Smith-Hughes bill originally authorized for appropriation to agricultural education and home economics, but excluding vocational training in trade and industry. This bill provided for an equal distribution of the appropriation between agriculture and home economics, the amounts being \$500,000 for 1930, to be increased each year after that for 4 years in the amount of \$500,000, so that on June 30, 1934, this act expired, thus making necessary the passage of this bill we are now considering if the Federal Government is to continue its past policy of cooperating with the States in financing and encouraging vocational education in agriculture, home economics, in trade and in industry.

The enrollment in Federally aided schools in the year ending June 30, 1933, totaled 253,197. Of this total enrollment

153,062 boys in high schools were enrolled in vocational classes. In the evening schools for adult farmers there were 76,596. In day schools for boys 10,075 were enrolled, and there were 13,464 enrolled in part-time schools for farm youth out of school. Since 1917 there has been an ever-increasing enrollment, which would seem to indicate how great is the necessity for legislation of the kind provided in this bill. The school year ending in June will show for the evening school the largest enrollment in the history of this educational service.

There are three kinds of classes served by vocational teachers, as follows:

First. All-day classes for boys enrolled in high school.

Second. Evening classes for adult farmers.

Third. Part-time classes for boys out of school.

In 1932-33 in the George-Reed department alone there were 1,326 teachers in 1,309 departments in high schools. Forty-three thousand eight hundred and fifty-two boys were enrolled in 3,169 vocational classes for farm boys in high school. It should be kept in mind that these same teachers directed classes for a total enrollment of 21,945 adult farmers attending 836 evening classes and 241 part-time classes serving an enrollment of 3,857 farm boys who were out of school.

Those who were responsible for directing vocational education reported at the hearings conducted by your Education Committee facts which indicate that if the funds provided by the George-Reed Act are withdrawn the present difficult situation in country schools, where most of these departments are located, will be compelled to abandon practically all of these departments. If business conditions were normal, there is a possibility that many of the departments would be able to continue, financed by local and State funds, but under the unfortunate conditions of the depression there is little likelihood that the Department will be able to continue without the aid of Federal funds.

That the financing of this type of education is a profitable investment is indicated in the facts made available by a study of 8,340 former students selected at random in nearly all the States, of which group 59 percent were on farms. This survey was made in 1922. Another survey, in 1927, revealed the fact that there has been no reduction of the 59 percent of former students engaged in using their vocational training in actual farming. A survey made in 1932 showed an increase to 64 percent of former vocational students engaged in farming.

Additional proof of the investment value of the type of education provided for in this bill we are discussing today is evident from a survey made by State Supervisor of Agriculture Education in Virginia, Walter S. Newman. This survey was made of two groups of farmers, alike in every respect, except that one group had enjoyed the advantages of vocational training and the other group had not. The number of years farmed, the amounts of capital, and the years in high school and other factors in relation to each group were equal. The individual labor income of these two groups was determined for a period of over 2 years. Because the 2 years were years of depression, and therefore all labor incomes were low, the comparison in relation to the two groups is valid.

The farmers in the group vocationally trained were able to earn a much larger annual income. Eight hundred and sixty dollars was the average labor income of the vocationally trained farmer as compared with only \$549 for the non-vocational group, a difference of \$311. In other words, as a result of enjoying the educational advantages such as the provisions of this bill help to make possible, the earning power of the farmers in the vocationally trained group was increased \$311 each.

Other convincing arguments which should persuade Congress to vote immediate passage of this legislation are contained in the reports of the serious results that seem inevitable if the Congress should fail to authorize this appropriation to continue vocational education in collaboration with the States. Here are a few of the possible consequences if the funds are withdrawn.

First. Elimination of vocational agriculture in schools will cause the overloading of academic courses and impair the work of the entire school system.

Second. Work now being done by the vocational teachers on relief and recovery programs must be discontinued.

Third. It will be necessary to drop some of the vocational training for the unemployed.

Fourth. The continued development in vocational agriculture will be blocked.

Fifth. Buildings and equipment have been especially provided for vocational agriculture department. If these funds are not made available then it will not be possible to utilize these buildings and equipment.

Sixth. Another serious result of failure to pass this legislation will be the increasing of unemployment by the discharging of vocational teachers now being financed under the funds provided for by the George-Reed Act.

Seventh. In addition to these serious possibilities that would seem to be inevitable if this legislation should fail to be favorably considered is the fact that State funds which have already been appropriated contingent on receipt of Federal funds will, of course, necessarily lapse, and the very serious emergency that now confronts education everywhere will be alarmingly increased.

This bill affords Congress a real opportunity to participate in a great service to the Nation by investing some of the financial benefits of our growing prosperity in building the character and developing the intelligence of the coming generation of citizens whose thinking and whose standards of citizenship will help to determine the Nation's destiny. I earnestly urge the passage of this deserving measure.

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, along with the other speakers who have voiced their opinions on this bill, I want to add my endorsement of the thing which this measure is attempting to do.

This bill gives to the State of Kentucky, to be spent in vocational education in trades and home economics and in agriculture, a little over \$87,000. As is well known throughout the Union, Kentucky does not rank as high educationally as that State ought to rank. We have been for a great many years under the domination of a bipartisan combine of Republicans and Democrats who have used the educational system of the State and the money that ought to have gone to education as a pawn in politics. This money they cannot use in that way. This money goes to the point where it ought to go, because the Federal Government designates it for this particular purpose.

It gives actual benefit to the boys and girls of the State of Kentucky, and they will be grateful to the national Government for continuing this splendid work which is now being carried on in these fields.

There are other measures before this House to give additional aid to education, and I trust that the Congress will give thoughtful consideration to emergency relief to school systems. Our present head of the educational department of Kentucky, Dr. Richmond, a very able educator, is the head of the National Council of Educators for Emergency Relief. They have made a study of the needs in the Nation as a whole and they have advocated appropriation to the school systems of this Nation. I sincerely hope that before we adjourn we shall have an opportunity to vote on that subject. [Applause.]

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GLOVER].

(Mr. GLOVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us is H.R. 7059, by the gentleman from Mississippi, which is a bill to continue vocational education in the United States. Money spent in developing the youth of our land is never wasted; in fact, no money we have ever spent has brought better results than money spent in vocational education. No nation has ever risen, or will ever rise above the intelligence of its citizenship.

The constitution of my State declares that "Education is the safeguard to liberty and the bulwark of our free institutions and good government." Vocational education teaches the person the practical things of life. Many boys are now drifting around when if they had received a vocational training they would be useful citizens, home owners, and would be helping to maintain a government.

There are many persons who have some physical defect and without being trained for some useful trade or vocation they have a poor chance in life to earn a living as they would like to do. It is for that class I plead.

I had the privilege of serving for 2 years on the Committee on Education. I remember well when we had hearings on a bill for vocational education that several persons who had received training from vocational training schools appeared before us to give testimony of what it had meant to them in life. I remember one in particular who was on the street corner selling pencils for a living. He was induced to take a training course to learn a vocation or trade, and at the time he gave testimony he was earning a good salary and was the owner of a home. Every person growing up should be taught along this line.

The author of this bill has spent a part of his life in educating the youth of the land, and he feels keenly the need of this kind of education for our boys and girls. I can see no reason why anyone should oppose this bill, and I hope it will be passed by a large majority.

I hope the time will soon come when our National Government will contribute to the States a large percent of the money necessary to carry on our schools as they should be. The Government is interested in the education of its citizenship. [Applause.]

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time now stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California 4½ minutes.

Mr. CARTER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DOUGLASS].

Mr. DOUGLASS. I thank the gentleman cordially.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the Smith-Hughes Act passed by Congress in 1917 provided for aid by the Federal Government on a 50-50 basis to the several States to promote vocational education for the benefit of agricultural education, home economics, and industrial training. This is permanent legislation.

In 1934 agricultural education under the Smith-Hughes Act received \$2,270,250, home economics received \$457,000, and industrial training received \$1,830,000. Under the Smith-Hughes Act, in addition, \$910,000 was appropriated for the maintenance of teacher training.

In 1929 authorizations were made under the George-Reed Act for additional funds to the original Smith-Hughes authorization in the field of agricultural education and home economics, trade and industrial training being excluded in the George-Reed Act.

In 1934 under the Economy Act \$1,275,000 was appropriated under the George-Reed Act, which act will expire on June 30, 1934.

The pending bill provides for a continuation and expansion of the authorization under the George-Reed Act.

The bill, as reported, authorizes an annual appropriation for the next 3 years of \$3,000,000, one third to be allotted to agricultural education, one third to home economics, and one third to trade and industrial education.

I am pleased with the provisions made for industrial education. Child labor has been abolished under the new deal. The youth that formerly worked in factories will thus have an opportunity to train themselves for life. The youth is not being, in many cases, employed, so that employment may be given to people who have family obligations. Manual training will be provided, and the youth will be better prepared for life.

Under previous legislation much equipment, at large expense to the local taxpayers, has been provided for vocational training and for home economics.

States, counties, and municipalities are unable to carry on without assistance the vocational work for which equipment has been provided. It is important, therefore, that the George-Reed Act be continued.

Schools are probably harder hit than any other institutions on account of the depression. The salaries of teachers have been drastically reduced. Local taxes are inadequate to provide for the operation of the schools. There was an unusual expansion in school building and construction during the past 15 years. Interest must be paid and bonds must be retired—sinking funds must be provided. Probably no class among us has suffered more than the teachers during the past 4 years as a result of economic conditions. Our schools must be saved.

I have therefore gladly promoted and aided in the emergency in the allocation of relief funds to the cause of education. The program of recovery is not complete; the need for assistance to schools is still urgent; and States, cities, and local districts are unable to support and maintain their schools adequately. I shall continue to cooperate with all of the friends and supporters of legislation to secure additional funds for education to supplement local funds.

The paramount duty of the State and Nation is to provide for the education of the youth. Thomas Jefferson was right when he said:

There is no darkness except ignorance.

We hear much of the problem of the youth today. Heretofore the high school was intended to prepare largely for the college and university. Comparatively few high-school graduates are now attending college. It is necessary, therefore, for the high schools of the country to revise their courses and to prepare the young men and young women of today for life.

I believe in the countryside. It should be made more attractive. I am an advocate of the ownership of the farm by the man who cultivates the soil. It is just as essential for the farmer to be educated as it is for the engineer to be trained. In the race of life, success is the result of preparation. Home life in the country should be made more desirable. The women who live on the farm should have the comforts and conveniences that obtain in the homes in the towns and cities.

Again, it has been my experience and my observation from my contacts with the vocational schools that they reach a class of students who otherwise would be unable to obtain vocational training or training in home economics. We are coming more and more to believe that education should prepare for life.

My heart goes out to the youth of the land today. We live in a period of uncertainty. Our college and university graduates are without employment. It is more imperative than ever, therefore, that our schools provide training that will enable the youth to be prepared definitely to earn a living as well as to live. The value of vocational education and training in home economics has been fully demonstrated.

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the debate upon the election case just preceding when the gentleman from Texas inquired, if there was a unanimous committee report, why all the fuss about it. I am not going to do any fussing about this bill. I am glad that the committee has reported it unanimously, and I think all its details have been thoroughly explained to you. I sincerely hope it will go through speedily and without amendment, as the bill has been carefully thought out and we need hasty action.

This is but an authorization for an appropriation, and not an appropriation itself. The bill must go through the Senate and then back to the Committee on Appropriations. We are nearing the adjournment of Congress, we are told, and, therefore, I ask for speedy consideration and passage of this bill.

I am very much in the position of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BAKEWELL] who so eloquently addressed

you yesterday. I am one of the men of the House most thoroughly opposed to Federal aid, but this is one of two bills involving Federal aid that, as chairman of the Committee on Education of the House, by your sufferance, I have favored, and I do it despite my general opposition to Federal aid to education, except perhaps in an emergency, of which we shall hear more later. This vocational education is an established national policy, set in operation 17 years ago. It has worked out well, and it has accomplished splendid results. I could not find it within myself, with all my stern principles and objections to Federal aid, to refuse to help the passage of this bill, and I do it principally because of the argument that has been advanced, though briefly here, and that is on account of the youth of the Nation.

We organized the C.C.C. because there were hundreds of thousands of young men wandering about this country in idleness and temptation. We have appropriated for migratory birds, and I have human nature enough to want to appropriate also for human souls. We have this youth problem before us, and even your C.C.C. men, when they get through their course of training in the C.C.C., will some day have to find means of making a living. Under the N.R.A. code we have closed the doors of the shops and the industries to those under 18 years of age. That multitude of young men and young women is thrown back upon us. We are in a Federal educational emergency, and the surging and dangerous wave of it all is those thousands of youths. Here is a measure providing for vocational education, to take them off the streets at a tender age, when their minds are receptive, and to put them into a vocational school of an agricultural nature, or in an industrial or trade school, or, in the case of the girls, into a home economic school, that their time may be taken up advantageously, and that they may learn a healthful way of making a living. In voting for this bill you are voting for the young men and young women of the future America. [Applause.]

I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks a portion of the committee report. It is very brief and much to the point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

The Smith-Hughes Act, which was passed by Congress in 1917, provided for aid by the Federal Government, under a match fund agreement, to the several States, in the field of vocational education, for the benefit of agricultural education, and home economics and trade and industrial education.

This is permanent legislation. Starting with the year 1918, \$500,000 was appropriated for agricultural education and \$500,000 for home economics and trade and industrial education—home economics not to receive more than 20 percent of the latter appropriation. This appropriation of \$1,000,000, which was to be divided as mentioned, was to increase each year by \$500,000, until in 1926, the sum of \$6,000,000 was reached; one half for agriculture and one half for home economics and trade and industrial education, and from 1926 thereafter, it was to remain at \$6,000,000. In 1933 the appropriations were reduced 10 percent by an act approved June 30, 1932, the Economy Act. This reduction amounted to \$600,000 per year from the total amount. In 1934, the appropriations were further reduced by an act approved March 20, 1933, entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government." This reduction amounted to approximately \$400,000.

Thus in 1934, agricultural education, under the Smith-Hughes Act, received \$2,270,250; trade and industrial subjects, \$1,830,000; and home economics, \$457,500.

In addition, under the Smith-Hughes Act \$1,000,000 is allotted each year for maintenance of teacher training. In 1934, \$910,000 was appropriated.

In 1929 Congress passed the George-Reed bill, the purpose of which was to add funds to the original Smith-Hughes bill in the field of agricultural education and home economics, excluding trade and industrial subjects. The appropriation was to be divided equally between agriculture and home economics. This act provided for \$500,000 for the first year, 1930, to be increased \$500,000 each year for 4 years. Thus on June 30, 1934, this act expires. In 1933, instead of receiving the \$2,000,000 authorized under the act, only \$1,500,000 was received under the provisions of the Economy Act. Instead of receiving the \$2,500,000 for 1934, \$1,275,000 was appropriated under the Independent Offices Act of June 16, 1933.

This bill, as introduced, H.R. 7059, called for \$3,750,000 annually and was intended to be permanent legislation. Under the George-Reed Act, now expiring, \$1,250,000 of the \$2,500,000 authorized in 1934 goes to agricultural education and \$1,250,000 to home eco-

nomics. It was proposed in the bill H.R. 7059 that a further \$1,250,000 be added to be allotted to trade and industrial subjects, making a total of \$3,750,000.

The committee believes there is no question of the great value of vocational education in each of these phases mentioned. Vocational education has made a splendid social contribution, as evidenced by the testimony and reports of those appearing before the committee in favor of this bill. But it is believed that this problem of vocational education is essentially a problem for the individual State while it is able to carry it on.

From 1930 to 1934 these added provisions to the Smith-Hughes Act helped to meet the emergency which existed and which is now continuing. The committee is reporting this bill, not as a permanent measure but to cover a period of 3 years as an emergency measure during the present depression, in the sum of \$3,000,000 annually, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935; one third to be allotted to agricultural education, one third to home economics, and one third to trade and industrial education. It is believed that trade and industrial education should be included in order to assist those young people who, because of lack of employment, are going back to school to learn trades. It is thought that this is not the proper year and time to withdraw Federal aid, as this action would mean probably the immediate loss of employment to many people engaged in this work, and there is no desire on the part of the committee to bring about this situation.

But it is recommended strongly that the States put their houses in order and prepare themselves, just as soon as possible, to take over this whole program of vocational education, and rid the Federal Government of a task which is properly the duty of the State.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of providing for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for each year thereafter, the sum of \$3,750,000. One third of this sum each year shall be allotted to the States and Territories in the proportion that their farm population bears to the total farm population of the United States, exclusive of the insular possessions, according to the United States census last preceding the end of the fiscal year in which any such allotment is to be made, and shall be used for the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects in such States and Territories. One third of the sum appropriated for each fiscal year shall be allotted to the States and Territories in the proportion that their rural population bears to the total rural population of the United States, exclusive of the insular possessions, according to the United States census last preceding the end of the fiscal year in which any such allotment is to be made, and shall be used for the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of home-economics subjects in such State and Territories. One third of the sum appropriated for each fiscal year shall be allotted to the States and Territories in the proportion that their nonfarm population bears to the total nonfarm population of the United States, exclusive of the insular possessions, according to the United States census last preceding the end of the fiscal year in which any such allotment is to be made, and shall be used for the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of trade and industrial-education subjects in such States and Territories.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "1935", strike out "and for each year thereafter."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$3,750,000" and insert "\$3,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, the sum of \$3,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, the sum of \$3,000,000."

Page 3, after the word "Territories", insert "Provided, That the allotment of funds to any State or Territory for each of three purposes enumerated in this section shall be not less than a minimum of \$5,000 for any fiscal year, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1935; June 30, 1936; and June 30, 1937, the sum of \$84,603, or so much thereof as may be needed, which shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotments to the States and Territories provided for in this section."

The committee amendments were severally reported and severally agreed to.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CONNERY: Page 3, line 9, at the end of section 1, insert "Provided further, That none of the funds herein authorized shall be allocated to any State or Territory to pay salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors, if such teachers, supervisors, and directors are denied the right of joining any legal organization of their own choosing."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, the whole purpose of this amendment is that it is asked for by organized labor to pro-

tect the school teachers in their right to organize, if they see fit to do so and to join an organization of their own choosing. In some instances boards of education may say to the teachers, "We forbid you to join a labor union." The House will notice that the language in the amendment is "any legal organization of their own choosing." Since labor organizations are legal I do not see how any Member can have any objection to this amendment which I am offering.

The right of labor to organize, the right of collective bargaining, is a legal right now under the NRA; and the purpose of this amendment is merely to prevent some board of education from saying to its teachers that they shall not be permitted to join a labor organization under penalty of losing their positions. That is the sole purpose of this amendment. I am not trying to harm this bill. I am in favor of the bill. I favor the general principle of vocational education, but I do not want to allow any board of education to get funds from the United States Government and then use those funds to outlaw labor-union organizations. I hope the committee will adopt the amendment, because it injures the bill in no manner whatsoever and merely protects the right of school teachers to organize if they want to, and as they should be entitled to under the law.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RANKIN. No. I think the soundness of the point of order is apparent on its face.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be heard on the point of order. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The section under consideration deals with the appropriation of money and sets out certain sums authorized to be appropriated. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts places certain restrictions upon the use of the money.

The Chair holds that the amendment is germane, and overrules the point of order raised by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to oppose such an amendment, but I feel compelled to do so. This matter was not brought before the committee in any of its hearings, and we held 3 days of hearings on the subject of vocational education.

I think that the gentleman from Massachusetts, perhaps, is raising a straw man here at which to throw balls. There is no proof before us that any such condition as the gentleman described has actually occurred or is likely to occur.

In a matter of such grave importance as the pending bill, and in the present parliamentary situation, we are not, in my opinion, in a position where we can risk this legislation by burdening it with an academic question not based on any facts presented to the House and which was not brought before the committee.

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

Mr. DOUGLASS. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I can cite instances in the State of Georgia where teachers were prohibited from joining organizations.

Mr. DOUGLASS. If that be true the State authorities can take care of the situation. I do not know why this bill should be burdened with such an amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment read again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, these funds are used to supplement funds appropriated by States and subdivisions of the States. The expenditure of these funds is in the hands of the State, whether it be Georgia, New York, Massachusetts, or any other State of the Union.

One of the objections, Mr. Chairman, to Federal aid for education has been that the States are to be deprived of their independence, and of their supervision of education. I respectfully submit that the virtue of this legislation lies in the fact that the handling and expenditures of the funds is left entirely to the States. However sympathetic we may be toward the gentleman's amendment, the matter should be left to the States and to the municipalities to provide restrictions on the expenditure of these funds. For this reason, among others, I submit that, inasmuch as there may be one requirement in Louisiana, an entirely different requirement in Massachusetts, and a still different one in Ohio, and so on throughout all the 48 States, and further, as the States have the last word in the expenditure of these funds, the States alone should have the right to impose these restrictions.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. In the opinion of the gentleman from Mississippi, will not the placing of restrictions in measures of this kind result in killing such legislation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; I do not think such a policy is helpful to this kind of legislation, and I ask that the committee be supported in its stand.

Mr. Chairman, I am always sympathetic with labor and with the men and women who work and toil, but the question of labor has no place in this bill nor should the race question be injected into this legislation.

Federal aid to education of any kind would be endangered if Congress undertakes to exercise authority in the operation of the schools. Education is primarily the function of the State. The purpose of Federal aid is to enable States, counties, and municipalities, especially in the emergency, to provide for the youth of the land, but in the last analysis education is the function of the State. The State should, therefore, be supreme in the matter of the employment of teachers and in the disbursement of funds. When Congress undertakes to prescribe and stipulate as to the disbursement of the funds within the State the cause of Federal aid will be endangered.

The virtue of the bill under consideration, as well as the Smith-Hughes Act, is that the funds are distributed by the local agencies. Conditions in Mississippi may be different from conditions in Massachusetts; conditions in New York may be different from conditions in Kentucky. There is too much centralization already. The rights of the States are fast disappearing. As the friend of labor and as the friend of all races, I urge that the amendment be defeated, and that any amendment that has to do with the distribution of the funds within the States among the races should also be defeated.

Of course, I believe the teachers should have the right to organize. I think all classes are entitled to consideration, but there is no place in the pending legislation for either the labor question or the race question.

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Chairman, I know I have not the right to speak a second time on one amendment, but I feel so strongly about the matter that I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak again for 2 minutes on this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Chairman, I take pride in saying that the Committee on Education is a very conservative

committee. We understand the difficulty with regard to Federal control through Federal aid. We have conscientiously, and I may say jealously, religiously tried to avoid this issue to keep it from coming upon the floor of the House.

I am a lifelong, tried friend of labor, but I can see that such an amendment as the one now pending brings in the subject of Federal control. Just as soon as we inject into bills providing Federal aid to education any element of Federal control strong opposition will be raised to the whole vocational and rehabilitation system, and perhaps result in the denial of Federal aid to any form of education.

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

Mr. DOUGLASS. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. Under the N.R.A., industrial enterprises are not allowed to work their employees more than 40 hours a week, and they are required to pay a certain standard of wages.

Mr. DOUGLASS. But I do not see how the situation the gentleman pictures in his mind can arise at all.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman from Georgia has just stated that such a situation exists in his State.

Mr. DOUGLASS. Then, as pointed out by the gentleman from Mississippi, for 17 years the distribution of funds under this act has been in the hands of the State authorities.

They will know the local situation best and can best deal with it at all times.

Mr. CONNERY. They have not taken care of it in Georgia and they have had it there for 17 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONNERY) there were—ayes 22, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DE PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DE PRIEST: Page 3, after line 9, insert: "Provided further, That in States and Territories where there are separate schools between white and colored pupils that the funds herein mentioned shall be divided according to population based on the last United States census."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the section or to the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is plainly a limitation, and, therefore, I believe it is in order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, may I offer the suggestion to the Chair that the distribution of this fund is fixed in this bill, as suggested by the gentleman from Alabama, to be allotted on the basis of population, on the basis of agriculture, and on the basis of industrial training. The proposed amendment undertakes to change the very foundation upon which this legislation rests and the method of distribution as outlined in the bill. It strikes me the amendment is not germane to the purposes of this bill, which is not only to provide for aid insofar as population is concerned, but also insofar as trade and agriculture are concerned.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman believe that the gentleman from Illinois can make a further limitation? The gentleman has already read a number of limitations.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If it is in line with the previous limitations and not in contradiction and absolutely repugnant to the provisions contained in this bill. It must be germane to the method carried in the bill. One yardstick cannot be substituted for another.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of the opinion that the section to which this amendment is offered fixes certain limitations and that the committee has the right to change these limitations. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois seeks to put a further and additional restriction upon the distribution of the funds, and therefore the amendment is germane, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. DE PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I would not have offered this amendment if I thought there would be a fair distribution of funds. I know, and every gentleman here knows, that in the Southland, where the great proportion of the Negroes live, they do not get their just proportion of the school funds according to population.

According to a recent study it was found that the average educational expenditure per pupil in 11 Southern States amounted to \$35. When divided according to the two races it was found that the average expenditure for each white child was \$44 as compared with \$12 for each Negro child.

It was further found that the average investment for plant and equipment was approximately \$160 for each white child as compared with \$40 for each Negro child.

The South, in general, is far behind other sections of the country educationally, and naturally the Negro in the South is proportionately further behind the whites of that whole section. For example, the average wealth per capita in the South is only \$1,700 as compared with \$3,600 for the States outside of the South.

It is believed by many persons in the South that the only way that the educational interests of the Negro can be safeguarded is by definitely earmarking funds appropriated for educational purposes.

In 1932 one State appropriated to counties, as the result of a Negro census and average daily attendance, in round numbers two and one half million dollars, with the assumption that the counties would supplement this from local funds. One hundred and thirty-two counties in this State not only failed to supplement the appropriation but failed to expend for Negro education the full amount allotted by the State for that purpose. Thus only a million three hundred thousand, or one half the amount received from the State for Negroes was spent for them.

In 15 Southern States in 1930 there were 230 counties with a Negro population of 12½ percent, or more, of the total, without any high-school facilities for colored children. These counties contain 1,400,000 colored people, 160,000 of whom are of high-school age.

The average annual salary of colored teachers in rural areas is only \$388 as compared with \$945 for white teachers in the same area.

It has been revealed that out of approximately \$72,000,000 loaned and granted by the P.W.A. for purposes of building and repairing schoolhouses, only \$3,000,000 went to Negro schools and colleges. Of this sum \$2,000,000 was spent on one institution alone which meant that only \$1,000,000 was left to be distributed among 6 Negro high schools and 1 Negro college.

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Chairman, I am in somewhat the same difficulty, hoping I will not be misunderstood, in opposing this amendment as I was in opposing the labor amendment.

I do not think anyone can accuse a man of my name and its association with the Negro race of prejudice. I do not think anyone can accuse me as a member of the Committee on Education for 10 years of prejudice, because I have been one of the staunchest supporters on that committee of appropriations for the Howard University. So with a free and open mind I make the same point against this amendment that I did against the other one.

Mr. DE PRIEST. I do not think the gentleman thinks for a minute I accused him of prejudice.

Mr. DOUGLASS. I want the gentleman to know that in opposing his amendment I am not actuated by prejudice.

Mr. DE PRIEST. I appreciate that fact.

Mr. DOUGLASS. I am glad the gentleman appreciates it.

Mr. DE PRIEST. I do not think the gentleman is acquainted with conditions in the South.

Mr. DOUGLASS. That is the point I want to bring out.

This amendment, as far as the committee's position is concerned, stands upon the same footing as the labor amendment. We cannot and should not by any action of this body begin to dictate the policies of education carried on in the schools nor interfere directly in the way that Fed-

eral funds are employed or distributed by the State, because when we take that position on this matter, as upon the labor matter, we drive the entering wedge of Federal control which we are not here advocating, but actually trying to avoid.

As soon as we pass one measure of this kind we open the door to measures of all kinds in the way of Federal control. The sentiment of this country is against interference with the States in the matter of education. [Applause.] Your committee is convinced, and I think the country is convinced, that education is a State function, a State duty, and a State responsibility, and it is only an emergency that a State has any real right to come here and ask for aid. There is no emergency in this case except the general one of depression. The amendment asks the Government of the United States to say to the States, "Not only do we give you this money but we are telling you how you shall distribute it."

As chairman of the Committee on Education, I believe the States of the United States are all broad and liberal and that they will properly, and in accordance with local tradition, local justice, and in good faith, administer these funds that we give them 50-50 in the interests of all the people of their States. I have no right to make any presumption to the contrary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Interior, Office of Education, for vocational education, the sum of \$100,000, annually to be expended for the same purposes and in the same manner as provided in section 7 of the act approved February 23, 1917, as amended October 6, 1917.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 13, after the word "education", insert "for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1935, June 30, 1936, and June 30, 1937"; and in line 15, after "\$100,000", strike out the word "annually."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PARSONS] having resumed the chair, Mr. ROBERTSON, of Virginia, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7059) to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories, pursuant to House Resolution 324, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? (After a pause.) If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. DE PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 133]

Allgood	Brooks	Chapman	Frey
Andrews, N.Y.	Browning	Claborne	Fulmer
Auf der Heide	Brumm	Clarke, N.Y.	Gasque
Ayers, Mont.	Buckbee	Collins, Miss.	Gillespie
Bailey	Burke, Calif.	Cooper, Ohio	Greenway
Beam	Cady	Corning	Greenwood
Beck	Cannon, Wis.	Crosby	Griswood
Berlin	Carley, N.Y.	Darden	Hart
Bloom	Carpenter, Nebr.	Doutrich	Hartley
Britten	Celler	Ellenbogen	Hastings

Hess	Lozier	Peyser	Sullivan
Hildebrandt	McGugin	Prall	Swick
Hill, Ala.	McSwain	Ramspeck	Taylor, S.C.
Hill, Knute	Maloney, La.	Randolph	Thom
Hill, Samuel B.	Marshall	Rayburn	Thurston
Howard	Meeke	Reid, Ill.	Vinson, Ga.
Huddleston	Montague	Sadowski	Vinson, Ky.
Jeffers	Montet	Schaefer	Wadsworth
Jenckes, Ind.	Nesbit	Shoemaker	Waldron
Kennedy, Md.	O'Connor	Simpson	Wilcox
Kerr	O'Malley	Sisson	Withrow
Kurtz	Oliver, Ala.	Smith, Va.	Wolfenden
Lehlbach	Oliver, N.Y.	Snyder	Zioncheck
Lesinski	Peavey	Stalker	
Lewis, Md.	Perkins	Stokes	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and thirty-two Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DE ROUEN and Mr. DE PRIEST rose.

Mr. DE ROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman a member of the committee?

Mr. DE ROUEN. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DE ROUEN. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DE ROUEN moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 7059) to the Committee on Education, with instructions to that committee to report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment: "On page 3, line 15, strike out '\$100,000' and insert in lieu thereof '\$75,000.'"

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

Mr. DE PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I rose before the Speaker put the question, and could not get recognition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. DE PRIEST. I rise to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DE PRIEST. My parliamentary inquiry is whether a second motion to recommit is in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rule provides for only one motion to recommit.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—H.R. 7059

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

THE DESCENDANTS OF THE PEOPLES OF NORTHERN EUROPE HAVE REASON TO BE PROUD OF THE IMPORTANT PART AND ROLE WHICH HAVE BEEN PLAYED BY THEIR ANCESTORS AND COUNTRYMEN IN THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my Scandinavian ancestry. I was accidentally born in this country, in Chicago, Ill., a very fortunate accident, I should say, but I do not claim any especial credit for that fact, for I did not have a great deal to say about it; in fact, I cannot remember that I was even consulted and asked to express a preference as to where I should like to be born. If I had been, I would certainly have selected the same country where I was born, the United States of America, the best, the freest, and the grandest country upon which the sun ever shone.

However, my mother was born in Sweden and my father was born in Denmark, and next to my love for America is

my affection for those countries and that other country in Scandinavia, Norway, where my mother and father met in Christiania, the capital, and carried on their courtship, and also for Finland, where my wife's parents were born. My wife was born in this country, in Montana, but both of her parents were born in Finland, so our two little daughters, Margaret Louise and Marian Eleanor, born in Hoquiam, Wash., are truly descended from the peoples of northern Europe.

The descendants of the peoples of northern Europe have reason to be proud of the important part and role which have been played by their ancestors and countrymen in the history and development of the United States. It is appropriate to mention the fact that George Washington, the Father of our Country, was directly descended from a family which emigrated from Skane, Sweden, in the year A.D. 970 and settled in Durham County, England, where they built a small town, calling it Wass-in-gatun—town of Wassings. Also that John Morton, of Swedish ancestry, as a Member of the Continental Congress, cast the deciding vote of Pennsylvania in favor of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence; that John Hanson, of Swedish ancestry, was elected the first president of the Confederation of the Thirteen Original States, with the official title of president of the United States in Congress assembled; that Sweden was the first nation which voluntarily recognized the American Republic in 1783; that Theodore Roosevelt was descended from forbears who settled in Normandy, and had the blood of the Viking in his veins. John Erickson, of Vermland, Sweden, invented the *Monitor*, the first iron-clad and screw-propelled battleship, and who, former President William Howard Taft declared, saved the Union cause; and when the first shot of the Civil War was fired it was none other than Robert Anderson who met the first shock of rebellion at Fort Sumter, a descendant of a Delaware Swede. In the Civil War we have General Stolbrand and Admiral Dahlgren, both Swedes, and there were 14 Swedish officers in the War of the Revolution.

Although limited in area geographically, the Scandinavian countries, considering their small size and populations, have made greater contributions to the culture, learning, progress, and development of the race than almost any other nation. Let us call the roll of some of the brilliant names which adorn the pages of history and biography: Leif Ericsson and Eric the Red, Norsemen, who were the first discoverers of America about the year 1000; Nansen, Amundsen, and Steffansen, the great Norwegian Arctic explorers; Eric Nelson, the Norwegian aviator; Lindbergh, the Prince of the Aviators, whose father was born in Sweden; Carl XII, the boy king and warrior of Sweden, of whom Voltaire wrote his famous biography; Gustavus Vasa and Gustavus Adolphus, the Lion of the North, champion of the Protestant Church after the Reformation, and who lost his life on the field of Lutzen in his battle for religious freedom for Europe during the Thirty Years War; Jenny Lind and Christine Nilsson, the Swedish nightingales, two of the most renowned singers the world has ever known; Ole Bull, Norwegian violinist; Grieg, the Norwegian composer; Ellen Key, Norwegian authoress; Tegner, Swedish poet, whose great classic, *Fritjofs Saga*, was beautifully translated by Longfellow, who declared it to be one of the masterpieces of literature; Strindberg, the great novelist and dramatist; Ibsen and Bjornson, the two noted Norwegian novelists; Selma Lagerlof, a daughter of Sweden and one of the greatest, if not the greatest living woman novelist of the world.

Finland has contributed a galaxy of brilliant names: Johan Ludwif Runeberg, professor of history and literature, and the famous author of *Vort Land*, the national anthem of Finland and Sweden; Elias Lonnroth, professor of Finnish language and compiler of the noted collection of folk epics, *Kalevala*; Johan W. Spellman, Finland's greatest senator and statesman; Topelius, her greatest novelist; Albert Edelfelt and Axel Gallen, two of the world's most noted painters and artists; John Sibelius, one of the world's greatest composers, author of the *Swan of Tuonela*, and the author of several world-known symphonies; Robert Kijanus, leader of the symphonic orchestra in Helsingfors for

the past 40 years; the great sculptor, Takanen, who died in Rome some years ago; Emil Wickstrom, its greatest sculptor; Johan Aho, one of Europe's greatest novelists.

Hans Christian Andersen, Danish writer of folk and fairy tales. Thorwaldsen, the eminent Danish sculptor. George Brandes, of Copenhagen, one of the most noted scholars of this generation. Carl Von Linnaeus, the poor Swedish barefooted boy who became the father of botany, and probably the greatest botanist that ever lived. Schele, the Swedish chemist who discovered oxygen. Emanuel Swedenborg, the great mystic and founder of the religion which bears his name. Count Bernadotte, Napoleon's field marshal, who was invited to become the King of Sweden and founded the present dynasty. Alfred Nobel, another Swede, inventor of dynamite and founder of the Nobel peace prize.

Time does not permit my enumerating any more of the names of the gifted sons and daughters of the North, but I have named a sufficient number to justify my pride in my Scandinavian ancestry.

Those of us who are of Scandinavian ancestry can justly take pride in the important part which the Scandinavians are playing in the growth and progress of the Pacific Northwest and of the State of Washington in particular. Some of the leading business men, newspapermen, industrial leaders, bankers, merchants, building contractors, doctors, lawyers, professional men, and public officials of the State of Washington are Scandinavians. Washington is becoming, in fact it already is, one of the leading States in the Union from the standpoint of the large number of our citizens who were born in the northern European countries, or whose parents were born there, and I believe we rank next to Minnesota in that respect. That is true particularly of my home community, Grays Harbor, and the Scandinavians are very numerous in Pacific County, in Clark County, in Lewis County, and throughout my congressional district and the State of Washington. They are doing their part toward the growth, development, and progress of the communities in which they live, and are highly respected for their industry, thrift, and sterling qualities as law-abiding citizens.

THE NECESSITY FOR MODIFICATION OF THE STEEL CODE TO RELIEVE OPPRESSED INDUSTRIES

Mr. CHASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHASE. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, it is vitally necessary that immediate action be taken to secure relief for the industries of Minnesota, and States similarly situated, from the harm done said industries by the actual workings of the steel code.

Tuesday, in an effort to secure Presidential intervention to end the oppressive discrimination, that if not stopped now, will ruin many industries in my home State, I introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to exercise forthwith the powers conferred upon him by the National Industrial Recovery Act, to cause such amendment or modification of the steel code as will eliminate the abuses herein described.

The steel code is a contract between all steel producers to make in a certain way their delivered prices, which delivered prices are made up of theoretical base prices at certain basing points, plus all-rail freight, although other and cheaper methods of transportation exist.

The United States Steel Corporation owns a plant at Duluth, Minn. The Minnesota Steel Co. is its subsidiary company, created to operate the Duluth plant, and the Illinois Steel Co. is its distributing agency. The ore used by this Duluth plant is mined from the Minnesota iron ranges. Orders placed with the United States Steel Corporation or any of its subsidiaries, by Minnesota steel fabricators, for articles produced at the Duluth plant are filled in many cases, from that plant, and not from Chicago, Gary, Pittsburgh, or any other point.

Under the code, Duluth is a basing point for wire, wire nails, bale ties, and wire fencing. These are all consumer goods—the finished product—and the basing price is the Chicago price on similar goods plus \$1 a ton.

Duluth is not a basing point on merchant bars and billets. On these articles, which are not consumer goods, but require fabrication for their ultimate use, Chicago is the basing point, and the price at Duluth is the Chicago price plus all-rail freight of \$6.60

per ton—this in spite of the fact that the goods are not shipped from Chicago, have never been in Chicago, and the \$6.60 charge is a fictitious one imposed for an imaginary service.

In the Twin Cities the price on merchant bars and billets is the Chicago price plus freight from Chicago, and this in spite of the fact that the metal is shipped from Duluth, less than half as far away as Chicago.

This method of fixing prices ignores conditions—that Duluth-produced steel is made from Minnesota ore; that it can be moved from Duluth to many manufacturing cities at a fraction of the freight charges from Chicago to these cities; that if sold and fabricated at Duluth there is no freight charge at all; and that if shipment were from Chicago there are available lower freight rates than the all-rail rates.

To gage the discrimination it is necessary to remember that various Minnesota industries using Duluth steel must compete with similar industries located, for example, at Chicago. Considerable quantities of steel made at Duluth are sold to Chicago fabricators. For this steel the United States Steel Corporation must charge the Chicago price. Therefore, it does not get the fictitious freight charge which the Duluth buyer must pay. So as between the Duluth and Chicago users of Duluth steel, the Chicago buyer pays \$6.60 per ton less and therefore has a production cost advantage of \$6.60 on this item alone.

But this is not all. Since the price of the Duluth steel at Chicago is the Chicago price and the steel must be shipped from Duluth to Chicago, it is clear that the United States Steel Corporation must pay the \$6.60 freight from Duluth to Chicago. Consequently it is too apparent to require argument that on the product of its Duluth plant shipped to Chicago, the United States Steel Corporation receives for each ton of merchant bars \$13.20 less, and for each ton of billets approximately \$13.20 less from the Chicago buyers than it charges the Duluth competitors of said Chicago buyers.

These lower prices made to Chicago fabricators have the effect of lessening substantially the competition of Minnesota fabricators and are not prices made to meet competition in good faith. It is an outrageous situation.

Minnesota steel-using industries always have been handicapped because of the State's geographical location, but this handicap has been offset somewhat by lower production costs, particularly for labor, in the Northwest.

Also, the United States Steel Corporation, realizing the burden placed on Minnesota industry, endeavored to equalize costs of production for Minnesota and eastern industry by making partially offsetting price allowances.

Now the code has changed this.

Many Minnesota producers have signed their industry codes and are complying with their provisions. Consequently these producers are paying nearly the same wage as their eastern competitors.

The United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries have signed the code and are complying with its provisions. Consequently they are unable to make price allowances or adjustments.

As a result, Minnesota industry, without offsetting advantages, has tried to carry the oppressive burden of the fictitious charges for imaginary services, which burden is unbearable. Therefore, Minnesota producers are faced with two alternatives: Go out of business or appeal for modification of those provisions of the code which have brought about the trouble.

Of course there are other kindred problems. For example: (1) In the past, enormous tonnages of steel have been shipped into Minnesota based on water rates. Yet under the code, the fictitious charge is based on all-rail shipment. (2) Minnesota in its trunk highway program uses large quantities of concrete reinforcing bars. These are consumer goods, a finished product. The State should not be charged Chicago plus.

Since it is not the purpose of the President or the Congress to oppress small industries, and since under the code they are being oppressed to the point of extermination, and since under the provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act the President has the power to modify the code; it is fitting that, by formal congressional action, his attention be called to the conditions existing and that he be requested to modify the code's provisions in such manner as to provide immediate adequate relief from the abuses mentioned.

MINNESOTA INDUSTRIES ENDANGERED

Some hundreds of Minnesota industries with factories located at Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth use bars and billets. Their production costs are increased by the discriminatory freight charge for a service which is entirely and admittedly fictitious and imaginary.

One of these firms, the business of which affords a striking example of the problem in point because its factory is located in Duluth, and is therefore immediately adjacent to the plant of the Minnesota Steel Co. where merchant bars and billets are produced from Minnesota ores, is the Diamond Calk & Horseshoe Co.

LETTER ASKING RELIEF

Through its president the Diamond Calk & Horseshoe Co. wrote the Illinois Steel Co., distributing agents for the United States Steel Corporation, in part as follows, the letter

being dated March 8 of this year and constituting only a step in the company's continued and insistent demands for relief:

Mr. W. I. HOLLAND,
Vice President Illinois Steel Co.,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: As I have not been granted relief from the present oppressive, discriminating, and destructive position which my company has been placed under the present steel code, forcing us to pay Chicago prices for steel, plus an imaginary freight charge, which amounts to \$6.60 per ton, although the steel is made and rolled at your mill in Duluth, I have appealed to you and to Mr. C. L. Wood, vice president of the United States Steel Corporation, both by correspondence and by personal interviews ever since the code was being formulated, but so far without avail or relief.

This has of necessity forced me to appeal direct to the Government for relief. * * *

Yesterday I was asked to make a statement before the Chief Counsel for the Federal Trade Commission. I gave a complete history of our business, its progress from 1908 up to the present time, and how, until 1917, we made only horseshoes and horseshoe calks, but in that year made large quantities of tools for the United States Government, and as the horseshoe business was getting sharply less we decided to continue in the tool business permanently. We soon found that as we no longer were protected by patents in our horseshoe business and the tool manufacturing was a wide-open competitive proposition, we were getting in a bad way because of the high cost of raw material.

I appealed to Mr. Buffington, then president of the Illinois Steel Co., for reduction in our raw material cost and asked for parity with Pittsburgh. Mr. Buffington saw that I had to have relief and advised me to see Mr. Farrell, president of the United States Steel Corporation, New York City. After having listened to a detailed story of our position, he was convinced that we could not continue in open competition, unless we were granted some relief and I was then given \$5 per ton reduction as relief against freight, as a permanent proposition until I may eventually be relieved of the entire freight burden. This had reference to steel made or rolled at the Duluth mill.

I also explained to Judge Healy that, at that time, we had an investment of \$165,000 in the business and that, with the relief so granted us by Mr. Farrell, we were able to meet competition in a fair way, although we still were handicapped. Depending upon this relief being permanent we have, since that time, added more than one-half million dollars to our permanent investment so today, we have invested capital of about three quarters of a million dollars, which would never have been possible, had we not been granted such concession.

I further explained to Judge Healy that, because of our unfavorable location, so far from the consuming district, 90 percent of all goods we manufacture must first reach Chicago, which includes the west coast, because of lower freight rates. This adds another hardship to the amount of \$15 per ton on 90 percent of our manufactured goods and that added to the \$6.60 on raw material gives us a disadvantage of approximately \$22 per ton—which our competitor who is located at such points as Pittsburgh and Chicago, does not have.

I also stated that I was appealing for relief to the extent of \$1 over Chicago, in other words, steel rolled at the Duluth plant at Chicago base, plus \$1 differential and while that still gave us a handicap, we would, however, be able to operate, but anything in excess of \$1 over Chicago, we could not stand. I showed him our inability to continue in business under the present set-up; that it would be absolutely necessary for us to close our doors within a short time and that the entire investment would be lost and more than 300 men thrown out of employment.

I was finally told that my case was a most striking example of violation of the Recovery Act that had come to the Commission and it was agreed that I should at once appeal to you in person and have my request granted by the institute while in session now.

It has been the general impression of all those I have come in contact with that any reason which existed in 1924 in granting Duluth as a basing point on wire and wire products should also have been declared a basing point on merchant bars and billets manufactured and rolled in the same mill with the same machinery.

The appeal that I am making is for both merchant bars and billets. I have come here now in my final effort to save the business of the Diamond Calk & Horseshoe Co., and to save the 67 stockholders, all Duluth citizens, from losing their investment in this institution and our more than 300 employees from losing their jobs which would mean that a great many of them would be thrown upon the municipality and the Government for their support.

Sincerely hoping you may see the light, making it unnecessary for me to go further, I am,

Very truly yours,

DIAMOND CALK & HORSESHOE CO.,
OTTO SWANSTROM, President.

February 2 of this year another body, by resolution, directed the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the steel code and its effects upon industry, particularly con-

cerning price fixing and any increase in price of steel products.

The Federal Trade Commission immediately conducted an investigation and on March 19 submitted its report.

It went into the entire problem at length and in detail. Under "the practice of the steel industry under the code with reference to price fixing" it found:

Briefly stated, members must file their mill-base price quotations with the authority, may make deductions therefrom only as permitted by the authority, must make certain additions thereto as specified by the authority, must calculate delivery charges from specified common basing points according to a specified formula, must sell through distributors selected according to standards determined by the authority, and must require of such distributors written agreements to conform to specified resale prices. From the moment mill-base price quotations are filed the code itself prescribes the formula and the factors entering into it by which the ultimate price is automatically calculated.

As to what made up "the selling prices which are required by the code" its findings were:

With certain specified exceptions, all prices at which members of the code may quote and sell "shall be delivered prices" (schedule E, sec. 4). These delivered prices are a composite of several factors; a so-called "mill-base price" plus whatever extras may be specified by the code authority for given products plus a delivery charge which must be the equivalent of the all-rail freight charge to destination, regardless of what mode of transportation is actually used.

A little later on in speaking on this program the Trade Commission says:

The code accepts such a fiction by requiring that delivered prices shall be arrived at by adding to the mill-base quotation the all-rail freight from specified common basing points. As a result the so-called "mill-base quotations" do not represent net realized prices for steel except for such mills as are located at the basing point for a particular product. For all other mills the code contemplates that freight to a given destination shall not be calculated from actual shipping point but from what may be called the "ruling basing point", which is the one whose base quotation plus all-rail freight, makes the lowest delivered price.

On the exact point now before us, the Federal Trade Commission, to illustrate its views, uses the unfortunate experience of the same company used by me for illustrative purposes in this address.

The Commission in discussing "Minimum additions to mill-base quotation required by code authority", say in part:

The code (schedule F) lists the recognized basing points for each product and requires that delivery charges be calculated therefrom and not from place of shipment as such. A producer is not at liberty to sell his product f.o.b. his own mill and allow the purchaser to assume the exact delivery cost. Nor may he figure the actual delivery cost in his delivered price unless his shipping point happens to coincide with the authorized basing point. The power to select and establish basing points therefore is the power to determine which mills shall be required to calculate and collect a delivery charge from the purchaser, which is not the equivalent of their actual cost of delivery.

The basing points now established were selected by the organized industry through the American Iron and Steel Institute and they can be changed only by similar action of the institute as the code authority. As a result a member whose mill is not located at a recognized basing point must get the approval of the institute before he can calculate his delivery charge at its actual cost. In the last analysis the application of a member to make his mill a basing point or to enlarge or reduce the number of basing points is subject to the collective approval of his competitors.

An illustration of those facts and the sort of results which may occur in their application is found in the experience of the Diamond Calk & Horseshoe Co., of Duluth, Minn. It has long been buying its raw steel from the Minnesota Steel Co., whose mill is at Duluth. Duluth not being a recognized basing point for such steel, the code requires prices to be based on Chicago, the nearest basing point. This required the Diamond Co. to pay in addition to the price as quoted by the Duluth mill, the equivalent of the all-rail freight from Chicago to Duluth, or imaginary freight of \$6.60 a ton on steel produced at Duluth. As a further result the nearest competitor of Diamond Co. located in Chicago can buy there at the basing point price, or \$6.60 a ton less than the Diamond Co. pays at Duluth.

For a number of years before the code, this competitive disadvantage of the Diamond Co., due to the basing-point system, was largely offset by the Minnesota Steel Co. making it a special concession of \$5 a ton on steel from its Duluth mill. This still left the mill with \$1.60 a ton out of the imaginary freight of \$6.60 a ton which the basing point system called for, yet enabled the Diamond Co. to compete. Because the code forbids continuation of that concession, and despite the desire of the Minnesota Steel Co. and United States Steel Corporation, its parent company, to

continue it, they are forced to collect from the Diamond Co. the full \$6.60 a ton imaginary freight. At the same time, however, Minnesota Steel Co. sells similar steel in Illinois and Indiana and nets \$13.20 a ton less for it than it nets from Diamond Co. By contrast, the code establishes Duluth as a basing point for other forms of this same steel, thereby permitting them to be sold at Duluth at a fixed differential of only \$1 per ton over the Chicago prices.

The Diamond Co. has invested three quarters of a million dollars in its Duluth plant and has some 300 employees, while the Minnesota Steel Co. has a plant investment at Duluth of \$10,000,000 or more with numerous employees. Without the consent of its competitors on the appropriate Institute committee and Institute board of directors, the Minnesota Steel Co. is unable to continue a price reduction which it can much better afford to make than that which the code requires it to make on sales at distant points. Similar situations are likely to be created in many other sections of the country.

CONCLUSIONS ON THIS PROBLEM

The Trade Commission's conclusion on this problem which concerns so vitally Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth is this:

It is a conservative statement that the power to select, discontinue, or increase the number of basing points involves the power of deciding what cities shall be handicapped and what cities shall be built up as centers for the remanufacture and processing of steel products. The importance of such a power over the future of communities can hardly be overstated. The tendency is distinctly against what is commonly considered as desirable decentralization of industry.

SUMMARY IN PRICE FIXING

The Federal Trade Commission's explanation of the reasons or causes for the fatally discriminatory plan for price fixing, apparently unforeseen when the code was adopted, is summarized in the statement found on page 26 of its report:

Summing up this system of calculating delivery charges, it starts with an arbitrary basing point, so that differences in actual delivery cost are merged into a fictitious common rate. Then it uses, but solely for calculating purposes, a higher cost mode of transportation than is frequently utilized. Then in some cases it substitutes arbitraries which are higher than the actual cost even of the calculated transportation. Thus the system is not one for determining actual freight costs. It is a device for automatically insuring that all mills will reach a given destination at identical delivered prices and that the identity in their mill-base quotations will not be set at naught by differences of location and of actual freight costs.

After giving the entire problem intensive study, the Federal Trade Commission submits to the other body of this Congress its—

FINAL CONCLUSION

The question naturally arises whether this situation of enforced violation of the Commission's order in the Pittsburgh plus case can be harmonized with the terms of the National Recovery Act and the powers therein conferred.

The National Industrial Recovery Act looked forward to the authorization of codes of fair competition. True, it conceived the possibility of such codes designedly authorizing practices hitherto forbidden by the antitrust laws of the United States, but at the same time it sought to restrain the promulgation of codes that were designed to promote monopolies or operate to eliminate or oppress or discriminate against small enterprises. Furthermore, it expressly prohibited codes from permitting monopolies or monopolistic practices.

A distinct conflict of means and objectives exists between the provisions of the code and the Commission's order in the Pittsburgh plus case. That conflict raises questions not only of legal import but of basic economic implication. Departure from hitherto accepted policies of governmental concern over the maintenance of fair competition is, however, evident. Nevertheless it has been assumed thus far that the departure has the sanction of a congressional mandate embodied in the National Industrial Recovery Act. The test of whether such a sanction is actually present in that act can, of course, be submitted to the courts for determination. But other means for the solution of such an issue are also available. The work under the National Industrial Recovery Act was conceived of as necessarily being largely experimental. The act itself provides not only for means to pursue effectively paths demonstrated to be sound and desirable, but also for means to withdraw from the enforcement of policies which evidence a tendency to attain ends regarded by the act as those that our national economy has discarded.

By direction of the Commission:

GARLAND S. FERGUSON, Jr.,
Chairman.

MARCH 19, 1934.

FURTHER ATTEMPTS TO SECURE RELIEF

None of the industries concerned having secured relief, on March 28, 1934, the Diamond Calk & Horseshoe Co. applied for help to the National Recovery Review Board, of

which Clarence Darrow is chairman. The company's appeal was, in part, as follows:

NATIONAL RECOVERY REVIEW BOARD,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I hereby apply to you for relief from certain sections of the steel code that are oppressing, unjust, and discriminatory in their present form, and if continued will force my company to close its doors, confiscate our investment of approximately three quarters of a million dollars, and throw more than 300 of our employees out of employment.

The Minnesota Steel Co., a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation, is located in Duluth. Under the steel code we are compelled to pay Chicago base price, plus an imaginary freight rate from Chicago to Duluth of \$6.60 per ton, although a large portion of their products, merchant bars and billets, are sold in Chicago and Indiana at \$13.20 per ton less than the price forced on us. Our business is built up and depending upon national distribution of our products.

In 1924 Duluth was made a basing point for wire and wire products, Chicago base plus \$1, and in all fairness we only ask the same consideration pertaining to merchant bars and billets. We have been able to develop our business to its present position because of an allowance granted us of \$5 per ton in 1918, and which we have had continuously until October 1, 1933; in other words, we have had Chicago base plus \$1.60, and now the steel code has taken that away from us, even though the steel corporation declares to us their willingness to grant our request of \$1 over Chicago.

Formerly, we had a lower labor cost, because of a natural lower cost of living at our location. This, however, is not so any more. We signed the President's reemployment agreement and are complying with all of its provisions. We are operating under the metal fabricators code. Because of these new conditions we ask for a differential not to exceed \$1 over Chicago on both merchant bars and billets—a greater handicap would be destructive to us.

We have appealed to the United States Steel Corporation and to the Iron and Steel Institute, and to Mr. K. M. Simpson, deputy administrator for the steel code, ever since last August, but without any result or promise.

As president of the Diamond Calk & Horseshoe Co. of Duluth, a Minnesota corporation, who started in business in 1908, I now appeal to you and most urgently request your help for immediate relief, as our resources are being rapidly depleted, with the final results of being forced to close our business if relief is not granted very soon.

Sincerely yours,

DIAMOND CALK & HORSESHOE CO.,
OTTO SWANSTROM, President.

GENERAL AGREEMENT CODE SHOULD BE MODIFIED

That those charged with final supervision of the codes are inclined to believe that the steel code requires modification is evidenced by the statement of Gen. Hugh S. Johnson as reported in the Wall Street Journal of last Saturday.

The article starts as follows:

JOHNSON DOUBTS STEEL PRICE RULE—BASING-POINT SYSTEM "PROBABLY WRONG"—HAS NO BIG LABOR CASE WORTH PUTTING TO TEST

WASHINGTON.—The basing-point system embodied in the steel code is "probably wrong", General Johnson stated in discussing criticism of the code before the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

This is the story of how one Minnesota industry is being forced out of business through actual operation of the provisions of the steel code, which increase production costs, add an unbearable burden for charges for imaginary freight service and forbid relief in the form of price allowance.

The same story is being repeated in the business life of many other Minnesota industries.

Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth cannot grow as they should as industrial centers if they are to be handicapped for no other reason than their geographical location, by the arbitrary addition of fictitious charges for imaginary service to those production costs which of necessity they must pay for real service.

The existing procedure constitutes, in effect, a fatal attack on many industries of my home State and is an incalculable blow to the development of the State.

All other avenues of relief thus far having proved ineffective, it is apparent that a feasible way is to seek remedial action through the provision of the National Recovery Administration, which authorizes the President to modify codes.

RURAL LETTER CARRIERS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 355.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 8919, a bill to adjust the salaries of rural letter carriers, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted; and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit; with or without instructions.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY]. It is the desire of the majority leader that we try and dispose of this bill this afternoon. It is now about 3:30 o'clock, and in order to conserve the time for the consideration of the bill upon its merits, I shall be most brief in presenting the resolution for consideration of the bill.

I do not conceive it to be necessarily the function of a member of the Committee on Rules in presenting a resolution for consideration of a bill to undertake to explain all its provisions, or any of its provisions, unless it is a highly controversial or a political proposition.

This bill has been reported by the committee—I understand unanimously. It is a bill that seeks to reclassify salaries and allowances of rural carriers.

You gentlemen will recollect that under the provisions of the Economy Act there was a reduction in the equipment allowances of rural carriers. Under the provisions of this bill, as I understand it, the allowances for equipment of rural carriers upkeep is raised from 4 cents to 6 cents a mile. There may be some controversy as to whether or not that increase shall be put at 5 cents a mile or 6 cents a mile. I understood that perhaps there was some division on that in the committee as to the amount of increase.

I shall not undertake to go into the provisions of the bill. The members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will explain it thoroughly; and, gentlemen, I want to say—if I can say it with propriety—I have been serving in Congress for many years, and I have had occasion to observe the capacity, character, poise, and good judgment of various chairmen of the legislative committees of the House. I do not want to indulge in any flattery of the Chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, but the more I see of his conduct with bills, his familiarity with the legislation, his knowledge of all details of the bill he is sponsoring, the higher becomes my admiration of the admirable qualifications of the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD]. [Applause.] He is always armed and equipped, his information is accurate concerning all features of the legislation under his control. Of course, there are able gentlemen associated with him on his committee, but I felt that in passing, this small tribute to his capacity should be stated.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I am in favor of this legislation. I wondered whether the gentleman could state whether this is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand that it is. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

BILL TO PAY DEPOSITORS OF BANKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein such tables and other information as may be explanatory of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about the McLeod bill. The way I view it, it is like the story I heard about Columbus.

M'LEOD BILL SUPPORTERS LIKE COLUMBUS

Columbus left home and did not know where he was going; when he got there he did not know where he was; when he returned home he did not know where he had been.

The proponents of the McLeod bill are in a similar position. They are advocating an appropriation of public funds unknown in amount; they do not know who will get the money; and they do not know the reason for its payment. The bill is sponsored by the Republican Members of the House. It is opposed by the President of the United States.

WHAT THE BILL PROPOSES

The McLeod bill—H.R. 8479—proposes that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be compelled to acquire by purchase all the remaining assets of closed banks that are in charge of receivers and conservators, which at the date of closing were members of the Federal Reserve System. It is proposed that the bill be amended so as to include State and private banks, and I understand the author is favorable to the amendment.

WHERE WILL MONEY COME FROM?

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under the present policy of obtaining funds, will be required to issue more tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds to get the money. The Government will guarantee the payment of interest and the principal of the bonds. It is not known how much money it will take, since we do not know the institutions that will come within the provisions of the law by the time it is enacted.

WILL THERE BE A LOSS, AND WHO WILL PAY IT?

Certainly there will be a loss. The Government cannot acquire the bad debts of closed banks without taking a loss. The taxpayers will pay the loss. If the present sources of revenue are insufficient for that purpose, Congress will be under obligations to enact additional tax measures, which will doubtless restore many of the nuisance taxes, to pay the losses. Further, by reason of paying these losses, deserving appropriations for the relief of destitution and the unemployed will probably have to be reduced in amount.

WHO WILL GET THE MONEY?

If this bill is enacted, one depositor will get more than \$32,000,000. Four percent of the depositors will receive 50 percent of the money. The following table is self-explanatory:

Analysis of closed national banks, showing percentages with respect to accounts

Classification of deposit accounts by size:	Percent, number of accounts by groups	Number of accounts	Net deposits (deposits less offsets, etc.)
\$0 to \$500.....	80.89	2,402,359	\$258,261,348
\$501 to \$1,000.....	8.43	238,645	173,749,086
\$1,001 to \$2,500.....	6.91	206,824	311,144,797
\$2,501 to \$5,000.....	2.28	63,636	231,341,902
\$5,001 to \$10,000.....	.92	31,819	183,247,096
\$10,001 and over.....	.57	15,909	433,218,932
Grand total.....	100.00	2,959,192	1,590,963,161

THE RICH MAN'S BONUS

This is not a bill to help the poor so much as it is a bill to help the rich. If we owed the rich anything, I would be in favor of paying them, but we do not owe them a penny.

A few, less than 300, of the large, wealthy depositors of the Guardian National Bank, Detroit, Mich., contributed an amount sufficient to pay in full all the depositors of that bank who had accounts less than \$1,000. It required more than \$3,000,000. If this bill passes, the small depositors of that institution will not be paid; they have already been paid; the ones who paid them will be reimbursed. The Government will assume the debt and release them. This bank, when closed, had deposits amounting

to more than \$100,000,000. All depositors have already been paid 68 percent of the amount of their deposits, and more will be paid. I wonder how many people in Detroit can get 68 percent in cash from any other investment they made at the same time the deposits were made.

The First National Bank of Detroit, Mich., when closed, had deposits aggregating more than \$388,000,000. The depositors have already been paid 50 percent of the amount of their deposits and will likely be paid 75 or 80 percent. The average for all banks is around 76 percent.

Someone is doing a good job liquidating these institutions. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has authorized loans and commitments to receivers and conservators in Michigan banks for the purpose of paying depositors the enormous sum of \$198,640,351.07.

Notice the following statement:

Loans authorized to receivers and conservators prior to Oct. 17, 1933, plus authorizations and commitments for ratable distribution to depositors from Oct. 17, 1933, to Apr. 18, 1934, inclusive

State	Loans authorized (receivers and conservators) by States through Oct. 16	Authorizations and commitments, after Oct. 17, 1933	Total
Alabama.....	\$270,500.00	\$3,704,932.48	\$3,975,432.48
Arizona.....	85,000.00	228,750.00	313,750.00
Arkansas.....	2,176,709.18	4,216,417.66	6,393,126.84
California.....	3,322,000.00	6,133,000.00	9,455,000.00
Colorado.....	327,600.00	1,642,700.00	1,970,300.00
Connecticut.....		1,250,000.00	1,250,000.00
Delaware.....			
District of Columbia.....	7,226,000.00	3,187,903.52	10,413,903.52
Florida.....	794,500.00	5,565,888.33	6,360,388.33
Georgia.....	113,000.00	2,963,268.54	3,076,268.54
Idaho.....	392,900.00	364,000.00	756,900.00
Illinois.....	12,265,300.00	14,004,694.19	26,269,994.19
Indiana.....	3,638,100.00	8,355,890.69	11,993,990.69
Iowa.....	6,810,000.00	7,412,855.04	14,222,855.04
Kansas.....	839,500.00	2,485,602.94	3,325,102.94
Kentucky.....	4,122,850.00	2,420,014.57	6,542,864.57
Louisiana.....	24,812,511.90	11,016,256.44	35,828,768.34
Maine.....	8,342,572.57	24,723,000.00	33,065,572.57
Maryland.....	1,488,000.00	6,241,000.00	7,729,000.00
Massachusetts.....	2,638,000.00	14,199,000.00	16,837,000.00
Michigan.....	79,911,770.00	118,728,581.07	198,640,351.07
Minnesota.....	481,100.00	3,059,384.10	3,540,484.10
Mississippi.....	1,045,759.00	4,980,800.94	5,976,559.94
Missouri.....	2,329,600.00	7,193,225.20	9,522,825.20
Montana.....	37,200.00	636,000.00	673,200.00
Nebraska.....	229,400.00	1,535,753.43	1,765,153.43
Nevada.....		290,000.00	290,000.00
New Hampshire.....		500,000.00	500,000.00
New Jersey.....	7,899,000.00	10,451,676.07	18,350,676.07
New Mexico.....		437,947.08	437,947.08
New York.....	17,271,470.63	18,660,869.54	35,932,340.17
North Carolina.....	2,052,200.00	4,366,975.00	6,419,175.00
North Dakota.....	1,799,150.00	117,100.00	1,916,250.00
Ohio.....	79,085,565.42	28,028,032.08	117,113,597.50
Oklahoma.....	448,300.00	599,368.00	1,047,668.00
Oregon.....	151,700.00	1,264,993.44	1,416,693.44
Pennsylvania.....	12,057,070.87	74,541,933.25	86,599,004.12
Rhode Island.....	600,000.00		600,000.00
South Carolina.....	735,000.00	5,592,230.14	6,327,230.14
South Dakota.....	392,500.00	1,184,257.70	1,576,757.70
Tennessee.....	5,667,500.00	1,429,038.64	7,096,538.64
Texas.....	2,260,600.00	3,148,478.92	5,409,078.92
Utah.....	635,000.00	197,000.00	832,000.00
Vermont.....		542,000.00	542,000.00
Virginia.....	1,432,400.00	3,713,500.00	5,145,900.00
Washington.....	948,000.00	6,534,925.32	7,482,925.32
West Virginia.....	2,869,000.00	5,102,742.83	7,971,742.83
Wisconsin.....	384,800.00	3,777,079.47	4,161,879.47
Wyoming.....		127,000.00	127,000.00
Total.....	300,389,129.57	436,806,006.62	737,195,136.19
Loans authorized between Apr. 18 and Apr. 21, 1934.....			1,041,500.00
Total.....			738,236,636.19
Total number of loans authorized to closed banks.....	730	1,633	2,363

HOOVER AND MILLS SPEECHES—DEPOSITS DECREASED

It is contended that depositors were persuaded to deposit their funds in national banks by reason of the antihoarding speeches made by President Hoover and Secretary of the Treasury Mills in February and March of 1932, which caused them to lose it. Let us consider the facts. The last report of deposits in national banks before these speeches were made was December 31, 1931. At that time the deposits were \$19,244,347,000. The next report after the speeches were made was June 30, 1932. The deposits had dropped to \$17,460,913,000. In other words, it seems that deposits decreased almost \$2,000,000,000 instead of increasing.

Within 12 months after these speeches were made, the deposits in all banks had been reduced more than \$4,000,000,000.

BAD PRECEDENT

The passage of this bill would enact a very bad precedent. If carried to its logical conclusion, it would call for the Government to pay the debts of all banks—national, State, and private—even though the banking officials are now serving time in a penitentiary for embezzling the funds—building and loan companies, joint-stock land banks, and finally all losses suffered by investors on the stock exchange. Many investors claim the banks denied loans to brokers which caused stocks to be thrown on the market, causing the break. They also contend that Government officials caused these banks to reduce their loans to brokers. Therefore, they contend the Government agents caused their loss. If the McLeod bill passes, these investors who lost their money will have claims against the Government supported by the same sort of reasoning.

WHAT IS NOW BEING DONE TO AID BANKS AND DEPOSITORS

In order to show what is now being done in the way of aiding the banks, including closed banks and their depositors, the following statement is inserted from the 1934 report of the Comptroller of the Currency:

In addition to the new duties of the Comptroller as a member of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Board, he was appointed to membership on two special committees created by the President, one to be known as the Deposit Liquidation Board, on October 15, 1933, which constitutes a special division of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The President appointed this Board for the purpose of making loans to banks closed since January 1, 1933, on their assets. The Board was constituted as follows:

C. B. Merriam, the head of the special board; Jesse H. Jones, chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; Dean G. Acheson, Under Secretary of the Treasury; J. F. T. O'Connor, Comptroller of the Currency; Walter J. Cummings, chairman Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Lewis Douglas, Director of the Budget.

"The purposes of the Deposit Liquidation Division", the President's announcement read, "will be to stimulate and encourage liquidating agents of banks closed after January 1, 1933, to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in order that funds may be made available to depositors as quickly as possible. The general intention is to make loans on the assets of closed banks for the benefit of depositors up to a maximum of 50 percent of their deposits, inclusive of distributions heretofore made. This does not, of course, mean that in a bank whose remaining assets are worthless, the depositors will get 50 percent. They will get in such a case only their share in the remaining assets."

"It is estimated that the maximum loanable value of the assets of banks closed during the year 1933 will not exceed \$1,000,000,000, and it is hoped that the distribution will approximate that amount."

We have acted speedily in coming to the rescue of depositors in closed banking institutions. Between October 17, when this Board started functioning, and January 2, 1934, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation authorized \$243,119,582.97 for distribution to depositors in 496 closed banks, nearly all of which were closed after the first of the year.

The President on October 23, 1933, announced the establishment of a special Reconstruction Finance Corporation division for bank reorganization and to make recommendations for purchase by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of preferred stock of State banks. The following members of this new division were named by the President:

Harvey Couch, to be its head; Jesse Jones, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, ex-officio; Eugene Black, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board; Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of the Treasury; Lewis Douglas, Director of the Budget; J. F. T. O'Connor, Comptroller of the Currency; Walter J. Cummings, Chairman Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Henry Bruere; Frank Walker.

At the same time the President announced that "Governor Black is to head a subcommittee on cooperation with member banks in this same effort." The prime purpose behind the formation of this special division was to prepare State banks for eligibility in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by January 1 in that the sale by them of preferred stock will strengthen their capital structure. "We hope", President Roosevelt said, in announcing the creation of this division, "that all banks will take advantage of this opportunity to put themselves in an easy cash position to help in the work of recovery. We need the banks and want them to have adequate capital. As a rule such capital cannot now easily be found in the communities. As recovery continues, such capital will be found. But in the meanwhile and temporarily, but for such length of time as may be necessary, the Government will supply the necessary capital through the

Reconstruction Finance Corporation in its purchase of preferred stock. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation will thus serve as a recovery finance corporation.

"The banks must feel free to function well, and the Government will help them prepare themselves to play their important part."

"To accept the Government's offer to purchase preferred stock does not mean that a bank is weak but that it is eager to cooperate in the recovery effort to the fullest possible extent and thus undertake to put this additional capital to work. We are not thinking of idle capital. We are thinking of working capital—capital working for recovery."

As a member of the Board appointed by President Roosevelt, I can say with pardonable pride that we have made a good record so far in strengthening State banks through the purchases of their preferred stocks, capital notes, and debentures by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. From October 23, the date of creation of this division by the President, to the close of business on December 31 a total of 3,323 nonmember banks had a total of \$242,100,000 approved for issue, of which amount \$84,936,000 consisted of preferred stock and \$157,164,000 consisted of capital notes and debentures.

In addition to the above record made by the special division in such a short time, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation during the 7 months ended December 31, 1933, approved the purchase of a total of \$65,336,000 in preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures in 78 nonmember banks. During the same time the Corporation approved 1,059 applications from member banks for a total issue of \$502,930,000, of which amount \$372,868,000 was in preferred stock and \$130,062,000 in capital notes and debentures.

Never in our history has the Federal Government done so much to aid distressed depositors in closed banks by declaring dividends from the loans made on the assets, as well as the purchase by the Government of preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures in the banks in the country.

Do not overlook the statement of President Roosevelt in the foregoing, and be sure and read the last paragraph of this statement about more being done by the Government for distressed depositors and closed banks than ever before in our history.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY].

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this rule and of the legislation which it seeks to make in order. It is my privilege to enjoy the acquaintance of the very able and efficient president of the National Association of Rural Letter Carriers, Mr. W. G. Armstrong. He is a resident of the State of Michigan. His recommendations and views on matters relating to the Rural Carrier Service go a long way with me, because I feel he knows the problems of the rural carrier and the Rural Carrier Service from A to Z.

The bill contains three important provisions. The first recommended by the Department takes into consideration the improvement that has been made in our road system during the last few years and changes the length of a standard route from 24 miles to 30 miles, keeping the compensation for a standard route the same as it is now, \$1,800 per year. It further takes into consideration the improved condition of the roads and provides a compensation of \$20 per mile over the standard road instead of \$30 under existing law. My understanding is that the carriers are willing to accept this provision, provided the other provisions of the bill are retained in the bill and enacted into law.

The second provision in the bill raises the equipment allowance of the rural carriers from 4 cents to 6 cents per mile. There is a tendency on the part of many when considering this equipment-allowance question to compare it with the cost of maintaining an automobile used only in good weather, on good roads, under normal conditions, traveling long distances, and making few stops. That is not the situation with the rural carrier. He must go in all kinds of weather, rain or shine, and, in many instances, snow or shine. He makes frequent stops, he goes over good and bad roads alike, and I am told that the equipment allowance of 6 cents a mile, as a matter of fact, is much less than the average cost to the rural carrier in keeping up his equipment. He has more oil to buy, more gas to buy, and he has to take his car to the service stations for repairs more frequently than the average user of an automobile.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Can the gentleman tell the House how much additional cost will be entailed on the Public Treasury as a result of this legislation?

Mr. MAPES. I am not on the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, but I am told that there will be a saving to the Department of something like \$3,000,000 per year by the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. McDUFFIE. What is the average salary of the rural carrier now?

Mr. MAPES. I cannot tell the gentleman what the average salary is, but I understand that under the Economy Act the equipment allowance was reduced to 1 cent per mile.

The third provision in the bill prevents the consolidation of rural routes except in case of the resignation, death, retirement, or dismissal, on charges, of carriers in the Rural Mail Delivery Service. That provision is put in to prevent arbitrary dismissals by the Department and the consolidation and extension of routes in some cases to abnormal lengths.

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

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. What the gentleman says about the mileage allowance is particularly true in the north country, where the winters are long and severe, and where the wear on the equipment is extremely severe.

Mr. MAPES. There is no question about it in the gentleman's State of New York and in the State of Michigan.

Mr. CULKIN. In other words, they face storms and bad roads for 6 months at a time.

Mr. MAPES. That is correct. I shall not discuss the bill further but content myself with the statement that I am in favor of it with the amendments recommended by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BLANCHARD].

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, this legislation has my approval. I followed the course of the bill in the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads through my good friend the chairman of the committee, who has been considerate enough to keep me advised as to its progress. I know the thorough job Mr. MEAD has done in the consideration of the bill. I make this statement not with any idea of flattering the gentleman from New York, but merely to stress the fact that the rural carriers in coming before this committee laid their program before the Membership with the desire to do them the justice they claimed they deserved and to be heard on the merits of the matter.

From my study of the provisions of this bill and the report of the committee, from the testimony I heard, and the talks I had with members of the Rural Letter Carriers' Association, I am satisfied that the bill in its present form represents a carefully worked-out program that not only does a measure of justice to these Federal employees but at the same time does no violence to the financial program of the Treasury. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I give my full approval to this measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Do I state the fact correctly when I say that the bill reduces the appropriation by \$3,000,000?

Mr. BLANCHARD. It makes a reduction in the appropriation, of course, and it also irons out some of the inequalities which exist at the present time. Am I correct in my understanding of the matter?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And is not the total reduction \$3,000,000?

Mr. BLANCHARD. It is my understanding that it is more than \$3,000,000. The rural carriers, in giving their approval to this measure and the amendments to be proposed, recognize the practical difficulties confronting them. It represents to them the securing of some stability to their employment, and it removes uncertainties and inequalities. In addition

the maintenance and equipment allowance is fixed by law and will no longer be subject to administrative order. This is a highly desirable change.

The rural carriers do not desire to raid the Treasury. They are willing to do their part in this trying time; they have always been loyal servants. They do ask common justice, and this measure provides Congress with the opportunity to correct a situation which all must admit is unfair, harsh, and unjustifiable from every standpoint.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MORR].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this bill for the same reason that I supported the Senate amendments to the independent offices appropriation bill and for the same reason that I voted to override the veto on that bill.

In supporting the Senate amendments to the independent offices bill, we undertook to restore the compensation of underpaid Federal employees whose salaries had been cut by the Economy Act. We did not succeed in restoring all their compensation but did effect a restoration of two thirds of it.

That bill, which was vetoed by the President and passed over his veto, not only helped to restore a living wage but it tended to make the jobs of the Federal employees more secure. It took the jurisdiction of fixing the wages of Government workers out of the hands of the executive department and put it back into the hands of the lawmaking branch of the Government, where it originally was and where it rightfully belongs. The pending bill has for its purpose the taking of a further step in the same direction in regard to one very large and important class of Federal employees, the rural mail carriers.

For many years the rural mail carrier has been working under conditions of uncertainty, both with respect to the compensation he receives and also with respect to the tenure of the work itself. The bill we are now considering undertakes to remove that uncertainty. It does this by stabilizing the base pay of the rural carrier by adjusting it to modern methods of travel upon modern roads, and by assuring to the carrier a reasonable allowance for the necessary upkeep of the modern equipment which he uses on those roads in the performance of his daily work.

I think it is generally conceded that an equipment-maintenance allowance of 4 cents per mile is too low; that it actually costs the rural carrier more than this amount to maintain and operate his mail-delivery equipment. In this bill not only has the equipment-maintenance allowance been raised from 4 cents to 6 cents per mile, but neither the Postmaster General nor anyone else is permitted, under the provisions of the bill, to lower the amount provided by law, as was the case under the Economy Act.

The legislation provided in this bill also saves the jobs of about 9,500 rural mail carriers. The Postmaster General declared some time ago that the service could be maintained adequately with 9,500 fewer rural carriers than we have at present. He also announced that adequate rural mail service could be maintained for \$11,000,000 less than it is now costing. He proposed to effect this saving by dismissing 9,500 rural mail carriers and by consolidating existing rural mail routes.

By the plan worked out under this bill, the jobs of these 9,500 rural carriers are saved, and in addition thereto a reduction of \$3,000,000 in the total cost of the service is made. The members of the Committee on the Post Office are to be congratulated on their splendid and humane solution of this problem. And the Congress is to be congratulated for taking this matter into its own hands and by demonstrating that real economy can be effected without throwing men out of work and without reducing the wages of those who remain at work.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair bill and a just bill. It not only gives to the rural mail carrier a net compensation as large as he is now receiving but it does what I believe is even more important. It makes the jobs of the rural mail carriers secure, and it removes the mental hazard under which they

have been working, and it prevents 9,500 men from being thrown out of work at a time when we are bending every effort to put men to work.

The results of this legislation will prove of benefit not only to the rural carriers themselves, but to everyone with whom they come in daily contact. It will benefit the patrons whom they serve. It will benefit the communities in which these faithful, patriotic, and hard-working public servants live. The bill deserves and it should receive our hearty, unanimous support. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was adopted.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit tomorrow during the session of the House.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

- H.R. 518. An act for the relief of T. Perry Higgins;
- H.R. 1127. An act for the relief of O. H. Chrisp;
- H.R. 1724. An act providing for settlement of claims of officers and enlisted men for extra pay provided by act of January 12, 1899;
- H.R. 1870. An act for the relief of Corinne Blackburn Gale;
- H.R. 2026. An act for the relief of George Jeffcoat;
- H.R. 2321. An act for the relief of Capt. J. O. Faria;
- H.R. 2339. An act for the relief of Karim Joseph Mery;
- H.R. 2340. An act for the relief of Russell & Tucker and certain other citizens of the States of Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas;
- H.R. 2541. An act for the relief of Robert B. James;
- H.R. 2561. An act for the relief of G. Elias & Bro., Inc.;
- H.R. 2666. An act for the relief of D. F. Phillips;
- H.R. 2682. An act for the relief of Bonnie S. Baker;
- H.R. 2689. An act for the relief of Edward Shabel, son of Joseph Shabel;
- H.R. 2828. An act to authorize the city of Fernandina, Fla., under certain conditions, to dispose of a portion of the Amelia Island Lighthouse Reservation;
- H.R. 2858. An act to add certain lands to the Pike National Forest, Colo.;
- H.R. 2862. An act to add certain lands to the Cochetopa National Forest in the State of Colorado;
- H.R. 3345. An act to authorize the Department of Agriculture to issue a duplicate check in favor of the Mississippi State treasurer, the original check having been lost;
- H.R. 3463. An act for the relief of Walter E. Switzer;
- H.R. 3551. An act for the relief of T. J. Morrison;
- H.R. 3579. An act for the relief of O. S. Cordon;
- H.R. 3580. An act for the relief of Paul Bulfinch;
- H.R. 3611. An act for the relief of Frances E. Eller;
- H.R. 3843. An act to repeal an act of Congress entitled "An act to modify and amend the mining laws in their application to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes", approved August 1, 1912;
- H.R. 3851. An act for the relief of Henry A. Richmond;
- H.R. 3952. An act for the relief of Grace P. Stark;
- H.R. 4013. An act to provide an additional appropriation as the result of a reinvestigation, pursuant to the act of February 2, 1929 (45 Stat., p. 2047, pt. 2), for the payment of claims of persons who suffered property damage, death, or personal injury due to the explosion at the naval ammunition depot, Lake Denmark, N.J., July 10, 1926;

- H.R. 4269. An act for the relief of Edward J. Devine;
- H.R. 4519. An act for the relief of C. W. Mooney;
- H.R. 4611. An act for the relief of Barney Rieke;
- H.R. 4779. An act for the relief of the estate of Oscar F. Lackey;
- H.R. 4808. An act granting citizenship to the Metlakahtla Indians of Alaska;
- H.R. 4846. An act for the relief of Joseph Dumas;
- H.R. 4847. An act for the relief of Galen E. Lichty;
- H.R. 5038. An act authorizing pursers or licensed deck officers of vessels to perform the duties of the masters of such vessels in relation to entrance and clearance of same;
- H.R. 6013. An act to authorize the sale of land and houses at Anchorage, Alaska;
- H.R. 6386. An act for the relief of Lucien M. Grant;
- H.R. 7279. An act for the relief of Porter Bros. & Biffle, and certain other citizens;
- H.R. 7551. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of the Pass A'Loutre Lighthouse Reservation, La.;
- H.R. 7744. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer to the city of Bridgeport, Conn., a certain unused light-station reservation;
- H.R. 7793. An act authorizing a preliminary examination of the Ogeechee River in the State of Georgia, with a view to controlling of floods;
- H.J.Res. 10. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 12 as Columbus Day for the observance of the anniversary of the discovery of America; and
- H.J.Res. 61. Joint resolution granting compensation to George Charles Walther.

RURAL LETTER CARRIERS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8919) to adjust the salaries of rural letter carriers, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 8919, with Mr. WEST of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the lateness of the hour, I trust it will not be necessary to use all the time allotted for general debate. I hope we may proceed without delay with the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule. While the measure is important, the degree of opposition in the committee and, I believe, on the floor of the House will be such as to warrant our speedy consideration of this measure.

This bill was introduced after the receipt of a letter from the Postmaster General directed to our committee urging a reclassification of the salaries of rural letter carriers on the theory that the Department could get along with approximately 9,500 less than the number they have in that service and because of the modernization of transportation methods and the improvement of highways.

Under the original plan proposed by the Postmaster General it was suggested that the standard route of 24 miles be extended to 30 miles; that is, that the standard rural route hereafter would be a route of 30 miles, for which the carrier would receive \$1,800 per year. It was further recommended that the equipment allowance for rural carriers in this service be restored to 4 cents per mile. On the basis of recommendations proposed by the Postmaster General a saving of approximately \$11,000,000 would be effected. The saving of the \$11,000,000, however, would be a wage reduction upon the personnel of this service.

The committee, in its consideration of the measure, agreed to the adjustment so far as the length of the standard route was concerned, and in that connection the committee was in entire accord both with the Department and with the representatives of the employees. The committee differed, however, with the Post Office Department in connection with the equipment allowance, and, as will be noticed in the bill, the committee felt that 6 cents a mile was a fair

and just rate. Increasing the equipment allowance from the recommendation of the Department to the figure contained in the bill reduces the saving to approximately \$3,000,000 annually. So that the personnel of the rural service will suffer a total reduction, in the aggregate, of \$3,000,000. The bill increases the standard route from 24 to 30 miles. In addition to this, it reduces the annual pay per mile for every mile in excess of 30 miles from \$30, which is the rate they now receive, to \$20 per mile, which is the rate they will hereafter receive. The adjustment of the standard route from 24 to 30 miles and the reduction from \$30 to \$20 for the excess mileage over and above the standard route effects the saving requested by the Department. The increase in the equipment allowance from 4 to 6 cents, as was adopted by our committee, reduces the \$11,000,000 saving by approximately \$8,000,000.

The rural letter carrier under the Economy Act had his equipment allowance reduced by 15 percent. As a result of a provision inserted in the independent offices bill, authority was given the President to reduce or suspend the equipment allowance. As a result of that authority, the equipment allowance was reduced to 3 cents for the months of November, December, January, and February, and to 1 cent a mile for the remaining months of the year. Under this bill that authority is repealed and the equipment allowance will be 6 cents.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I do not know whether I have the right figures, but may I ask if it is not a fact that the equipment allowance is 4 cents and that that is the present law?

Mr. MEAD. The present law is 4 cents.

Mr. SABATH. And this is increased to 6 cents?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. This is an increase of 50 percent, causing an additional expenditure for equipment allowance of \$8,000,000?

Mr. MEAD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not true that in the extension of these routes, with the reduction in the amount allowed for equipment, many of these carriers had to absorb a great deal of their salaries in order to keep up their equipment and carry the mail?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. The carriers, particularly those on long routes, are credited with being the recipients of excessive salaries. Such is not the case, because the best information received by our committee permits me to explain to the House that somewhere in the neighborhood of \$500 annually on an average is necessary to meet the expenses incident to the transportation of mail by motor vehicle. It is also necessary for these rural letter carriers to purchase a new car on an average of every 3 years. Much of the excessive salary or compensation, as it is called, is used in the upkeep and maintenance of their equipment.

Mr. DOWELL. Of course, it is necessary to keep up the equipment in order to give service, and the longer the route assigned to the carrier the more expensive it becomes to the carrier?

Mr. MEAD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Can the gentleman give us information as to what it costs the carrier to maintain his equipment on the average?

Mr. MEAD. I may say to the gentleman that our committee heard from the carriers and the Department, and we also took occasion to communicate with many of the large organizations of the country, including telephone, gas, electric companies, and various other organizations that use a great many cars. The best information that we have is that it costs somewhere in the neighborhood of 6 cents a mile to operate a motor vehicle of the type used in the rural letter-carrier service; and the committee felt, upon the

evidence presented, that 6 cents was a fair equipment allowance.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. ADAMS. Does the bill make any provision for routes less than 30 miles in length; and if so, what is the provision?

Mr. MEAD. I may say to the gentleman that routes of a mileage less than 30 miles suffer a severe reduction in base pay.

The reduction in some instances exceeds \$400; but we have an amendment taking care of that situation, so that the reduction in no case, on the shorter routes, will be in excess of \$180 per annum.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DUNN. Are the rural letter carriers in favor of this proposed legislation?

Mr. MEAD. The rural letter carriers face a reality rather than a theory, and they realize that the dismissal of approximately 9,000 men would be an undue hardship, one they could not accept if there is any avenue of escape, and therefore they are willing to accept this readjustment at a loss to them of some \$3,000,000 in order that they may meet the recommendations of the Department and save the personnel.

Mr. DUNN. Then they are not opposed to this legislation?

Mr. MEAD. No; they are not opposing it.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. On a 30-mile base how many hours a day does it require a carrier to complete his service?

Mr. MEAD. The Department informed us that the average rural route in the country requires about 5½ hours.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. What did they mean by the average rural route?

Mr. MEAD. Rural routes run all the way from 7 miles to 90 miles; but they take an average route, and it is their claim that the average number of hours put in, 6 days a week by a rural letter carrier, is somewhere in the neighborhood of 5½ hours.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. Is it not a fact that it takes them from 1½ hours to 2 hours per day on a 30-mile base and during the balance of the time they crowd out some other good man from giving service at an oil station or something of that kind?

Mr. MEAD. Under the regulations of the Department no rural letter carrier can compete, in employment with any other man.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. But they do, to my knowledge.

Mr. MEAD. That may have been the case some years ago.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. No; lately.

Mr. MEAD. The gentleman may have this service confused with the star-route service.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. The gentleman is not confused. He has made an examination of the matter.

Mr. MEAD. The rural letter carrier of today, I will say to the gentleman, in very few cases violates the regulations of the Department.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. Should not this bill provide against that?

Mr. MEAD. The regulations are severe. They are so severe that no law could make them more stringent. Separation from the service is the penalty, and I may say to the gentleman that in view of the regulations, legislation on the subject, in my judgment, is not necessary. While the Department maintains that the average number of hours is 5½, the best information we have is that it is 1 hour in excess of that, or approximately 42 hours a week.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. I was not inquiring about the average, but I was taking your base of 30 miles of which the gentleman speaks. How long does it take such a carrier to give this service on good roads?

Mr. MEAD. Thirty miles is approximately the average route because they run from 7 miles to 90 miles in length, and therefore the average number of hours on the average route, according to the Department, is 5½, but according to the employees it is 7 hours. It is my judgment that it is somewhere in the neighborhood of 6½ or 7 hours.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. My dear sir, I have made an examination, and the information that you have been giving is incorrect on a 30-mile base on good roads.

Mr. MEAD. I may say to the gentleman that this country is so large and the geography of the country is so different in so many different sections, and there are so many different seasons of the year, that the committee, intimately associated with this problem, is perfectly willing to meet the statement of the gentleman by saying that we believe the average rural letter carrier works in excess of 5½ hours a day and that nearly 7 hours a day is more than reasonably correct.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. On a 30-mile base?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; taking the average route over all the United States.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. I should like the Members to examine into this question before voting on this bill.

Mr. ROMJUE. If the gentleman will permit, I may say that nobody before the committee ever questioned that it was not at least 5½ hours.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. For 30 miles.

Mr. MEAD. Yes; 30 miles or the average route. I am very sorry the gentleman did not come before the committee and give us the benefit of his information.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. The gentleman did not want to come before the committee. I am looking to you for information, and I am challenging the statement that a 30-mile base takes five hours and a half of service. That is what I am challenging.

Mr. ROMJUE. And I am telling the gentleman that the members of the committee, after long hearing, as well as the Post Office Department itself, never made any such claim as the gentleman is now making.

Mr. MEAD. I may say in further answer to the gentleman that when the Post Office Department explained to us that the average workday of the rural letter carrier on the average route, taking the country as a whole into consideration, is five hours and a half, the gentleman can bank on it that no rural letter carrier finishes his duties on such an average route in less than five hours and a half. That was a minimum estimate in our estimation, and I may say in addition to what I have already said on this subject, the average rural letter carrier does not follow the improved highways of the country. The average rural letter carrier is crisscrossing the highways like the average hockey player crisscrosses the hockey rinks. The rural letter carrier follows the good and the bad highways; he follows the hills and the valleys, and takes the improved highways once in a while in the course of his daily tour. I think it is unfair to say that the average rural letter carrier of the country on an average route, in following the highways, works less than five hours and a half. There is no information before our committee to support such a statement, and as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROMJUE] has stated, I am sorry we did not have such information during our hearing.

Mr. BEEDY. The net result of this bill is that the rural carrier is going to do more work and get the same base pay, but with an increase of the equipment allowance, and have more money than he is now getting.

Mr. MEAD. More money for equipment and less base pay.

Mr. BEEDY. He gets less money in toto and does more work.

Mr. MEAD. Yes; they are reduced \$3,000,000 a year.

Mr. BEEDY. Do the carriers want this legislation?

Mr. MEAD. As I said a moment ago, it is a serious situation that confronts them. The Postmaster General has authority to drop 9,500 to effect the saving required by the Budget.

Mr. BEEDY. And in face of that possibility, the carriers think it is the best thing to do.

Mr. MEAD. They accept this legislation as the best way out.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. I want to say that I asked the gentleman with reference specially to the 30-mile route—I did not refer to the average route. I want to say that the chances are that I will vote for the gentleman's bill.

Mr. MEAD. I will say to the gentleman that perhaps we were both somewhat confused.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. No; I was not confused; I was not making an unfair statement, and I resent the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. MEAD. If the gentleman from Indiana knew the caliber of the men who are members of our committee, he would allow the chairman to resent the challenge made to the committee.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. I would not, but I think the gentleman was a little bit out of order.

Mr. MEAD. I could have explained the misunderstanding—30 miles is the average route.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. I think I will vote for your bill, but I want to say that out in Indiana they work an hour and a half or two hours a day, and they work at other things, throwing men out of jobs.

Mr. HENNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HENNEY. Does the chairman take into consideration the time that the rural carriers put in at the post office distributing mail?

Mr. MEAD. The rural carrier is a traveling postmaster. He collects c.o.d.'s, issues money orders, attends to registered letters; he is a traveling salesman for the Department and a traveling bureau of information. He sells stamps. He does the work of a postmaster; he prepares the mail in the morning, makes up his reports in the afternoon, and he should be credited with that in addition to the service on his route.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. I am aware of all that.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman from New York explain section 3? Suppose there is no voluntary resignation, no death, no retirement, the rural carrier can only be dismissed under charges, and in any event there can be no consolidation of routes.

Mr. MEAD. That is the situation today, except that under the Economy Act the rural carrier, after 30 years' service, can retire, even though he has not reached the age limit. But we expect that that will soon be eliminated; then this bill follows existing law.

Mr. HASTINGS. And prevents the consolidations except under the conditions as stated in section 3.

Mr. MEAD. That is present law. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the ranking minority member of the committee, because I think he will be able to answer questions that I have at least attempted to answer. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the able and distinguished Chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has been answering questions with all directness and with full information. This bill as amended by the House Post Office Committee is a constructive solution of an emergency. This measure did not originate with any member of the Post Office Committee.

The Postmaster General came before our committee and stated that he was compelled to save \$11,000,000 in the conduct of the Rural Free Delivery Service, and that he proposed to do it if possible by extending the standard route and by reducing the amount paid for additional mileage from \$30 to \$20 per mile. We were faced with a proposition of doing a grave injury to the Rural Free Mail Service or adding some provisions to that proposal changing that. That is the situation regarding this bill. The committee has modified it in the interest of the Rural Delivery Service. From the beginning there has been a conflict between the Post Office Department and the Congress as to this Service. At the beginning two appropriations were made, originating

in this House, and the then Postmaster General refused to expend the money on the ground that the Rural Free Delivery Service was not justified, and that it would cost more money than the American people would favor. Still the House put through the appropriations, and finally with a start of \$40,000 it was established. From that time the House and the Senate have been supporting this great Service, even while there has been more or less lukewarmness on the part of the Department.

Postmaster General Farley stated that it would be necessary for him to dismiss 9,500 rural carriers unless we gave him a saving through legislation. In my estimation, the Department has already curtailed this great service quite far enough. Between 1932 and 1933 they stripped off 1,597 rural carriers. They are proceeding now at the rate of a hundred a week. This cuts down this service, which ought to be kept up and extended as in the past. Beginning with a very small expenditure, this service grew until 25,000,000 Americans in the rural sections are being served every day by their Government carrying them the mail, which means enlightenment and information. Many of these 25,000,000 are out of touch with any other activity of the Government. This service has led to a great many improvements in rural sections. It takes the market reports every day to the farmer. It helps to bring good roads to the rural sections. Instead of being isolated, it made them really part of a great community. In my estimation we should not hesitate in giving complete service to every dweller in the rural sections of America. Instead of endeavoring to cheapen and curtail this service we should be extending it at a time like this and thus bring encouragement to those who are so greatly discouraged at this time.

As I said, our committee did not originate this legislation. The bill was sent to us by the Department, and we were compelled to take action. The bill as originally presented provided that the standard route should be raised from 24 miles to 30 miles, with the pay remaining the same—\$1,800 a year. We believe that that can be justified, because since the 24-mile route was established, better roads have come. It is justifiable to say that the standard route shall be 30 miles. Where the excess mileage went above 30 miles, there was a provision for \$20 per mile instead of \$30 per mile. We thought that was fair also, and it was approved. However, the Postmaster General has power to consolidate arbitrarily—to dismiss these faithful servants of the rural sections and to cut the equipment allowance down to 1 cent, as is being done at this moment. We felt that protection features should be written in this bill. I remember very well when we first put that equipment allowance in the law. It was in the salary bill of 1925, which, as some here will remember, had a hectic history for 2 years. We provided a basic increase for the post-office clerks, city letter carriers, and railway mail clerks of \$300 a year. We did not give \$1 increase in salary to the rural-delivery carriers. We gave them, instead, a 4-cent equipment allowance, which amounts to about \$300 a year on a standard 24-mile route. That was the inception of this equipment allowance, and it was a matter of simple fairness and justice.

I have always believed that it is unfair for the Government of the United States to employ a citizen and then compel him to spend an indeterminate amount for equipment in order that he may perform the duties of his position. We endeavored to correct that through the equipment allowance. Then along came the Economy Act which reduced this allowance. In February an Executive order was issued again reducing the amount to be paid. Here is an Executive order of February 23 which states that beginning on April 1 and continuing to July 1, 1934, the rate of equipment allowance shall be fixed at one cent and one hundred and eleven ten-thousandths of a cent. This, with a 10 percent reduction, reduces the equipment allowance to exactly 1 cent per mile. So that until the 1st of July the equipment allowance is only 1 cent per mile.

We have had abundant testimony before the committee that it costs more than 6 cents per mile on the average to provide and maintain the vehicle required by the Post Office

Department. The amendment in section 1 of this bill, therefore, provides that the rate shall be 6 cents and that such allowance shall not be changed except pursuant to law enacted after the date this act takes effect.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that we maintain the equipment allowance at this rate. Unless that is done, we will work a grave injustice upon these rural letter carriers. With this allowance we do them some measure of justice. I am confident that it will meet with the approval of the rural carriers as a rate more nearly in accordance with the actual expense.

Without further amendment the carriers would have to face the chance of dismissal to the extent of any number the Post Office Department felt necessary. Therefore, another amendment was inserted on page 3. It is a very important provision and reads as follows:

No consolidation of rural routes shall be made otherwise than on account of the resignation, death, retirement, or dismissal on charges of carriers in the Rural Mail Delivery Service.

Without this amendment there is no limitation to the arbitrary power of the Postmaster General. Without it he may dismiss 9,500 rural carriers, and there can be no way of preventing it. With this amendment we undertake to hold the number of employees in the Rural Mail Service at the point where normal causes operate. We have precedent for it in the Railroad Act, where the service rendered by the common carriers of the country comes under the Interstate Commerce Commission. In the last session of Congress we passed an act freezing the number of employees as of May 1, 1933, and providing for a 5-percent reduction only.

In this amendment we provide that consolidations can be made only on account of resignation, death, retirement, or dismissal on charges; and that provides more than enough curtailment of the service. It seems to me that we know from the Postmaster General's own report that he has been going far enough in the matter of the reduction of the number of rural free delivery carriers.

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As a matter of fact, has the Post Office Department been making consolidations except in the instances mentioned in section 3 of the bill?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. In 1933 there were some 1,591 consolidations.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But were not all those cases in which there had been resignation, retirement, death, or dismissal?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Or transfers from the rural service to some other service.

Mr. BANKHEAD. So, as I understand it, then, section 3 is really nothing but a perpetuation of the present situation with respect to consolidation.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That is correct. The Postmaster General told us he would be forced to dismiss some 9,500 carriers, which means adding to the unemployment problem of the country, unless we gave him legislation.

Now, we are not going to accomplish a saving of \$11,000,000, for each one of the two additional cents for equipment allowance will mean \$4,000,000; but, I am convinced that by the operation of this provision with respect to consolidations as a result only of death, resignation, retirement, or dismissal from charges, that a proper and natural reduction will be made and that the Department should ask for no more power than that.

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. DOBBINS. The gentleman referred to the curtailment of service. The gentleman does not mean to curtail the number of people receiving rural free delivery service, but he means, rather, does he not, a curtailment of the number of carriers by an extension of routes?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. At the present time, for instance, there are 39,000 carriers in the Service. A few years ago there were 45,000 carriers in the Service. This means that some 6,000 carriers have been dropped. Our

committee has received many complaints from people who are without the service that should be given in the rural sections of the country.

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. TABER. In connection with the hearing on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill there was testimony to the effect that a very substantial number of families had been deprived of rural free delivery service because of the consolidations.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That is true; and, Mr. Chairman, I may say further that we have gone far enough in the matter of curtailment. Hardships have been inflicted upon the carriers and the public has less service. Therefore it seems to me that to pass this measure will be to do a constructive act along two lines.

We are endeavoring to establish a permanent basis for this travel allowance, at a point which will more nearly meet the costs, and we are endeavoring to make sure the rural carrier does not have the fear of dismissal hanging over his head every day of the year. We are trying to give him some security.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I am in full sympathy with the able argument which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made. I should like to know what special compensation is provided for those carriers whose routes are more than 30 miles?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Those that have routes more than 30 miles in length receive \$20 for each mile per year in excess of 30 miles. At present it is \$30, and this is a cut of \$10 per mile per year.

Mr. HASTINGS. What will a rural carrier get who serves a route under 30 miles after the enactment of this bill?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That is figured out at \$60 a mile. On a 10-mile route his regular pay would be \$600. If the reduction amounts to more than \$180 it stops at \$180 under an amendment authorized by the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. May I say a word in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois in reference to curtailing service to patrons of rural routes by citing an example? I know of one consolidation in my own county where they cut out one rural carrier. They previously had 4 and now they have 3. The route was extended mostly on the route of one carrier. I know that one farmer who formerly had his mail delivered right to his door now has to walk a mile and a half to get it. Two of his neighbors had their mail delivered previously to their farms and now they have to travel a mile to get their mail, and there are two more that have nearly a half mile to go to their mail boxes. This goes to show that every time there is a consolidation of mail routes there is some curtailment in service at the same time resulting in a detriment to the rural patrons.

Mr. DOBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DOBBINS. That may be true in the locality to which the gentleman refers, but does he know that on the 1st day of July 1932 there were nearly 7,000,000 families receiving rural delivery service and notwithstanding the reduction of the number of routes throughout the country the total mileage of the routes had increased by 3,271 miles because the old routes were made longer and the aggregate length was increased under the rearrangement of the routes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. I understand; and the committee has considered that phase of it. May I say that I agree with the able chairman of the committee and also with the able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] in what they have already said about this bill. They are experts on postal and postal-employee legislation.

The rural carriers in wanting the passage of this legislation are not asking for anything that is unfair. They desire to be secure in their positions. They only ask a fair salary

with a fair and reasonable expenditure allowance. The committee has carefully considered this bill and has reviewed every phase of it before bringing it out on the floor today. The committee has sought information from all sources, and in establishing the mileage rate now contained in this bill it was found that the 6-cent-a-mile rate was fair and that in use by private companies with equipment very much similar as that used by the rural carriers.

The carriers are forced to take almost a \$3,000,000 salary loss by the passage of H.R. 8919, but they are faced with the cold reality of either accepting the salary adjustment embodied in this measure or seeing 9,500 of their fellow carriers dismissed from the service, through a wholesale consolidation of routes by the Post Office Department. This bill will provide the rural carriers with assurance against dismissal. It provides against any indiscriminate or wholesale letting out of rural carriers. It makes it impossible for the Post Office Department to consolidate thousands of rural routes and release from employment a like number of carriers.

The committee has felt that the rural carriers had suffered a real set-back in fair earnings when their mileage allowances were slashed by Executive bulletin, following the passage of the Economy Act, to 1 cent a mile. This reduction in allowance, coupled with the 15-percent cut under the Economy Act, placed practically all of the carriers in a most unfair condition.

The rural carriers are daily serving more than 25,000,000 people in the conduct of their duties, and to curtail this service by the dismissal of 9,500 employees would mean the elimination of decent rural service to thousands of people who are entitled to get rural free delivery. They are as much entitled to daily mail service as those persons residing in the cities. They are just as much entitled to as close a contact with the other sections, both with their own community as well as other parts of the country, as the residents of villages and cities. Why deny them such service? If the Post Office Department is facing a deficit why should the rural carriers be made to shoulder the burden?

In the first place, this Department has never paid its way, except during the year in which the Economy Act was in operation, and then only at the expense of the employees in that Department, and if the air and ship subsidies are considered, they would still be in the red. Each employee was trimmed of part of his wages, wages which should never have been sliced. The salary of the rural carrier is not high. He is not able to put away each month any amount from his earnings, nor will he after this bill is passed. No; on the contrary, the rural carrier as a general rule spends his entire monthly salary, and where is it spent? I would say that, without an exception, his wages go into the merchant's cash drawer of his own community. He buys everything locally, and the community as a whole benefits from the salary of the rural carrier.

The argument has been raised by Members of Congress that the rural carrier should be cut in salary and mileage because he competes with his neighbor in other employment. In answer to that I would say that no rural carrier—and this is Department order—can enter into any competitive employment of any kind. This regulation is strictly and rigidly enforced, and I do not believe that there are any violations of this Department order.

The 25,000,000 rural-route patrons now being served by the rural carriers with this service will be gratified to hear of the passage of this bill. It means that their mail delivery service will be guaranteed and protected, and it will mean that they will not have to adjust themselves to changes which the Post Office Department could make without taking into consideration what effect it would have on the people being served by these routes.

The rural carrier travels over every kind of road in every kind of weather. He is faced with the task of serving the patrons of his route in all seasons and under all conditions. His salary is not being increased by the passage of this bill; as a matter of fact, it is decreased, but what it does is to guarantee him in his position so that he need not be under

the constant and everlasting fear of finding himself without a job because of a widespread consolidation of routes that the Post Office Department might wish to invoke. This bill merely adjusts his salary.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN].

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the Chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee [Mr. MEAD] is deserving of commendation for the excellent piece of legislation that he and the other members of the committee prepared for our consideration. I know these men are very much interested in the underpaid rural letter carriers and all other Federal employees.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the time has come when the representatives of our Government should discontinue the economy program, because of which thousands of men and women have been dismissed from their positions.

The other day I stated on the floor of the House that I was a member of the Labor Committee, and when this committee was holding public hearings on the 5-day, 6-hour bill many officials of our industries appeared before our committee in opposition to the bill. I asked these men, "Do you have an age limit in your plant?" I was informed by them that the age limit was 40 to 45 years.

Now, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, we will never get out of a depression unless we are able to find employment for men and women who are physically and mentally able to work.

I am going to repeat a statement I made here some time ago. I said that if we Members of the House would permit ourselves to be actuated by humanitarian motives instead of selfish ones, we could solve any problem which would confront us. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague on the committee [Mr. ROMJUE].

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Chairman, there are three points involved in this legislation and three only.

First is the base-pay proposition. As has been stated, the base-pay proposition of \$1,800 per year is now made to apply on a mileage of 30 miles. Previously it was on the basis of 24 miles.

The second proposition involved in the bill is the equipment allowance. Under the present law we have an allowance of 4 cents a mile. This bill makes the equipment allowance 6 cents a mile. I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that in many sections of the country some rural carriers have to maintain vehicles and horses; and, strange as it may seem, in all the testimony that has ever come before the Post Office Committee and in all the testimony that has come before the Post Office Department bearing on the proposition of equipment allowance, nowhere have the figures been officially submitted bearing on what it costs to maintain a horse and vehicle. We took all this into consideration, as in some sections of the country equipment of this kind has to be kept in addition to automobile.

The third proposition involved in the bill is the matter of consolidation. This is the same as the present law, except that this bill provides that there cannot be any dismissal except for resignation, death, retirement, or dismissal on charges. Taking this altogether, this bill, if enacted into law, will save something over \$3,000,000 to the Government.

Mr. McDUFFIE. May I ask the gentleman whether the rural carriers are in favor of this bill?

Mr. ROMJUE. Of course the rural carriers are not entirely satisfied with the bill, but they realize the situation the country is in and are willing to do their share to assist recovery.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I am sure they cannot be. I understood this morning they were. I could not understand how they would be in favor of a bill which would take from them \$3,000,000.

Mr. ROMJUE. I will explain the situation to the gentleman. Every member of this committee worked diligently

and painstakingly on this matter. And this bill comes to the House unanimously agreed upon.

I do not remember the exact number, but there have been something like 7,000 reductions in the personnel of the rural mail service. The Department, of course, wanted to be as economical as possible, and they felt that unless there was some legislation on this matter they might have to make further considerations and bring about dismissals in order to keep within the revenue of the Department.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Does this bill prevent any further consolidations regardless of whether the Department thinks that advisable or not?

Mr. ROMJUE. The consolidations that have taken place heretofore, mainly, have been where there was a death or resignation or dismissal on charges or a retirement, and that is what this bill provides.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Then there is no change in that respect.

Mr. ROMJUE. No change, except we are enacting that into law, whereas that is done under regulations at the present time.

Mr. McDUFFIE. In other words, you are writing the regulations into law.

Mr. ROMJUE. We are writing the regulations into law, and, so far as I know, the regulations of the Department have never gone beyond what I have stated, but the Department said they might have to dismiss a lot of these people, and the first proposition in this bill reduces the letter carrier's salary 25 percent on the basis of a base pay of \$1,800 for 24 miles. His mileage is increased to 30 miles. So he takes a 25-percent reduction in that respect, figured on the basis of the length of the 30-mile route.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ROMJUE. The standard now, instead of being 24 miles, is increased to 30 miles, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Is the provision with respect to equipment-maintenance allowance increased from 4 cents to 6 cents upon the initiative of the committee or upon the protest of the rural mail carriers?

Mr. ROMJUE. No; the committee listened to everybody who desired to be heard, and we had testimony from various sources as to what the equipment allowance should be. There were plenty of people who thought it ought to be 7 or 8 cents and the committee used what we thought was our best judgment and tried to do justice both to the Government and to those who are in the service.

Mr. ADAMS. Was there any general complaint among the carriers that a rate of 4 cents is insufficient?

Mr. ROMJUE. Yes; it was almost universal.

Mr. COLDEN and Mr. DONDERO rose.

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield first to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COLDEN. I want to ask the gentleman this question, bringing out a comparison of the wages of the rural carrier with the rural teacher. Every rural route goes past several school buildings in the country where teachers are probably laboring for 8 months at a salary of from \$40 to \$60 a month. Does not the gentleman believe that is an inconsistent salary in comparison with the rural mail carrier?

Mr. ROMJUE. I may say to the gentleman that we cannot go into every issue that may come up of that kind. We are trying to legislate on this particular problem and, of course, we will never get everybody equalized, and for that reason we did not go into that problem.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the committee justify the reduction in salary by the increase in mileage or by the increase in the pay per mile for his vehicle?

Mr. ROMJUE. No; as I said a moment ago, there was never any estimate about the operation of vehicles or the cost of feeding horses or anything of that kind, but there is a general belief that the roads have been improved; yet, as the chairman has said, improved roads in many sections of

the country do not mean very much to the rural carrier, for the reason that the rural carrier goes into the country and does not follow the main highway, because all improved concrete roads run practically on a straight line, and rural routes run mostly in a circle, coming back to the starting point with as little duplication in travel as possible.

Mr. DONDERO. And all the people do not live on the improved highways.

Mr. ROMJUE. No; and the rural mail carrier has to travel in a sort of circle. He may, of course, cross an improved highway now and then, but he does not travel straight down the highway like a tourist.

Mr. DONDERO. Have the rural carriers expressed their approval of this bill and are they satisfied with it?

Mr. ROMJUE. I do not know that anybody is ever satisfied with anything, and I cannot say that, but the committee, or at least the other members of the committee, used all the judgment they had to do what they thought was due the Government in the way of economy, and at the same time they tried to deal as fairly as they could with the employees under the circumstances.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, in view of some of the things that have come up today, I wish to make a brief statement about the consolidation situation.

According to my information, the consolidations that have been made so far are averaging at the present time a saving of about \$1,200 per consolidation; but these consolidations almost altogether come from forced 30-year retirements, so that the additional expense to the Government on account of retirement is \$1,000 a year and therefore the net saving, after you deduct the retirement cost, is only about \$200 per consolidation.

There are a couple of things about the bill itself that I want to ask some questions about. The first one is this: On page 2 it appears that the carrier with 30 miles receives a salary of \$1,800 for 6 days a week, and I would like to ask the chairman of the committee by what provision of law, is anything less than the \$1,800 paid to the carrier who carries mail only 3 days a week? I am wondering if this section requires an amendment to take care of that situation?

Mr. MEAD. No; a carrier who carries two triweekly routes of 40 miles each is paid at the rate of a carrier who carries 6 days a week on a route half the combined mileage of the two triweekly routes.

Mr. TABER. Is there authority of law for that?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; he is listed as a carrier who carries two triweekly routes and is paid the same as a carrier who carries one route 6 days a week.

Mr. TABER. I would like to ask the gentleman one other question. There are a number of roads in my territory that serve a section with a large population where the carrier is obliged to spend almost the full 8 hours of the time and some of the time, more, in getting over his route. These routes are not much more than the present standard of 24 miles. That would reduce these carriers substantially, would it not?

Mr. MEAD. We have an amendment to cover that. It will take care of the short routes. After we had the estimate furnished by the Department we found out that rural carriers whose routes are 7 to 20 miles were reduced in some instances in excess of \$400, an unwarranted reduction, so we have an amendment covering the short routes in which we limit the reduction so that it will not exceed \$180.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not true that most of these carriers necessarily, where their routes are extended, require a substitute carrier or someone to assist them?

Mr. MEAD. That may be true in the winter season and during the holidays, and in some cases the Department adds an auxiliary carrier.

Mr. DOWELL. And the carrier has to pay that substitute or assistant out of his own pocket.

Mr. MEAD. Any help provided by the rural carrier is paid for by the carrier, and it is no added expense to the Department. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am tremendously interested in this bill. I heartily approve of the bill and believe that it is just and fair.

I represent a district in which the routes have great mileage, and, although they have good roads, in the fall and wintertime there are, as there always have been, quantities of mud. The bill is apparently well justified, and if there is any injustice it is the amount paid to the carrier and not to the Government of the United States.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I have only one more speaker, and I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DOBBINS].

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois 4 minutes.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words about some of the inquiries, not all of them audible over this hall, but many of them questions that have come to me privately here at this desk, with reference to a comparison between alleged lower costs of operating ordinary motor vehicles and this allowance we are making for a motor vehicle used in the rural mail service. Gentlemen making that comparison lose sight of the fact that as they employ their own motor vehicles, they frequently drive them 200 or 300 miles a day, traveling on the best of improved roads, whereas the rural carrier in the performance of his service uses the vehicle on an average only 30 miles a day, and travels over roads of all conditions and descriptions. They lose sight of the fact also that the rural carrier has to perform his work on schedule and cannot wait for good weather nor for good roads.

He starts out at exactly the same hour every day, no matter whether it is raining or snowing or what the weather is and regardless of what the condition of his roads may be. He must frequently equip the wheels of his vehicle with tire chains, and the testimony before us showed that the average rural carrier wears out many sets of chains in the course of a year in his battles with mud, snow, and ice. He is obliged to attend to his vehicle and equipment after returning to his home, often requiring hours for this work, and that is probably overlooked by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DURGAN] in commenting upon the time they spend in their work. A good many people think that a rural carrier is working for us only when he is traveling. He must go to the post office and assemble his mail and route it in the order of its intended delivery. He must attend to numerous other postal transactions with the patrons of the route, and when he has traveled over his route, he must take care of his collected mail in the post office, take his vehicle home and put it in condition for punctual and efficient service on the following day.

There is another feature that we must consider. The rural carrier heretofore has been making up a considerable part of his equipment allowance, or the expense for which his equipment allowance is designed, out of his salary, yet the public have been looking upon him as receiving that salary net for his services. Few rural carriers in the past, with the small equipment allowances they have had, have been able to avoid dipping deeply into their salaries to supplement their inadequate expense allowance. Often \$300 or \$400 a year has had to be taken by a carrier out of his salary to pay for his equipment expense, which the meager allowance heretofore made is inadequate to cover. This new provision is fair to the carrier, because it allocates to him as salary only that which is intended to compensate him for the work that he does, and provides an equipment allowance that is actually required for that purpose.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. I am glad to yield to my friend the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. I know the committee has not investigated dairies, but within the last 30 days—and I hope the chairman of the committee will listen to this—a rural

carrier's neighbors made complaint that he works 2 hours a day and runs a dairy the balance of the time.

Mr. DOBBINS. I do not believe there is a rural carrier in the United States who devotes as little as 2 hours a day to the Postal Service.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. I have turned that complaint in to the postal authorities, and I wish the chairman would read those letters.

Mr. MEAD. I will help the gentleman get rid of him if necessary.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. He is a good Republican, as 90 percent of them are.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DOBBINS] is immensely interested in rural carriers. Nevertheless, in all fairness, I ask him whether he does not think that an equipment allowance of 5 cents should be made instead of 6 cents?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOBBINS. I am sorry indeed that the expiration of all time under the rule prevents my replying to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first paragraph of section 8 of the act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes", approved February 28, 1925, as amended (U.S.C., title 39, sec. 197), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. The salary of carriers in the rural mail delivery service for serving a rural route of 30 miles 6 days a week shall be \$1,800; on routes less than 30 miles, \$60 per mile per annum for each mile or major fraction thereof. Each rural carrier assigned to a route served 6 days in a week shall receive \$20 per mile per annum for each mile or major fraction thereof said route is in excess of 30 miles, based on actual mileage, and each rural carrier assigned to a route served 3 days in the week shall receive \$10 per mile per annum for each mile or major fraction thereof said route is in excess of 30 miles, based on actual mileage."

(b) The second paragraph of such section 8 (U.S.C., title 39, sec. 200) is amended to read as follows:

"Deductions for failure to perform service on a standard rural-delivery route for 30 miles and less shall not exceed the rate of pay per mile for service for 30 miles and less; and deductions for failure to perform service on mileage in excess of 30 miles shall not exceed the rate of compensation allowed for such excess mileage."

(c) The third paragraph of such section 8 (relating to equipment-maintenance allowance for rural carriers) (U.S.C., title 39, sec. 206) is amended by striking out "4 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof "6 cents."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 22, after the word "cents" insert: "Such allowance shall not be changed except pursuant to law enacted after the date this act takes effect."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLFORD: Page 2, line 22, after the word "thereof" strike out "6 cents", and insert "5 cents."

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order because this amendment has just been adopted by the committee. A motion to strike it out is not now in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WILLFORD. Mr. Chairman, before we grant 6 cents a mile for equipment allowance let us consider the practice in private industry. The big companies of the country which employ salesmen who travel across the country by automobile allow but 4 cents and 4½ cents a mile. Out in our country we have hard-surfaced roads.

I have listened to the controversy provoked when the gentleman from Indiana said some carriers worked an hour

to an hour and a half a day. I know that to be a fact in some places in my country.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. So do I.

Mr. WILLFORD. I know cases of rural carriers where they say their wives carry the mail for them and that it took only an hour or an hour and a half and that it took only 30 minutes to fix the mail. As I say, we have hard surfaced roads, fine gravel roads, all-weather roads.

I think 5 cents a mile is ample allowance, for if the carriers took any human kind of care of their cars at all they would not need to buy a new car every 3 years.

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

Mr. WILLFORD. I yield.

Mr. DUNN. The gentleman states there are rural carriers who work for an hour and a half or 2 hours a day. Does the gentleman know how many rural carriers work 5, 6, and 7 hours a day?

Mr. WILLFORD. I have never gone into the matter far enough to know the number, but I do know positively of one rural carrier with whom I am very closely acquainted.

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

Mr. WILLFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOEPEL. Does the gentleman realize that rural carriers are compelled to buy more tires and that they have more engine trouble and more clutch trouble than the ordinary driver, because the rural carriers have to make frequent stops and are frequently obliged to run off the hard road onto rough shoulders?

Mr. WILLFORD. I have listened to the rural carriers' talk until I have come to the conclusion that they are little tin gods favored above all others and that they have misused their privileges. In my country rural carriers receive from \$2,400 to \$3,600 a year. They receive greater compensation than the postmaster who accepts the responsibility. Not only that, but they are doing a wonderful lot of political activity in my country.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLFORD. I yield.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. How many Democrats are there among them?

Mr. WILLFORD. Not one that I know of; not one. I repeat, 5 cents a mile is sufficient allowance. I drive a car myself as many miles as the average rural carrier drives his, and it does not cost me any 6 cents a mile; and I drive a car for 5 years before I get a new one.

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

Mr. WILLFORD. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that the Federal Government has spent millions upon millions of dollars improving the roads, that the States and counties have spent vast sums of money, and the roads have been so improved that it does not cost as much to drive a car today as it did in years gone by?

Mr. WILLFORD. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in Iowa alone in the building and improving of roads to help the rural mail carrier. That was the plea on which the roads were built; that was the cry, "Help the rural carriers."

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

Mr. WILLFORD. I yield.

Mr. BEITER. Is it not a fact that practically every garage and activity connected with the use of automobiles has adopted a code which increases the cost of the maintenance of cars and that that is reflected in this rate?

Mr. WILLFORD. No; most of the rural carriers repair their own cars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLFORD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Does the gentleman take into consideration the high cost of gasoline? In Florida they pay a tax of 8 cents a gallon, 7 cents of which goes to the State and 1 cent to the Federal Government.

Mr. WILLFORD. In Iowa we are paying 14 cents a gallon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. I may add further, if the gentleman will permit, that in my section of the country for several years the mail carrier had to drive across my plowed fields for half a mile because the roads were blocked by snow.

Mr. WILLFORD. Under the rules of the Post Office Department when the roads are blocked the mail carrier is not compelled to travel his route.

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

Mr. WILLFORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLARD. Is the gentleman a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads?

Mr. WILLFORD. I am not.

Mr. MILLARD. Does the gentleman want to put his individual opinion against that of the whole committee?

Mr. WILLFORD. At least I have the right to state conditions as I know them to be in my part of the country.

Mr. MILLARD. Does the gentleman know what testimony was presented before the committee?

Mr. WILLFORD. No; I do not. But I still maintain I have the right to state my own observations and opinion.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLFORD. I yield.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. The gentleman's knowledge is practical, obtained from close association with the rural carriers?

Mr. WILLFORD. Absolutely. The rural carriers are organized. They came here in a body to sell their goods, and they have sold them to the committee. The other fellow was not heard; there were millions and millions who were not even considered because they were not organized. The carriers are like a lot of frogs in a swamp; they make a lot of noise.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. McDUFFIE to the amendment of Mr. WILLFORD: Strike out the figure "5" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "4."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment, if adopted, would mean nothing at all. There is a provision in the bill which states that the law is amended by striking out "4 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof "6 cents." The adoption of this amendment would make that provision read "strike out '4 cents' and insert in lieu thereof '4 cents.'"

Mr. McDUFFIE. No. The gentleman did not understand the substitute I offered. There is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WILLFORD] to strike out "6" and insert "5." I am offering an amendment to strike out the "5" and insert "4." I am suggesting the old rate, a difference of 2 cents under what the committee has reported. The language in the line can, of course, be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Insofar as the parliamentary procedure is concerned, the Chair holds that the amendment is in order and overrules the point of order. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, in nowise would I assume to know more about this subject than do the very fine gentlemen who have given it hours of study. I have just read the letter written the committee by the Postmaster General, and I am sure he has given quite as much thought and study to this problem as has the committee because he is dealing with this subject as closely and directly as the committee has done.

The Postmaster General suggested that 4 cents a mile should be given as an allowance to rural carriers in lieu of

what they are now receiving under the provisions of the Economy Act.

I recognize that the rural-carrier service is a very fine service. The personnel of that service is far above the average; indeed some of our best citizens are rural carriers. I appreciate the fact also that it is not a popular thing to stand in a legislative body and incur the displeasure of that great organization of some 40,000 men throughout the Nation who have their influence and their power. This is just one more instance of the power of an organized minority under our form of government. It is not a very happy thing to take a position that is not approved by that very active and fine organization.

The rural carrier in America today, and I say this without fear of successful contradiction, is the best-paid individual on the Government pay roll in proportion to amount of real work done. Five and one quarter hours per day is the average work done by the rural carrier. Roads have been improved, and the work is less arduous from year to year. There are thousands of people, yes, hundreds of thousands, who would be delighted to have an opportunity to serve the Government as rural carriers. No injustice would be done by giving them their allowance which was granted, I think, in 1925, and which was eliminated under the Economy Act, and it is proper for Congress to follow the suggestion of the Postmaster General and give them back the 4 cents per mile. I think gentlemen are not very sure of their ground when they say they cannot operate their vehicles on an allowance of 6 cents per mile.

I think it is unfortunate indeed if, in our admiration and respect for this great organization, we permit ourselves to lose sight of our better judgment and pay these employees more in proportion for the work they do than any other Government employee by and large. I submit that 4 cents per mile is not an unreasonably low figure.

I realize that you gentlemen are not going to adopt this amendment. I have no doubt that the House is going through with this program, but I have risen to take a few moments of your time to suggest that you are going beyond the recommendations made by the head of the Post Office Department in this allowance. In the light of these times of unemployment, I feel the average rural carrier should thank God for his job. He can, in many instances, finish his carrier service in time to work every day on his farm or do other things outside the Government service. Instead of urging more pay and allowance the carrier in these times should be very happy and feel himself a most fortunate citizen. The carriers have been my friends. It is not pleasing to me to oppose their program at any time. This committee has not followed the suggestions of the Postmaster General, who feels that economies must be effected to come within the Budget figures. No one wishes to curtail our splendid mail service. The Postmaster General has not done so where he could avoid it. We must not forget that funds expended for this service must come from the taxpayers. This bill repeals the Economy Act as it applied to the carriers. I realize it may be popular here to repeal that act, but the taxpayer will some day be heard from. We too often forget that he is the man who pays for all Government service.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are exaggerating just a little bit when we say that the rural carriers of America are favored above any of the Federal employees. We do not take into consideration, and I take it from the statement the gentleman has just made that he has not taken into consideration, the fact that rural carriers must spend some money to do the job that they are performing for this Government. I do not believe that the 6-cents-a-mile equipment allowance is too much. In addition to operating a pleasure car I have employed men in my business to operate automobiles. These men drive the best roads of the country, and it costs more than 6 cents per mile. This is not true with rural carriers. They are traveling the worst roads of this country. I know some rural carriers that work 2 and 2½ hours a day when

the weather is good. I have in my home town a fine fellow who carries mail in an old model T Ford. He has not been able to buy a new car because of the equipment allowance that is coming to him. That fellow has gone out at 9:30 in the morning and arrived back at 8 o'clock in the evening during the month of March.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Maybe he had to work a half hour to get the thing started in the morning.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, I know it is a popular proposition these days to find fault with the Federal employees, but I think it is all wrong. It is true that men want these jobs today, but they did not want the jobs years ago when the present incumbents went into service. The average time that these men have served in the Rural Free Delivery Service is a little more than 14 years. Some of these men are getting up in years. They have done a good job, and they have built up a service that is appreciated by the people in the rural sections of America. I think we should do nothing to tear down that great service.

I do not believe that they can operate their automobiles over the bad roads of this country for less than 6 cents a mile. The fact of the matter is I have some figures here which show that the average cost throughout the Nation to operate an automobile in the Rural Free Delivery Service is a little over 8½ cents a mile, and in the State of Texas the figures show it costs 13 cents a mile to operate automobiles in the Rural Free Delivery Service of that State.

This talk of all the men working 2 and 3 hours a day is an exaggeration. The average time that is put in by these men is almost 7½ hours a day. Of course you can take isolated cases and point to one or two rural carriers working 1½ or 2 hours a day, but we should not judge the entire service by an isolated case or two. In Pennsylvania we boast of having the finest roads of any State in the Union. We have a program on now for the building of 50,000 miles of roads in Pennsylvania. We built more than 13,000 miles of roads in that State in the last 2 years. Notwithstanding this fact, our rural carriers are traveling the mud roads and the upkeep expense of their cars is tremendous.

Here is one of the finest chaps I have ever known. He has a 41-mile route, serving 2,001 patrons. He has 499 families on his route. His salary is \$2,310. His maintenance allowance at the rate of 4 cents a mile is \$477 less 15 percent. During the year from July 1, 1932, to June 30, 1933, he received a salary of \$2,226.98. His maintenance costs amounted to 6.3 cents a mile to operate his car. He covered 11,960 miles and his total maintenance cost for the year was \$753.48.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HAINES. Now subtract this from his total amount received and you will find that this fellow received a net salary of \$1,473.50. A city letter carrier working 8 hours a day receives \$2,100, and this is not too much, but when Members stand here on the floor and claim that our rural carriers are the "best paid men in the service", they make statements that they cannot substantiate with facts. Deduct from this amount the depreciation of a car, which is several hundred dollars a year, his insurance, his liability costs, you will find that this carrier is not overpaid; and Mr. Chairman, this is but one of thousands of similar experiences in the ranks of the rural carriers. I know no finer type of men in the Government service. They give this service with a smile, and while there may be a few cases where these men have easy jobs and do things politically that are unethical, and engage in business on the side, this is the exception and a rare one indeed. I do not think that we should find fault with this great group of faithful Government employees for the mistakes of a few. I have many letters from these men who give me their cost experience, and after deducting this from the total paid them, they are not the best paid men in the service, but I believe I am safe in saying that they are among the lowest paid of our employees, when we know the true situation among these men. We want our employees to be well paid. The trouble right now in this country is that we have too many underpaid men and women and surely this great Government of ours should set the right example.

If we do not set such an example we have no right to ask private industry to do so. Another fact has been overlooked by those who appear to find fault with this 6 cents equipment allowance and that is that most of these men must call in auxiliary help, indeed 35 percent of the carriers are forced to do this. These men are not paid by the Department, but by the carriers themselves. Clerks and city and village carriers are not asked to do this. The rural carriers' working day is divided into four parts:

First he must spend time keeping his equipment in good condition.

He has a car to keep running or a horse to feed, many times both. He must spend part of his day sorting his mail, casing his mail in the post office; then he goes out on his route. When he returns he must again do a varying amount of clerical work in connection with the responsibilities that are his in the performance of his work and the fine service he wants to give to his patrons. Mr. Chairman, 6 cents is not too much equipment allowance. If we are to deduct 25 percent from the base pay of these men in the changing of the base pay upon the basis of 30 miles instead of 24 miles, we are working a hardship upon these men; but to reduce their equipment allowance below that called for in this bill, and unanimously approved by the committee, is unfair, to say the least. Mr. Chairman, I know most of the rural carriers in my own district. I say to you here and now that we have no finer group of employees in the Government service. I am proud to be listed as their friend. I am as much interested in economy in the affairs of the Government as any Member in this body, but I do not believe in economizing at the expense of faithful employees. I think that private industry admits that the greatest blunder they made in the past was the ridiculous reduction of wages, which contributed so much to our economic ills of this present day. Will not we profit by that mistake, Mr. Chairman?

Would it not be a grave error to take more from these men than we now propose to do in the enactment of this legislation? The saving of more than \$3,000,000 will meet with the approval of our people, but such a saving will not be looked upon with favor by the great host of public-spirited Americans, if by doing so we cripple an established service that is giving such wonderful service to our rural communities. I ask, Mr. Chairman and Members of this committee, that you vote down the amendment to reduce the equipment allowance to 4 cents and to also vote against reducing the equipment allowance to 5 cents. Stand by the committee, who gave serious and long study to this bill, and who come to you feeling that it is a fair and just measure, meriting the approval of the entire Membership of Congress.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEAD: Page 2, at the end of section 1, insert the following new subsection (d):

"In the case of any carrier in the Rural Mail Delivery Service on the date this act takes effect who serves 6 days a week a rural route of less than 30 miles or who serves 3 days a week a rural route of less than 60 miles, or two routes of a combined length of less than 60 miles, the annual salary of such carrier shall not be reduced more than \$180 by operation of subsection (a) of this section."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of the amendment I may say that it prevents a reduction in excess of \$180 per annum on the short routes. Many of them will be eliminated as quickly as possible; but were it not for this amendment the salary on some of the short routes would be reduced in the neighborhood of \$400 and no one wanted to do that. I therefore ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Amendment offered by Mr. HOEPEL: Page 2, line 10, strike out period and insert a colon and add: "Provided, That no reduction in salary shall apply under this section wherever the carriers in the Rural Service serve over 500 legitimate patrons on routes of 24 miles or less."

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and print them in the Record in a subsequent edition.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, after 8 years' experience as postmaster I am satisfied that the deficit which only too often exists in the Post Office Department is more or less chargeable to the Congress which, under the stimulus of political expediency, in some instances ties the hands of the post-office administration and in others is perhaps indifferent or illiberal. The Post Office Department is handicapped in the efficient conduct of business to a great extent due to the fact that it is subservient to the whim of 531 politicians who, apparently, are, as a whole, more concerned as to their political futures than in revising and modernizing the largest department in the Government.

That the Post Office Department itself is culpable in some respects is illustrated in this bill now under discussion. The fact that the Post Office Department has permitted the various inequalities pertaining to rural carriers to exist without suitable recommendation to the Congress for their correction would indicate that the Post Office Department officials are sympathetic toward the archaic procedure of the oxcart or pony-express days, notwithstanding that we have progressed to the days of the air mail with its expeditious and very satisfactory service.

It is my opinion that any competent business man could take over the functions of the office of Postmaster General if freed from the influence of politics and its concomitant ills, and through the adoption of modern, efficient methods, could improve the service immeasurably and at the same time save the taxpayers millions of dollars annually.

Outwardly the Post Office Department has every appearance of efficiency, but in its internal administration there are many glaring examples of inefficiency which no corporation would permit to exist. During the days I served as postmaster I was continually calling the attention of the Department to the unbusinesslike methods forced upon the various postmasters and the personnel which, if corrected, would have resulted in improvements in the service with lesser expenditures.

My time is too limited to go into extensive details on the subject, but a few illustrations will suffice to indicate the type of discriminations, extravagances, and inefficiency which is so costly to the American taxpayers and so unfair to our post-office personnel.

For instance, the postmaster of a third-class office whose sales are \$7,999 per annum receives a limited clerical allowance, and at the same time he must provide himself with all incidental supplies required in the administration of his office. Where the sales of the same type of office are, for example, \$8,001 per annum, the postmaster is supplied every facility without charge, and clerical allowance is increased from \$2,100 per annum to approximately \$3,900 per annum. In addition, the Government then furnishes all post-office boxes and other facilities. To be more specific, because of the sale of only \$2 more stamps in 1 year over another the clerical allowance is increased approximately \$150 per month, plus the furnishing of all facilities at a high annual rate. In addition, village letter carriers serving such offices may then be classified as city carriers, and receive approximately a 30-percent increase in salary.

Criticism in this respect does not apply to the Post Office Department but is directed at the Congress, and it is my opinion that postal laws and regulations should be rewritten in order to permit greater elasticity in the administration of

the Post Office Department by the Postmaster General and less interference on the part of the Congress.

In this bill under discussion, I wish to congratulate the committee on its sympathetic attitude toward the rural carrier. The Republican as well as the Democratic Members have shown a helpful attitude toward our rural carriers, but I am very sorry that they have apparently failed to recognize the most pertinent features of the rural service which should be corrected. In this bill we have a striking example of exterior service which cries to high heaven for correction in the interest of justice to the rural carriers and also in the interest of the National Treasury.

According to my observation, some rural carriers are overpaid and others are underpaid. Strict justice would demand that this be corrected as soon as possible. I can explain this best by citing specific instances.

In my district, one rural carrier has a 30-mile route having 205 patrons. Another carrier in my district, with a 30-mile route has 705 patrons. Both carriers receive the same annual compensation, while the truth is that one of these men is working almost three and a half times more than the other. This is flagrantly unfair.

I have another rural carrier in my district who serves approximately 680 patrons. His route is 22 miles long. Notwithstanding that he has 475 more patrons than one of the carriers just mentioned, his compensation, under the provisions of the bill under discussion, will be approximately \$300 less per annum than is the compensation of the carrier on the 30 mile route with only 205 boxes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEPEL. In just a moment.

This condition prevails throughout the United States where service is from the densely populated areas. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] just a moment ago made a reference to this same condition, which exists in his district.

In my opinion, we should enact legislation to correct the injustices in compensation paid to rural carriers with short routes but who have a large number of patrons on these short routes. While the amendment just adopted will reduce the compensation of this class of rural carriers only \$180 per annum, it still places them in an unfortunate position with relation to other carriers with more mileage and fewer patrons to be served.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is correct in saying that something must be done about the short routes where there are many boxes and I want to inform the gentleman that we are endeavoring to work out a fair differential. The gentleman's amendment will not do justice and it will be necessary for us to fix a differential based on the number of boxes on the route. The Post Office Committee now has under consideration a separate measure to fix this differential and I hope the gentleman will not press the amendment, because it will not do justice.

Mr. HOEPEL. The statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania brings out exactly what I referred to a moment ago when I spoke of the sympathetic attitude of the Post Office Committee. Both the Republican and the Democratic members are outstanding men and I know they will remedy this situation. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 24, insert after the word "effect" a new paragraph, as follows:
"Provided, That no rural carrier shall operate more than one route."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is to prevent one rural carrier from operating more

than one rural route. There are conditions in many parts of the country where one rural carrier handles two routes. He goes out in the morning on one route and comes back and starts out on another in the afternoon. In this time, when we are trying to make opportunities for employment for the unemployed, I think that condition is unfair.

Mr. DURGAN of Indiana. Will the gentleman turn to the committee and make that statement in a loud voice so it can hear. [Laughter.]

Mr. COLMER. I think the committee has heard it. I have mentioned it to them before. Now, I do not care to take up further time except to say that in fairness to millions of unemployed men I think the amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. DOWELL. Are not the two routes that the gentleman mentions consolidated?

Mr. COLMER. It is my information that they are not.

Mr. DOWELL. I never heard of any two routes operated by one carrier, unless the routes were consolidated.

Mr. COLMER. I will ask the chairman of the committee if I am not correct.

Mr. MEAD. There are some cases where carriers operate two routes—usually one today and another tomorrow. If the mileage of the combined routes is 80 miles he is paid for a 40-mile daily route.

Mr. DOWELL. In that event the pay is fixed according to the schedule of one half of the combined mileage.

Mr. COLMER. I want to say that these cases have caused more discussion among the people, and reacted unfavorably to the rural mail carriers themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. The last sentence (making inapplicable to rural carriers provisions respecting rotative furloughs, and authorizing the President to suspend or reduce equipment allowances of rural carriers) of subsection (a) of section 9 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1934, and such sentence as continued and amended for the fiscal year 1935, are amended to read as follows: "The provisions of this section relating to furloughs shall not apply to carriers in the Rural Mail Delivery Service."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of section 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. Salaries (not including equipment-maintenance allowances) of rural carriers shall, during that portion of the fiscal year 1934 which remains after the time this act takes effect, and during the fiscal year 1935, be reduced by the percentage of reduction, if any, applicable by law to salaries of employees of the Government generally.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 10, page 3, strike out the figure "3" and insert the figure "2".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. No rural route extended or established, by consolidation or otherwise, after this act takes effect, shall exceed 60 miles in length.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of section 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, after line 18, insert:

"Sec. 3. No consolidation of rural routes shall be made otherwise than on account of the resignation, death, retirement, or dismissal on charges of carriers in the Rural Mail Delivery Service."

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment. Was that language suggested by the Postmaster General?

Mr. MEAD. No; it was not suggested, but the committee considered the amendment in section 4 that no rural route should be extended in excess of 60 miles. We thought that

was too drastic, and so we continue the present law. That is, we permit consolidations as a result of retirement, resignation, death, or removal from the Service.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Under the Economy Act and the law as it is today, the President acting through the Postmaster General, by Executive order can order consolidations whenever he thinks it is feasible without waiting for death of one in the Service or his resignation or retirement if it be found that adequate delivery service can be given by consolidation of two short routes at a saving to the taxpayers; the Postmaster General can now consolidate. This language would not permit that to be done. Is not that true?

Mr. MEAD. Only as specified in the amendment.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Those occasions may not arise.

Mr. MEAD. They are arising.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Other than death, resignation, or retirement?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; dismissal, or discharge for cause.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The point I make is that occasion may arise when the Postmaster General may find it proper, at a saving to the Treasury, to consolidate two or more short routes, but he will not be permitted to do so if this language is carried in the bill.

Mr. MEAD. He is not doing it now, and no other Postmaster General has ever done so in the way the gentleman would permit. They are effecting consolidations when such occasions arise, and this bill will not prevent a deviation from present policy. Consolidations are being effected at the rate of from 75 to 100 a week, and routes are being extended until I doubt very much whether they can continue these consolidations for any great length of time. I believe we will have finished consolidations within the next few years. There is ample authority to create all the necessary consolidations in this amendment.

Mr. McDUFFIE. But it is based only upon death, resignation, or retirement. Those are the only conditions under which a consolidation may occur. Is not that correct?

Mr. MEAD. That is the existing policy.

Mr. McDUFFIE. It may be the existing policy, but suppose the Postmaster General found that certain routes should be consolidated, we will say two 20-mile routes; he may find such a thing is necessary and not hurtful to the Service. I am not an expert, but you prevent that under this committee amendment. I am trying to prevent the tying of the hands of the Postmaster General, so that he may not be able to act in the interest of the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. MEAD. In that case the Postmaster General would consolidate those two routes. He would effect that consolidation by a separation from the Service of a rural carrier on some other route, and so he can effect all the consolidations he wishes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The gentleman means that he will take a carrier from one of these routes and send him over to another route where there has been a retirement or a resignation or death.

Mr. MEAD. And that is just what he is doing now. That is the only way in which he can eliminate these short routes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Why hedge him about with this language?

Mr. MEAD. We are doing no more than the Postmaster General is doing himself.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I think if he had wanted this done he would have suggested it.

Mr. MEAD. We are the legislative committee and the Postmaster has not requested such authority.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I represent a progressive farming district in Indiana. The farmers of that country have been served with prompt and efficient rural-mail service for 25 to 30 years. They have adapted their business and occupations to that service. They have come to expect and rely upon receiving their mail at an early hour in the day.

But under this proposed reorganization of the Service and consolidation of routes, many of these farmers are and will be thrown off the mail route from a quarter to a full mile.

Where the reorganization and consolidation has already gone into effect, many of the farmers have taken down their mail boxes rather than leave their mail exposed at some distant highway corner where delivered and are renting a box in the post office and going back for their mail, where they received their mail before the rural-route service was inaugurated.

I could understand this policy better, coming from the other side of the House, where greater attention has always been given to industry, and the interests of the people of the towns and cities have always been favored over the farm population.

But this side has always stood for the farm population and for the farmer against the impositions of high tariffs under which the farmers have been compelled to buy high and sell low.

This reversed position of the majority here puts the Members on this side at great disadvantage in their claim for equal rights and equal consideration of the farm population under the administration of public affairs. We can defy our enemies, but God only can save us from our fool friends. [Applause.]

I confess I am greatly confused and embarrassed by this uncalled-for policy of legislation, with the farmers still left to pay high prices for equipment and supplies, and before there is a proper rise of values and prices for their grain, crops, and stock. And now, with the administration withdrawing their only remaining consolation, the rural mail service, in the name of economy, I am constrained to exclaim in the words uttered by King Solomon when he was growing old and failing in his powers to meet the obligations of life, "All is vanity and vexation of spirit." [Laughter.]

The farmers today want to receive their mail at the noon hour and have their papers and letters before them at the midday meal the same as the town and city patrons want their mail and daily papers at the breakfast table. Where this consolidation has been carried out the farmers are greatly dissatisfied and discommoded with the service afforded. In many localities they are in a state of revolt and demanding a restoration of the service.

I am opposed to the policy of increasing salaries, cutting down the service, throwing men out of employment, lengthening the routes, and depriving the farmers of proper and convenient mail service only to effect trivial economy. This is not justifiable economy; it is false economy. It is not only an injury to the farmers but it is a policy in conflict with any principle of the recovery program.

The shorter routes not only afford the patrons earlier service and more regular, reliable, and prompt deliveries but I have made inquiries among the hundreds of men seeking rural-carrier positions and I find the majority would prefer a shorter route at half or less salary, which would leave them with the greater part of the day to devote to work for themselves or otherwise. This would afford both employment to a greater number and better and more prompt and reliable service to the patrons without greater cost to the Government.

The counties of my district include many highly developed and well-organized country communities. The town and the surrounding country form such communities, of which the town is the business and social center and the general meeting and assembling place of the people. In most, if not all, of these towns, well-regulated stores, a bank or banks, and other business institutions have been established. Modern high-school buildings, churches, theaters, or lecture halls have been erected, and physicians and other professional men have located there in response to the needs and wants of the people.

The town post office, long established, and the rural-route service have become a part of the community organization. Here the farmers come to market and ship their products, do their banking, and to purchase supplies to meet their daily needs. Here all the children of the nearby country come to attend school, and from greater distances come the more advanced students to graduate in the higher branches of education. Here the people come to attend

their clubs, churches, lodge sessions, lecture courses, and various gatherings and entertainments.

Farmers or members of their families driving into town in the afternoon or evening on business or to attend club meetings or social entertainments and school children and high-school students from the country call at the post office to receive the afternoon or late mail; and farmers often drive in from the country to receive important mail matter arriving too late for delivery by the carrier, and which it is necessary for them to have in time for some important business transaction.

In these agricultural community centers telephone exchanges have been established, and telephone service has been extended over the country coextensive with the territory covered by the rural routes running out from their respective towns. Country patrons order many articles of merchandise to be delivered to them by parcel post, and town residents likewise take advantage to receive their food products from the country by the carriers on their return trips. Physicians respond to phone calls from their patients and send out their medicine by the rural carriers. The telephone and the carrier service have become joined as one coordinate system of local communication and transportation in general and universal use.

But this long route service deprives the people of all these advantages and conveniences, and places their mail beyond their reach in a far-distant town or city to which they never go and in which none of their interests are located, neither business nor social.

The free-delivery service of two or more daily deliveries of mail to the people of the towns and cities is not to be curtailed under this economy program. This service is in no way to be affected or impaired. The economy to be brought about and the service to be reduced is only to apply to the isolated rural population and to leave the farmer's mail long delayed and in some cases to arrive only late in the afternoon, and in bad weather even nearing the nighttime.

If the town and city free-delivery service was to be equally cut down and reduced to 1 delivery instead of 2 and if the same strenuous economy was to be observed in other departments of the public service, this proposition for economy at the expense of the rural population might come with better grace.

I am in favor of economy, but I am opposed to the impairment of the rural mail service as a means to effect economy and solely at the expense and at the sacrifice of the rural population. Reducing the cost at the expense of regular, reliable, and prompt service is not economy. It is a false system of cost reduction. Economy is maintaining efficient service while reducing expense and cost of operation or maintaining greater efficiency in the Service at the same cost. If mere cost reduction is economy, then greater economy would be effected by triweekly service, and still greater economy by a discontinuance of the Service altogether.

Reducing the number of carriers and increasing the salaries of those remaining, where a superior service can be secured by maintaining the full number of employees at the same cost to the Government, is not only a false economy but is a wrong policy of public employment at this time, when 10,000,000 remain unemployed.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. As a matter of fact, under the N.R.A. private employers are being urged to increase the number of their employees and to increase wages, are they not?

Mr. GRAY. I think that is the policy being urged under the N.R.A. program. I would rather see more men put on the routes than more men taken off, because that would increase employment and mean better and more prompt and efficient service to the farmers. But I would not want to increase the pay provided for in the Rural Route Service until there is a restoration of employment and an increase of pay to private employees. There is no reason why public employees, with a fixed and fair wage and with uninterrupted employment, should be favored over private employees.

Ten million men remain unemployed and strenuous efforts are being made to spread employment to a greater number of men. Economy is the watchword. The isolated farmers are suffering not only neglect but discrimination against them. Under these conditions it is difficult to understand this demand to increase the salaries of the few, consolidate the routes, and throw public employees out of employment, and at the same time compel the farm population to suffer an impairment of its mail service. This proposition is urged upon the country with a strange consistency at this time.

The so-called "economy" resulting would be trivial and negligible in comparison with the decrease of employment suffered and the great damage and injury brought upon the farm population.

But I am not advocating a change at this time in the Rural Route Service, except sufficient change to give better and give equal mail service to the farmers with the service provided for the patrons in towns and cities. But if I were making a change to meet the conditions of the times to effect economy and bring about an increase of employment to a greater number of men and afford more equal mail service, then it would be made under N.R.A. principles of employment. Then, I would say, until there is relief from this panic, divide the salaries, put two men on the routes instead of one and give the farmer his morning paper at breakfast time the same as enjoyed by the people of the towns and cities, put more men to useful service and take them off the relief roles. But I am not urging such change here. I am only opposing a change at this time that will reduce employment, work injury and damage to the farmer without a substantial saving. The farmers are satisfied with the existing service; they are asking the Postal Department to let well enough alone.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. This act shall take effect on April 15, 1934.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 23, strike out the figure "5" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "4."

Page 3, line 23, strike out "April 15, 1934", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the 1st day of the calendar month next following the month in which this act is enacted."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. WEST of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8919) to adjust the salaries of rural letter carriers, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 355, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN URGENT NEEDS IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 332, to provide appropriations to meet urgent needs in certain public services, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 332

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purposes hereinafter enumerated:

LEGISLATIVE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For expenses of special and select committees authorized by the House, fiscal year 1934, \$35,000.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

PUBLIC DEBT SERVICE

The limitation on the price per pound permitted to be paid for distinctive paper for United States securities under the appropriation for the purchase of such paper in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1935, is hereby repealed.

PROCUREMENT DIVISION

Washington, D.C., furniture for triangle buildings: The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to expend not to exceed the sum of \$472,454 out of the aggregate of the unexpended balances under the authorizations for the construction of the new buildings for the Departments of Justice, Post Office, and Labor, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, the connecting wing between the Interstate Commerce Commission and Department of Labor Buildings, and the Archives Building as may be required to provide the necessary furniture and furnishings for said buildings, and the unexpended portion of the appropriations available for the construction of such buildings is hereby made available for that purpose, and the Director of Procurement, Treasury Department, is hereby authorized to make contracts, after advertising and competitive bidding, without regard to section 4 of the act approved June 17, 1910 (ch. 297, sec. 4, 36 Stat. 531), for the purchase of said furniture and furnishings, and to make expenditures for services, supplies, material, and equipment, including moving services and the reconditioning of old furniture and the temporary rental of space therefor, and necessary travel and subsistence in connection with the inspection of commodities to be contracted for or purchased; and, when deemed desirable or advantageous by him, the said Director of Procurement is authorized to employ, by contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations, such temporary outside professional or technical services as he may find necessary in furnishing those portions of the said buildings requiring special treatment, all within the total amount made available herein: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for such temporary outside professional or technical services: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$31,515 may be expended for furniture and furnishings for the auditorium located in the connecting wing between the Interstate Commerce Commission and Department of Labor Buildings: *Provided further*, That the cost of furniture and furnishings for Cabinet officers' suites, assistant Cabinet officers' suites, executive officers' suites, and conference and hearing rooms for the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be based upon the square-foot area of the rooms to be furnished, and shall not exceed the rates set forth herein, as follows: For Cabinet officers' suites and conference rooms for the Interstate Commerce Commission, \$1.75 per square foot; for assistant Cabinet officers' suites, \$1.50 per square foot, and for executive officers' suites, \$1 per square foot.

WAR DEPARTMENT

PANAMA CANAL

For repatriation of unemployed aliens who have been employed in the service of the United States Government or the Panama Railroad Co. on the Isthmus of Panama for 3 or more years at any time, and repatriation of members of families of such alien former employees, including expenses of transportation of such alien former employees and members of their families, and the payment in cash of not to exceed \$100 to each such alien former employee for assistance in rehabilitation after repatriation, \$150,000, to be expended under the direction of the Governor of the Panama Canal and to be available until expended.

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

There was no objection.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

[Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. SABATH, Mr. McDUFFIE and Mr. PATMAN asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.]

PROPOSED TEXTBOOK CODE, IF ADOPTED, WILL ADD MILLIONS TO COST OF EDUCATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution, same being House Resolution 351, asking for the appointment of a committee to investigate the proposed code for the school textbook industry. I feel that this is an important matter and fear that steps may be taken that will increase by many millions of dollars the annual outlay for books that our school patrons must buy. Every school child in America, whether in private, parochial, or public schools, is affected by the price of textbooks. Every teacher is affected. Every parent who buys textbooks is affected. I would not want to see any step taken that would add unnecessary burdens to our school children, teachers, and school patrons.

I have loyally supported the National Recovery Administration and was one of those who voted for the National Industrial Recovery Act. I have addressed civic clubs and organizations in practically every town in my district, calling upon business men to support the N.R.A. and urging the cooperation of citizens in eliminating the chiselers. The N.R.A. is not so important in the district represented by me in Congress as it is in the Eastern States, since my district is principally an agricultural section. In fact, the N.R.A. has worked a hardship on many small business men of Oklahoma, yet I have urged that the spirit and letter of the National Industrial Recovery Act be complied with to the fullest by citizens of my State.

But I also believe in State rights, and I do not believe we should take any action here, or permit action to be taken, that would impair or threaten to impair contracts entered into by our States for the protection of the school-book buying public. I feel that this matter should be gone into carefully before any definite action is taken.

Permit me to cite a few facts for consideration in connection with any proposal affecting textbooks.

By reason of the practices that have existed in the school-book industry, practically every State in the Union has laws for the protection of the consumer.

Textbook publishing companies are, practically without exception, organizations that employ teachers to write their textbooks, paying the authors small royalties on sales, and that employ commercial printing establishments to print their books.

Wage earners engaged in actual composition and printing of textbooks are all protected under codes for the various phases of the printing industry.

All employees of the textbook publishers are now protected as to hours and wages under the general provisions of the N.R.A.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the textbook publishers have sought to advance their own selfish interests at the expense of the consumers for more than a quarter of a century and I want to be assured that the proposed code is not another effort to advance the selfish interests of the textbook publishers and hide behind the protection of the Federal Government in so doing.

The proposed code appears to me to be merely an effort to take advantage of a national emergency to entrench the textbook publishers still further with the backing of Federal authority.

The State governments are coordinated with the Federal Government. They have never been in such financial difficulty as at present. Delinquent taxes, reduction in tax rates and tax strikes have threatened to close most of the public schools of this country. I feel that the schools are entitled to look to the Federal Government for financial aid in the present emergency and early in this session introduced legislation to provide for an annual Federal appropriation to aid our weak schools.

But so far the Federal Government, although giving temporary help to the public schools, has failed and refused to provide for a permanent program for schools that are financially unable to remain open a full term. In my judgment the very least the Government could do at this time would be to reduce rather than materially increase the cost of textbooks that are now in the making if the present textbook code is allowed to stand.

I see no reason why the Federal Government should interest itself in or lend sanction to a code which clearly has for its purpose the increasing of prices on this universally used product. If there must be a textbook code, I feel that it should be confined strictly to wages and hours and the necessary machinery to enforce such provisions without any effort, veiled or implied, to eliminate competitive bidding. The school patrons certainly should not be called upon in their distressed financial condition to add to the profits of the textbook trust. Nor should it be made easy for the publishers to evade, under the protection of the Federal Government, the laws of the various States.

WAGES IN FEDERAL BUILDINGS

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks by including therein a newspaper article and certain letters.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to your attention a set of circumstances which carry alarming possibilities. First let me place before you an article which appeared in the Washington Herald of this morning:

WAGES RACKET MENACES UNITED STATES BUILDING HERE—CARPENTERS' UNION VOTES 5 TO 1 FOR RESTORATION OF \$11 RATE—CONTRACTORS' OFFER SPURNED

The entire Federal building program in this city, involving \$100,000,000 in massive Government buildings, faces a sudden halt unless contractors are made to return the \$500,000 wage steal, the local carpenters gave notice last night.

Charging that the present rate of \$8 a day paid to union men was illegally adopted and has robbed workmen of half a million dollars, the membership of the union demanded, by an overwhelming vote of 5 to 1, that the \$11 rate (on the 8-hour day) be restored.

The contractors offered a compromise of \$8.80 a day but this met with a crushing defeat, 828 to 156.

CONTRACT NEAR END

Only 4 more days remain until the present contract expires. Unless an agreement can be reached by May 1, union officials declared they will be forced to call a strike.

More than 1,000 members of the local carpenters' union fought for admission into Carpenters Hall, 1010 Tenth Street, last night, to attend the special meeting called to decide on the terms of the wage contract which will be drawn between the union and the Master Builders' Association, representing the employers.

Two propositions were presented to the meeting. One came from the Master Builders' Association. It offered an 8-hour day, 5-day week with a rate of \$1.10 an hour.

The other, which the union adopted, calls for a 6-hour day, 5-day week, with a rate of \$1.37½ an hour. This is the rate at which the Government contracts were let and at which the carpenters were originally hired.

HERALD WORK LAUDED

Subsequently the rate was reduced. The union claimed this act was illegal because it was never accepted by a vote of the membership. It is charged that workmen have been robbed of \$500,000 during the last year through the illegal reduction in wages.

Last night Albert Caya, business agent for the union, and J. B. Lagasa, who has been working with Caya to bring about a restoration of the wage scale, spoke in favor of the \$11 rate. Lagasa said:

"We are making splendid progress toward having our rightful wage rate restored. The \$1.37½ rate is not a raise. It is the rate that was in force on all Government work prior to last year, when the present illegal contract went into effect.

"It has been ruled to be the prevailing wage on two occasions by the United States Treasury Department. Congress is now interested in finding out how we have been deprived of the money which the Government paid to the contractors for us. The Washington Herald has done a wonderful job in bringing the facts to light. I hope you will vote for the \$1.37½-an-hour rate, as I am going to."

"TO HELL" WITH THEM

The hall resounded with cheers for several minutes after Caya and Lagasa sat down. Immediately after the membership voted the \$1.37½ rate by a landslide.

The 6-hour day stipulation will fix the daily rate at \$8.25. This is less than the daily rate of \$8.80 now offered by the contractors. It would mean that several hundred more carpenters would have to be employed to keep up production schedule.

Frank J. Sheehan, secretary of the Master Builders' Association, when informed that the union had rejected the contractors' offer, replied:

"If they want to reject it, to hell with them."

Let me place particular emphasis upon the last paragraph of that article. After reporting that the union carpenters of the District of Columbia had voted to reject a wage compromise with the Master Builders' Association, the article says in this last paragraph:

Frank J. Sheehan, secretary of the Master Builders' Association, when informed that the union had rejected the contractors' offer, replied:

"If they want to reject it, to hell with them."

The money to pay the wages under discussion, Mr. Speaker, is not the money of Mr. Sheehan nor of the Master Builders' Association. It is the public money of the American people, appropriated by the Congress, and allotted by

the Executive for the primary purpose, not of fattening contractors but of giving payment to skilled craftsmen for the work they do with their hands and brains. That makes the affair the business of this House.

I read that statement of Mr. Sheehan's with astonishment. I made inquiries to discover who this Mr. Sheehan is, who so casually says that workmen employed on work paid for by the United States Government can take what he and his associates choose to give them or else—and I am quoting Mr. Sheehan—"To 'hell' with them."

I found out a little about Mr. Sheehan. My time was short and so the findings are not yet extensive. Perhaps they will grow with time. But, short as they are, they are of considerable interest.

First, I call your attention to an extract from a letter written by G. Clark Macomber, of the George B. H. Macomber Co., of Boston, Mass., and addressed to Mr. R. D. Morrison, post-office box no. 283, Benjamin Franklin Post Office, Washington, D.C. This extract reads as follows:

I further understand that you have agreed that we would contribute to the Washington Building Trades Employers' Association the sum of \$500 to be paid in installments, an initial installment of \$100 which you can pay from petty cash during the coming week, and the balance to be paid during the life of the B-W job as may work out most conveniently for us. Please make certain that the dollar-an-hour rate for carpenters is in effect before making any contribution to the employers' association.

Let me say that the prevailing rate of wages in Washington to be paid to carpenters under the Bacon-Davis Act was and is \$1.37½ per hour.

Now I quote another letter in which a demand is made for the payment of this contribution to what may turn out to have been a slush fund.

GEORGE A. FULLER Co.,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1933.

GEORGE B. H. MACOMBER Co.,
Care of McCloskey Co., Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Will you kindly forward to the writer your check made out to the Master Builders' Association, in amount agreed upon as promptly as possible.

The writer has received several calls from the secretary of the association regarding this matter and it is getting to be rather embarrassing inasmuch as the master builders fulfilled their part of the agreement 2 weeks ago.

Trusting you will give this your immediate attention, I am,
Very truly yours,

J. B. BOWLING, Jr.

The secretary of the association wanted his money. Who was this secretary? The next letter will tell us.

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 20, 1933.

Re: B-W Construction Co.,
Washington post-office extension.

Mr. C. CLARK MACOMBER,
George B. H. Macomber Co., Boston, Mass.

DEAR CLARK: Joe Bowling, of Littlejohn, Bowling & Morris, and Frank Sheehan, secretary of the Master Builders Association, were on the job today asking me for the balance due for our contribution toward the reduction in carpenters' rate. They seem to think they have waited long enough for us to realize a saving and want to get the matter cleaned up.

You will remember some time ago I made them a payment of \$100 from the petty cash account and they are now looking for the balance. I told them I would write to you regarding the situation and I think you might reply directly to Frank J. Sheehan, secretary, Master Builders Association, 1719 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Sincerely,

RALPH D. MORRISON.

Now let me add another interesting letter about Mr. Sheehan. Everything seems to be getting along all right. The contractors are making money, even if the carpenters are not. Mr. Sheehan is to have some of his money, but only a part of it. The rest will have to wait until Mr. Macomber could get it out of Uncle Sam.

GEORGE B. H. MACOMBER Co., BUILDERS,
CHARLES CHAUNCY BUILDING,
Boston, Mass., July 21, 1933.

Re: B-W Construction Co.,
Washington post-office extension.

Mr. R. D. MORRISON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MORRISON: I have your note relative to Mr. Sheehan and Joe Bowling, relative to the Building Trades Association. Mr. Sheehan called me on the telephone after he left you. I told him that I would at this time send him a small remittance that

would follow with the balance as soon as we could get it out of the B-W job.

I have not had any comments from any of you three men on the job relative to the communications which I sent to you on Tuesday. I am assuming, therefore, that everything is coordinating properly and that you are working together to accomplish the objectives as we set them forth on Monday and as I confirmed them to you in my Tuesday communications.

Yours very truly,

C. C. MACOMBER.

That is as much as I can tell you today about Mr. Sheehan, who says "to hell with them" in speaking of workmen.

RURAL LETTER CARRIERS—EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all those who spoke on the rural letter carriers' bill may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission granted by the House yesterday during the discussion of the bill to adjust the salaries of rural letter carriers, I desire to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD information pertaining to these carriers which may be of interest to the Members of the House.

RURAL ROUTES

There is no limitation upon length of routes.

The shortest route at present is 7.6 miles, at West Englewood, N.J.

Longest routes are at Brawley, Calif., and Brewster, Ala., each 91 miles.

All persons, except those who reside within the city-delivery limits of cities where city-delivery service is in operation, or within the village-delivery limits of cities, towns, or villages where village-delivery service is in operation, may be served by rural carriers, provided they will erect approved boxes on the established line of the routes in the manner required by the Department.

Roads on which rural-delivery service is established shall be in good condition and so maintained, unobstructed by gates, and there shall be no unbridged streams not fordable at all seasons of the year.

The frequency of service on a newly established route shall not exceed three times a week, unless such route is formed wholly or in greater part by rearrangement of six-times-a-week service.

Rural mail delivery shall be extended so as to serve, as nearly as practicable, the entire rural population of the United States.

Number of rural delivery carriers under each salary, Mar. 1, 1933

Salary	Number of carriers
\$3,810	2
\$3,720	1
\$3,690	2
\$3,660	2
\$3,630	4
\$3,600	1
\$3,570	2
\$3,540	3
\$3,510	2
\$3,480	10
\$3,450	7
\$3,420	6
\$3,390	5
\$3,360	19
\$3,330	13
\$3,300	16
\$3,270	25
\$3,240	20
\$3,210	39
\$3,180	38
\$3,150	33
\$3,120	47
\$3,090	56
\$3,060	68
\$3,030	73
\$3,000	83
\$2,970	125
\$2,940	149
\$2,910	162
\$2,880	154
\$2,850	203
\$2,820	202
\$2,790	251
\$2,760	275
\$2,730	300
\$2,700	317
\$2,670	332
\$2,640	337
\$2,610	11
\$2,600	361
\$2,580	403
\$2,550	439
\$2,520	451
\$2,490	493
\$2,460	

Number of rural delivery carriers under each salary, Mar. 1, 1933—Continued

Salary	Number of carriers
\$2,430	[1] 487
\$2,400	[1] 585
\$2,370	[1] 640
\$2,340	[1] 627
\$2,310	[1] 722
\$2,280	[1] 752
\$2,250	[1] 808
\$2,220	[2] 852
\$2,190	[3] 918
\$2,175	(1) 1
\$2,160	(2) [1] 1077
\$2,145	
\$2,130	[4] 1102
\$2,115	(2) 2
\$2,100	[2] 1231
\$2,085	(1) 1
\$2,070	(1) [6] 1,377
\$2,055	(3) 3
\$2,040	(1) [7] 1,653
\$2,025	(2) 2
\$2,010	(2) [5] 1,887
\$1,995	(1) 1
\$1,980	(1) [5] 2,439
\$1,965	
\$1,950	(1) [8] 2,680
\$1,935	(1) 1
\$1,920	(2) [6] 2,905
\$1,905	(2) 2
\$1,890	[2] 2,676
\$1,875	(2) 2
\$1,860	(2) [7] 2,462
\$1,845	(2) 2
\$1,830	(2) [4] 2,284
\$1,815	(2) 2
\$1,800	(1) [1] 1,101
\$1,785	(16) [4] 1,544
\$1,770	(25) [3] 832
\$1,755	(37) 379
\$1,740	(85) 250
\$1,725	(112) 198
\$1,710	(105) 145
\$1,695	(83) 101
\$1,680	(36) 89
\$1,665	(13) 15
\$1,650	(2) 2
Total	40,329

Figures in parentheses indicate number of rural letter carriers serving one triweekly route.

Figures in black brackets indicate number of rural letter carriers serving two triweekly routes.

Triweekly routes

Miles:	Number
9	1
11	1
12	1
13	1
14	4
15	6
16	4
17	8
18	13
19	8
20	21
21	13
22	18
23	24
24	17
25	25
26	27
27	21
28	30
29	28
30	26
31	24
32	19
33	27
34	20
35	20
36	16
37	8
38	11
39	6
40	4
41	6
42	7
43	6
44	6
45	4
46	2
47	4
48	4

Triweekly routes—Continued

Miles:	Number
49	2
50	2
51	2
52	2
53	2
55	2
56	2
57	1
58	1
60	1
61	1
62	3
63	2
64	1
65	3
66	1
67	1
69	2
72	2
73	1

Total number of all rural carriers as of Apr. 1, 37,597.
Daily travel is 1,356,475 miles.

Triweekly routes

Two routes served by one carrier.
Where there are two routes, having a total length of 82 miles, both served by one carrier, he would be paid the salary for one daily route of 41 miles.

Miles (average length):	Number
41	2
42	1
20½	4
21	2
22	2
23	4
24	2
24½	2
25	2
25½	4
26	8
26½	8
27	2
27½	6
28	6
23½	4
29	8
29½	2
30	8
30½	8
31	4
31½	2
32	8
32½	10
33	4
33½	2
34	4
35	6
35½	2
36	2
36½	4
37	2
37½	2
38	2
39	2
40	2
41	2
42½	4
44½	2
45	2
47½	2
55	2
56½	2
58	2
59½	2
60	2
60½	2
61	2
61½	2
62	2
64½	2
66	2
73	2

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, April 26, 1934.

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
Chairman Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads,
House of Representatives.
MY DEAR MR. MEAD: Further reference is made to your letter of April 18, enclosing a copy of bill H.R. 8919 to adjust the salaries

of rural letter carriers, and requesting certain information pertaining to the rural service for consideration in connection with the measure.

If legislation were enacted limiting the lengths of rural routes hereafter to 60 miles, it would frequently be impracticable for the Department to effect consolidations of rural routes, but no estimate can be made as to the extent to which reduction of the cost of operating the service would thereby be prevented.

If the equipment-maintenance allowance to rural carriers were fixed at 5 cents per mile per day instead of 6 cents, as proposed in bill H.R. 8919, the difference in cost would be approximately \$4,150,000 per annum.

A statement is enclosed showing the amounts of salaries as well as the amounts of salaries with equipment-maintenance allowances, for service over rural routes of different lengths, which are authorized by existing law and those which would be authorized by proposed legislation now under consideration in Congress.

There are approximately 500 rural routes from 7 to 19 miles in length. Only 86 of these are less than 15 miles in length. These rural routes are operated where the territory is limited in which the condition of roads and the number of families that would be served would warrant extending the routes to greater lengths. It will no doubt be practicable to absorb some of these short routes through consolidations of service, but many of them will have to be continued because there are no adjacent routes with which they can be combined. No definite information can be given as to how many of them can be eliminated through consolidations.

The chart enclosed by you is returned as requested.

Sincerely yours,

HARLEE BRANCH,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

[Enclosure]

Statement showing present and proposed salaries and equipment-maintenance allowance for Rural Delivery Service

Miles	Present		Proposed		
	Salary	Salary plus equipment maintenance at 4 cents	Salary	Salary plus equipment maintenance at 5 cents	Salary plus equipment maintenance at 6 cents
6 and not over 6.5	\$792	\$865.44	\$360	\$451.80	\$470.16
Over 6.5 and not over 7.5	792	877.68	420	527.10	548.52
Over 7.5 and less than 8	792	889.92	480	602.40	626.88
8 and not over 8.5	864	961.92	480	602.40	626.88
Over 8.5 and not over 9.5	864	974.16	540	677.70	705.24
Over 9.5 and less than 10	864	986.40	600	753.00	783.60
10 and not over 10.5	936	1,058.40	600	753.00	783.60
Over 10.5 and not over 11.5	936	1,070.64	660	828.30	861.96
Over 11.5 and less than 12	936	1,082.88	720	903.60	940.32
12 and not over 12.5	1,008	1,154.88	720	903.60	940.32
Over 12.5 and not over 13.5	1,008	1,167.12	780	978.90	1,018.68
Over 13.5 and less than 14	1,008	1,179.36	840	1,054.20	1,097.04
14 and not over 14.5	1,080	1,251.36	840	1,054.20	1,097.04
Over 14.5 and not over 15.5	1,080	1,263.60	900	1,129.50	1,175.40
Over 15.5 and less than 16	1,080	1,275.84	960	1,204.80	1,253.76
16 and not over 16.5	1,260	1,455.84	960	1,204.80	1,253.76
Over 16.5 and not over 17.5	1,260	1,468.08	1,020	1,280.10	1,332.12
Over 17.5 and less than 18	1,260	1,480.32	1,080	1,355.40	1,410.48
18 and not over 18.5	1,440	1,660.32	1,080	1,355.40	1,410.48
Over 18.5 and not over 19.5	1,440	1,672.56	1,140	1,430.70	1,488.84
Over 19.5 and less than 20	1,440	1,684.80	1,200	1,506.00	1,567.20
20 and not over 20.5	1,620	1,864.80	1,200	1,506.00	1,567.20
Over 20.5 and not over 21.5	1,620	1,877.04	1,260	1,581.30	1,645.56
Over 21.5 and less than 22	1,620	1,889.28	1,320	1,656.60	1,723.92
22 and not over 22.5	1,728	1,997.28	1,320	1,656.60	1,723.92
Over 22.5 and not over 23.5	1,728	2,009.52	1,380	1,731.90	1,802.28
Over 23.5 and less than 24	1,728	2,021.76	1,440	1,807.20	1,880.64
24 and not over 24.5	1,800	2,093.76	1,440	1,807.20	1,880.64
Over 24.5 and not over 25.5	1,830	2,136.00	1,500	1,882.50	1,959.00
Over 25.5 and not over 26.5	1,860	2,178.24	1,560	1,957.80	2,037.36
Over 26.5 and not over 27.5	1,890	2,220.48	1,620	2,033.10	2,115.72
Over 27.5 and not over 28.5	1,920	2,262.72	1,680	2,108.40	2,194.08
Over 28.5 and not over 29.5	1,950	2,304.96	1,740	2,183.70	2,272.44
Over 29.5 and not over 30.5	1,980	2,347.20	1,800	2,259.00	2,350.80
Over 30.5 and not over 31.5	2,010	2,389.44	1,820	2,294.30	2,389.16
Over 31.5 and not over 32.5	2,040	2,431.68	1,840	2,329.60	2,427.52
Over 32.5 and not over 33.5	2,070	2,473.92	1,860	2,364.90	2,465.88
Over 33.5 and not over 34.5	2,100	2,516.16	1,880	2,400.20	2,504.24
Over 34.5 and not over 35.5	2,130	2,558.40	1,900	2,435.50	2,542.60
Over 35.5 and not over 36.5	2,160	2,600.64	1,920	2,470.80	2,580.96
Over 36.5 and not over 37.5	2,190	2,642.88	1,940	2,506.10	2,619.32
Over 37.5 and not over 38.5	2,220	2,685.12	1,960	2,541.40	2,657.68
Over 38.5 and not over 39.5	2,250	2,727.36	1,980	2,576.70	2,696.04
Over 39.5 and not over 40.5	2,280	2,769.60	2,000	2,612.00	2,734.40
Over 40.5 and not over 41.5	2,310	2,811.84	2,020	2,647.30	2,772.76
Over 41.5 and not over 42.5	2,340	2,854.08	2,040	2,682.60	2,811.12
Over 42.5 and not over 43.5	2,370	2,896.32	2,060	2,717.90	2,849.48
Over 43.5 and not over 44.5	2,400	2,938.56	2,080	2,753.20	2,887.84
Over 44.5 and not over 45.5	2,430	2,980.80	2,100	2,788.50	2,926.20
Over 45.5 and not over 46.5	2,460	3,023.04	2,120	2,823.80	2,964.56
Over 46.5 and not over 47.5	2,490	3,065.28	2,140	2,859.10	3,002.92
Over 47.5 and not over 48.5	2,520	3,107.52	2,160	2,894.40	3,041.28
Over 48.5 and not over 49.5	2,550	3,149.76	2,180	2,929.70	3,079.64
Over 49.5 and not over 50.5	2,580	3,192.00	2,200	2,965.00	3,118.00
Over 50.5 and not over 51.5	2,610	3,234.24	2,220	3,000.30	3,156.36
Over 51.5 and not over 52.5	2,640	3,276.48	2,240	3,035.60	3,194.72
Over 52.5 and not over 53.5	2,670	3,318.72	2,260	3,070.90	3,233.08
Over 53.5 and not over 54.5	2,700	3,360.96	2,280	3,106.20	3,271.44
Over 54.5 and not over 55.5	2,730	3,403.20	2,300	3,141.50	3,309.80

Statement showing present and proposed salaries and equipment-maintenance allowance for Rural Delivery Service—Continued

Miles	Present		Proposed		
	Salary	Salary plus equipment maintenance at 4 cents	Salary	Salary plus equipment maintenance at 5 cents	Salary plus equipment maintenance at 6 cents
Over 55.5 and not over 56.5	\$2,760	\$3,445.44	\$2,320	\$3,176.80	\$3,348.16
Over 56.5 and not over 57.5	2,790	3,487.68	2,340	3,212.10	3,386.52
Over 57.5 and not over 58.5	2,820	3,529.92	2,360	3,247.40	3,424.88
Over 58.5 and not over 59.5	2,850	3,572.16	2,380	3,282.70	3,463.24
Over 59.5 and not over 60.5	2,880	3,614.40	2,400	3,318.00	3,501.60
Over 60.5 and not over 61.5	2,910	3,656.64	2,420	3,353.30	3,539.96
Over 61.5 and not over 62.5	2,940	3,698.88	2,440	3,388.60	3,578.32
Over 62.5 and not over 63.5	2,970	3,741.12	2,460	3,423.90	3,616.68
Over 63.5 and not over 64.5	3,000	3,783.36	2,480	3,459.20	3,655.04
Over 64.5 and not over 65.5	3,030	3,825.60	2,500	3,494.50	3,693.40
Over 65.5 and not over 66.5	3,060	3,867.84	2,520	3,529.80	3,731.76
Over 66.5 and not over 67.5	3,090	3,910.08	2,540	3,565.10	3,770.12
Over 67.5 and not over 68.5	3,120	3,952.32	2,560	3,600.40	3,808.48
Over 68.5 and not over 69.5	3,150	3,994.56	2,580	3,635.70	3,846.84
Over 69.5 and not over 70.5	3,180	4,036.80	2,600	3,671.00	3,885.20
Over 70.5 and not over 71.5	3,210	4,079.04	2,620	3,706.30	3,923.56
Over 71.5 and not over 72.5	3,240	4,121.28	2,640	3,741.60	3,961.92
Over 72.5 and not over 73.5	3,270	4,163.52	2,660	3,776.90	4,000.28
Over 73.5 and not over 74.5	3,300	4,205.76	2,680	3,812.20	4,038.64
Over 74.5 and not over 75.5	3,330	4,248.00	2,700	3,847.50	4,077.00
Over 75.5 and not over 76.5	3,360	4,290.24	2,720	3,882.80	4,115.36
Over 76.5 and not over 77.5	3,390	4,332.48	2,740	3,918.10	4,153.72
Over 77.5 and not over 78.5	3,420	4,374.72	2,760	3,953.40	4,192.08
Over 78.5 and not over 79.5	3,450	4,416.96	2,780	3,988.70	4,230.44
Over 79.5 and not over 80.5	3,480	4,459.20	2,800	4,024.00	4,268.80
Over 80.5 and not over 81.5	3,510	4,501.44	2,820	4,059.30	4,307.16
Over 81.5 and not over 82.5	3,540	4,543.68	2,840	4,094.60	4,345.52
Over 82.5 and not over 83.5	3,570	4,585.92	2,860	4,129.90	4,383.88
Over 83.5 and not over 84.5	3,600	4,628.16	2,880	4,165.20	4,422.24
Over 84.5 and not over 85.5	3,630	4,670.40	2,900	4,200.50	4,460.60
Over 85.5 and not over 86.5	3,660	4,712.64	2,920	4,235.80	4,498.96
Over 86.5 and not over 87.5	3,690	4,754.88	2,940	4,271.10	4,537.32
Over 87.5 and not over 88.5	3,720	4,797.12	2,960	4,306.40	4,575.68
Over 88.5 and not over 89.5	3,750	4,839.36	2,980	4,341.70	4,614.04
Over 89.5 and not over 90.5	3,780	4,881.60	3,000	4,377.00	4,652.40
Over 90.5 and not over 91.5	3,810	4,923.84	3,020	4,412.30	4,690.76

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, there is no type of Government employee upon whose faithful, efficient service the comfort and convenience of the public more depends, than the rural carrier. He is like a soldier and must see that the mail goes through irrespective of sunshine or storm.

This bill, H.R. 8919, adjusts the salaries of rural letter carriers and makes provision for their equipment-maintenance allowance. No group was more savagely hit by the Economy Act than the rural letter carriers. They were caught going and coming. They were at the mercy of the departmental head who was intent upon making a record and were made the subject of repeated changes in their salary and allowances. This bill fixes their status. The salary of a carrier in the Rural Free Delivery Service, serving a rural route of 30 miles, 6 days a week, will be \$1,800. It should be kept in mind that this is actually a reduction in base pay.

If there is additional mileage he shall receive \$20 per mile per annum or major fraction thereof. This measure fixes the mileage allowance for equipment and maintenance at 6 cents per mile. The statute insures permanence of this provision, for such allowance cannot be changed except by act of Congress. It provides that no consolidation of rural routes shall be made otherwise than on account of the resignation, death, retirement, or dismissal on charges of carriers in the rural mail service. This last provision removes the ever-present fear of retirement from the service.

It gives them an added mileage allowance which in my judgment is actually inadequate.

CLIMATE A FACTOR

The status of the rural letter carrier has been clouded by the fact that many of those administering the laws have never felt the rigorous and extreme weather that is typical of our climate in the northern States, both east and west. In my section of New York there are 5 months of solid winter, with the thermometer below zero much of the time. Snow, accompanied by windstorms of gale force, are frequent and these storms often continue over a period of days. On many of the roads the ordinary motor method of transportation has to be abandoned and horses have to be supplied by the

carrier under his arrangement with the Government. These horses have to be maintained by the carrier during the open season or he has to rent in the emergency. Roads are blocked with a coating of snow many feet deep. Drifts attain the height of 15 to 20 feet. All the perils and none of the glory of arctic exploration are present in the performance of duty by the rural carriers. I have no hesitancy in saying that the allowance of 6 cents per mile in the northern latitudes is not sufficient. I would gladly vote to make it 8 cents per mile.

But I am for this bill because it does partial justice to a group of faithful public servants. It does partial justice to a group of veteran employees who, during the rigors and perils of the northern winter, face the storms unflinchingly and bring the newspapers, supplies, and comforts of civilization to those who dwell in the open spaces.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Goss indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 250. An act for the relief of Fred Herrick; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2046. An act to provide relief for disbursing officers of the Army in certain cases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 27, 1934, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

423. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the legislative establishment, under the Architect of the Capitol, fiscal year 1935, in the sum of \$463,250 (H.Doc. No. 315); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

424. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damages to privately owned property by collision with river and harbor vessels in the sum of \$1,833.10 (H.Doc. No. 316); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

425. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting schedules of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office pursuant to Private Act No. 20, Seventy-third Congress, approved February 26, 1934, amounting to \$8,246 (H.Doc. No. 317); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

426. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation covering a claim amounting to \$10.25 allowed by the General Accounting Office, and certified under certificate of settlement no. 0157024 (H.Doc. No. 318); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

427. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriations submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damages to privately owned property arising in the Philippine Islands in the sum of \$45.50 (H.Doc. No. 319); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

428. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting schedules covering certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, as shown by certificates of settlement transmitted to the Treasury Department for payment, in the sum of \$17,853.30 (H.Doc. No. 320); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

429. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1932, amounting to \$3,000, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H.Doc. No. 321); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII,

Mr. COLLINS of California: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1887. An act to authorize the change of homestead designations on allotted Indian lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLLINS of California: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 2876. An act to provide for the transfer of national-forest lands to the Zuni Reservation, N.Mex., exchanges, and consolidation of holdings; without amendment (Rept. No. 1368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLLINS of California: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1882. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lots to Indians within the Indian village of Taholah, on the Quinaielt Indian Reservation, Wash.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLLINS of California: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1874. An act relative to leasing restricted lands of Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLLINS of California: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 2425. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to grant to the State of New York and the Seneca Nation of Indians jurisdiction over the taking of fish and game within the Allegany, Cattaraugus, and Oil Spring Indian Reservations", approved January 5, 1927; without amendment (Rept. No. 1372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLLINS of California: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 723. An act to amend the act of March 13, 1924 (43 Stat.L. 21), so as to permit the Flathead, Kootenai, and Upper Pend d'Oreille Tribes or Nations of Indians to file suit thereunder; without amendment (Rept. No. 1374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLLINS of California: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 847. An act for the relief of the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians; with amendment (Rept. No. 1375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SEGER: Committee on Claims. H.R. 514. A bill for the relief of the estate of Milton L. Baxter; with amendment (Rept. No. 1337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SEGER: Committee on Claims. H.R. 742. A bill for the relief of Fanny Reuter Shafer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'BRIEN: Committee on Claims. H.R. 1196. A bill for the relief of Henry Raley; with amendment (Rept. No. 1339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SWANK: Committee on Claims. H.R. 2711. A bill for the relief of the Yellow Drivurself Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H.R. 3856. A bill for the relief of Bertha Ingmire; with amend-

ment (Rept. No. 1341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H.R. 3866. A bill for the relief of Erik Nylen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. CLARKE of New York: Committee on Claims. H.R. 4073. A bill for the relief of Margaret Sloane; with amendment (Rept. No. 1343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLANCHARD: Committee on Claims. H.R. 4916. A bill for the relief of Virginia Houghton; with amendment (Rept. No. 1344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLANCHARD: Committee on Claims. H.R. 4917. A bill for the relief of Mary V. Spear; with amendment (Rept. No. 1345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLANCHARD: Committee on Claims. H.R. 4918. A bill for the relief of Alice E. Broas; with amendment (Rept. No. 1346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky: Committee on Claims. H.R. 6112. A bill for the relief of Grace Schultz; with amendment (Rept. No. 1347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky: Committee on Claims. H.R. 6392. A bill for the relief of Carrie K. Currie, doing business as Atmore Milling & Elevator Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Claims. H.R. 6649. A bill for the relief of Henry C. Zeller and Edward G. Zeller with respect to the maintenance of suit against the United States for the recovery of any income tax paid to the United States for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1916, and ending September 30, 1917, in excess of the amount of tax lawfully due for such period; without amendment (Rept. No. 1349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. OWEN: Committee on Claims. H.R. 6887. A bill for the relief of J. H. Taylor & Son; with amendment (Rept. No. 1350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ELLZEY of Mississippi: Committee on Claims. H.R. 7615. A bill to provide for the payment of a claim of the Ingram-Day Lumber Co. arising out of the sale of special ship timbers used in the construction of ships for the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. CLARKE of New York: Committee on Claims. H.R. 8456. A bill for the relief of Ettie A. Shepard; with amendment (Rept. No. 1352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLACK: Committee on Claims. H.R. 9032. A bill for the relief of Mary F. Crim; without amendment (Rept. No. 1353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLACK: Committee on Claims. H.R. 9128. A bill for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLACK: Committee on Claims. H.R. 9250. A bill for the relief of Ralph E. Wooley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Claims. S. 826. An act for the relief of the Tampa Marine Co., a corporation, of Tampa, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky: Committee on Claims. S. 1118. An act for the relief of George J. Bloxham; without amendment (Rept. No. 1357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky: Committee on Claims. S. 1119. An act for the relief of Fred A. Robinson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLANCHARD: Committee on Claims. S. 1526. An act for the relief of Ann Engle; without amendment (Rept. No. 1359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1600. An act for the relief of S. G. Mortimer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1753. An act for the relief of Marcella Leahy Mc Nerney; with amendment (Rept. No. 1361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. OWEN: Committee on Claims. S. 2233. An act for the relief of Mildred F. Stamm; with amendment (Rept. No. 1362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLACK: Committee on Claims. S. 2561. An act for the relief of Robert R. Prann; with amendment (Rept. No. 1363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. THOM: Committee on Claims. S. 2620. An act for the relief of N. W. Carrington and J. E. Mitchell; with amendment (Rept. No. 1364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. THOM: Committee on Claims. S. 2627. An act for the relief of Arvin C. Sands; with amendments (Rept. No. 1365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. OWEN: Committee on Claims. S. 2672. An act for the relief of Mabel S. Parker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H.R. 437. A bill for the relief of Charles Davis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLLINS of California: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 838. An act for the relief of Anson H. Pease; without amendment (Rept. No. 1373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H.R. 9355) to increase the postage charge for the return of dead letters and to provide for the collection of a registry fee upon such letters when containing money; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COFFIN: A bill (H.R. 9356) to amend section 36 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, and amendments thereto, relating to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H.R. 9357) to provide for the creation of the Pioneer National Monument in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOCKWEILER: A bill (H.R. 9358) to authorize the issuance of a medal to members of the Army of Occupation of Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H.R. 9359) to provide for the regulation of the business of making small loans in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TRUAX: A bill (H.R. 9360) to authorize and empower the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make personal loans secured by promissory notes of the borrower with one or more comakers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H.R. 9361) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to build a stadium at the end of East Capitol Street, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9362) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia", approved February 27, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CROWE: A bill (H.R. 9363) to clarify the provisions of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, to authorize the deportation of the habitual criminal, to guard against the separation from their families of aliens of the noncriminal classes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCHULTE: A bill (H.R. 9364) to provide for legalizing the residence in the United States of certain classes of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEIDEMAN: A bill (H.R. 9365) to extend non-quota status to certain relatives and to limit the class of aliens entitled to first preference in the issuance of immigration visas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COLMER: A bill (H.R. 9366) to amend section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 874); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEIDEMAN: A bill (H.R. 9367) to provide a penalty upon vessels arriving in the United States having on board stowaways; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H.R. 9368) to amend section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act so as to extend for 1 year the temporary plan for deposit insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALTER: A bill (H.R. 9369) to prevent shipment of machine guns, submachine guns, sawed-off shotguns, and bullet-proof vests in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN: A bill (H.R. 9370) to authorize an appropriation of money to facilitate the apprehension of certain persons charged with crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIMOND: A bill (H.R. 9371) to authorize the incorporated town of Douglas City, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including construction, reconstruction, enlargement, extension, and improvements of its water-supply system; and construction, reconstruction, enlargement, extension, and improvements to sewers, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$40,000; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RAYBURN: Resolution (H.Res. 363) for the consideration of H.R. 9323, a bill to provide for the regulation of securities exchanges and of over-the-counter markets operating in interstate and foreign commerce through the mails, to prevent inequitable and unfair practices on such exchanges and markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of California: A bill (H.R. 9372) for the relief of John J. Sweeney; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina: A bill (H.R. 9373) for the relief of John Y. Stokes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOEPEL: A bill (H.R. 9374) for the relief of Vincent Ford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: A bill (H.R. 9375) for the relief of the Mohawk Coal Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINZER: A bill (H.R. 9376) granting an increase of pension to Anna B. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Missouri: A bill (H.R. 9377) for the relief of Rock White; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H.R. 9378) for the relief of Walter M. Cass; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9379) for the relief of Charles J. LaFarge; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H.R. 9380) for the relief of Mary Czap; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H.R. 9381) for the relief of Max Geissler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H.R. 9382) granting a pension to Elmer J. Rush; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 9383) granting a pension to Annie Hankal; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H.R. 9384) for the relief of Luther M. Turpin and Amanda Turpin; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4281. By Mr. BOYLAN: Letter from the Workers Unemployed Union of the Hudson Guild Local No. 4, New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 7598, to provide for the establishment of unemployment and social insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

4282. Also, letter from Rand McNally & Co., New York City, opposing the Wagner Disputes Act; to the Committee on Labor.

4283. By Mr. BRUNNER: Petition of the St. Raymond's Holy Name Society, East Rockaway, N.Y., in support of the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4284. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of the Revere City Council, Revere, Mass., favoring passage of the McLeod bill, which would guarantee payment of frozen assets in closed banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4285. Also, petition of the Bricklayers and Masons Union, No. 10, of Lawrence, Mass., favoring the passage of the Wagner-Lewis unemployment insurance bill; to the Committee on Labor.

4286. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of the mayor and Common Council, of the city of Oswego, N.Y., together with 34 other business men and industrialists of that city, urging the immediate passage of legislation providing direct loans to industry by the Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4287. By Mr. HEALEY: Petition of the City Council of the City of Cambridge, Mass., favoring the McLeod bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4288. Also, petition of the city council of the city of Cambridge, Mass., favoring the Wagner-Costigan antilynch bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4289. By Mr. HOWARD: Petition of H. McKim, of Adams, Nebr., and many other producers of livestock in Nebraska, urging the passage of Senate bill 3064; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4290. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of 356 citizens of McKeesport, Pa., and vicinity, protesting against curtailment of Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

4291. By Mr. KENNEY: Petition in the nature of a resolution of the members of Westwood Council, Knights of Columbus, of the city of Westwood, State of New Jersey, calling upon Senators and Representatives in Congress to support the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910, providing for the insurance of equity of opportunity for educational, religious, agricultural, labor, cooperative, and similar non-profit-making associations seeking licenses for radio broadcasting by incorporating into the statute a provision for the allotment to said non-profit-making associations of at least 25 percent of all radio facilities not employed in public use; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4292. Also, petition in the nature of a resolution of the executive board of the New Jersey State League of Municipalities, respectfully petitioning and urging upon the President of the United States and the Members of the Congress thereof that additional funds be made available to the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, in order to enable it to adequately care for the relief needs of unemployed citizens prior to the next regular session of Congress, and that the Federal Government be urged to formulate a long-time relief program because of the fact that it is now apparent that the problem of unemployment relief is not temporary and it is impossible for local governments to intelligently plan relief activities on any long-time basis under the present system of constantly changing Federal relief policies; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4293. Also, petition in the nature of a resolution of the members of Westwood Council, Knights of Columbus, of

Westwood, N.J., calling upon our Senators and Representative in Congress to support the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910 providing for the insurance of equity of opportunity for educational, religious, agricultural, labor, cooperative, and similar non-profit-making associations seeking licenses for radio broadcasting by incorporating into the statute a provision for the allotment of said non-profit-making associations of at least 25 percent of all radio facilities not employed in public use; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4294. Also, petition in the nature of a resolution of the members of the Junior Holy Name Society of the Parish of Edgewater, N.J., calling upon our Senators and Representative in Congress to support the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910 providing for the insurance of equity of opportunity for educational, religious, agricultural, labor, cooperative, and similar non-profit-making associations seeking licenses for radio broadcasting by incorporating into the statute a provision for the allotment to said non-profit-making associations of at least 25 percent of all radio facilities not employed in public use; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4295. Also, petition in the nature of a resolution of the members of St. Theresa's Parish, of Cresskill, N.J., calling upon our Senators and Representative in Congress to support the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910, providing for the insurance of equity of opportunity for educational, religious, agricultural, labor, cooperative, and similar non-profit-making associations seeking licenses for radio broadcasting by incorporating into the statute a provision for the allotment to said non-profit-making associations of at least 25 percent of all the radio facilities not employed in public use; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4296. Also, petition in the nature of a resolution of members of the Senior Holy Name Society of the Parish of Edgewater, N.J., calling upon our Senators and Representative in Congress to support the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910, providing for the insurance of equity of opportunity for educational, religious, agricultural, labor, cooperative, and similar non-profit-making associations seeking licenses for radio broadcasting by incorporating into the statute a provision for the allotment to said non-profit-making associations of at least 25 percent of all radio facilities not employed in public use; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4297. Also, petition in the nature of a resolution of the executive board of the New Jersey State League of Municipalities, urging upon the Federal Government to provide funds to bear the cost of unfinished approved projects as begun under the Civil Works Administration program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4298. Also, petition in the nature of a resolution of the Phil Sheridan Council, No. 2229, Knights of Columbus, of Ridgefield Park, N.J., in council assembled, endorsing the amendments as presented by Father Harney, and instructing the grand knight to so advise the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the White House, and our representatives to the Congress, to wit, the Honorable HAMILTON KEAN and W. WARREN BARBOUR, of the Senate, and the Honorable EDWARD A. KENNEY, of the House of Representatives (the amendments referred to pertain to Senate bill 2910—this bill devised to accord to human welfare and other nonprofit agencies a fair proportion of radio time and location); to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4299. Also, petition in the nature of a resolution of the Federation of Holy Name Societies of the Diocese of Newark, N.J., representing its membership in calling upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress to support the amendment of section 301 of Senate bill 2910, providing for the insurance of equity of opportunity for educational, religious, agricultural, labor, cooperative, and similar non-profit-making associations of at least 25 percent of all radio facilities not employed in public use; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4300. Also, petition in the nature of a resolution of the members of St. Joseph's Parish, of Demarest, N.J., calling upon our Senators and Representative in Congress to support the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910, providing for the insurance of equity of opportunity for educational, religious, agricultural, labor, cooperative, and similar non-profit-making associations seeking licenses for radio broadcasting by incorporating into the statute a provision for the allotment to said non-profit-making associations of at least 25 percent of all radio facilities not employed in public use; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4301. Also, petition in the nature of a resolution of the members of Jersey City Council, No. 137, Knights of Columbus, commending the program of radio station WLWL as being thoroughly representative of radio's highest purpose—namely, to serve public interest, convenience, and necessity—and that we place ourselves on record as approving the radio station WLWL's struggle against monopolistic commercial interests, and dedicate ourselves to support with every means at our command the efforts of an agency which has been productive of so much good will, tolerance, and enlightenment; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4302. By Mr. LEHR: Memorial of the Jackson Association of Life Underwriters, at its annual meeting in Jackson, Mich., commending the President of the United States for resisting the pressure in favor of unsound monetary policies and as favoring the continuation of a sound currency; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

4303. Also, petition of the Southern Association of Congregational and Christian Churches of Michigan, favoring legislation for the nationalization of all munition and arms manufacturing plants, thus taking out of the realm of private profit the matter of national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4304. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Anne M. Flood and nine others, all of Brooklyn, N.Y., urging the passage of the Ickes-Collier program for the betterment of conditions among the American Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

4305. Also, petition of the Air Preheater Corporation, New York City, opposing the passage of House bill 8720 in its present form; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4306. Also, petition of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Washington, D.C., urging the enactment of Senate bill 752 in its original form; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4307. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of residents of Indianapolis, Ind., protesting against discriminatory operation of busses and trucks, and requesting the enactment of regulatory measures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4308. By Mr. McCORMACK: Petition of the city council of the city of Cambridge, Mass., endorsing the Costigan-Wagner bill, the so-called "antilynch bill"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4309. Also, petition of the city council of the city of Cambridge, Mass., urging early and favorable consideration of the McLeod bank bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4310. By Mr. RICH: Petition of citizens of Williamsport, Pa., favoring the passage of the McLeod banking bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4311. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Superheater Co., New York City, favoring certain modifications to the stock-exchange bill (H.R. 8720); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4312. Also, petition of Anne M. Flood and nine other citizens, of Brooklyn, N.Y., favoring the Ickes-Collier program for the betterment of conditions among the American Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

4313. By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the National Alliance of Bohemian Catholics, urging support of Senate bill 2910 to provide 25-percent allotment of radio facilities to non-

profit-making organizations; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4314. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Memorial of the township commission of Erin Township, Macomb County, Mich., urging the passage of the McLeod bill (H.R. 7908) for the relief of bank depositors; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4315. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Pontiac, Mich., urging passage of the McLeod bank bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4316. Also, petition of the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, urging passage of Senate bill 2800; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4317. Also, petition of Bellwood, Ill., urging the issuance of \$30,000,000,000 and the method by which same should be placed in circulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4318. Also, petition of St. John the Baptist Parish, of Newport and Middleville, N.Y., urging adoption of the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4319. Also, petition of St. Francis Parish, of North Adams, Mass., urging adoption of the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4320. Also, petition of St. Anne's Sodality of St. Matthew's Parish, of Milwaukee, Wis., urging adoption of the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4321. Also, petition of St. Mary's Parish, of Mount Vernon, Ill., urging adoption of the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

4322. Also, petition of St. Matthew's Benevolent Society, of St. Paul, Minn., urging adoption of the amendment to section 301 of Senate bill 2910; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 1934

(Legislative day of Thursday, Apr. 26, 1934)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR DECEASED SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, in the Hall of the House of Representatives, that body convening at noon today, memorial services will be held in memory of 10 deceased Members of the House and 4 former Members of this body who died during their terms of service, the Honorable THOMAS J. WALSH, late a Senator from the State of Montana; the Honorable ROBERT B. HOWELL, late a Senator from the State of Nebraska; the Honorable PORTER H. DALE, late a Senator from the State of Vermont; and the Honorable JOHN B. KENDRICK, late a Senator from the State of Wyoming.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess until the hour of 1:15 p.m. today in order that Senators may be afforded the opportunity of attending the ceremonies.

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

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess until 1:15 p.m.

At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled, and the President pro tempore took the chair.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
IN SENATE,
Albany, April 12, 1934.

By Mr. Burchill

Whereas the Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle, a domestic corporation of the State of New York, owns and operates, in the city of New York, Radio Station WLWL; and

Whereas such radio station is maintained for rendering religious, educational, cultural, and social service; and

Whereas in July 1925 the Department of Commerce granted to the said Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle a class b commercial license, no. 1829, to broadcast with 5,000-watt power and with unlimited time; and

Whereas on the 13th day of October 1926, due to a request from the Department of Commerce, the Radio Station WLWL changed its frequency from 1,040 to 780 under license no. 1829 with the enjoyment of unlimited time; and

Whereas said license no. 1829 was renewed without change on January 22, 1927; and

Whereas the Federal Radio Commission was created in February 1927 and said commission requested all stations to designate the minimum number of hours necessary to their existence; and Whereas Radio Station WLWL specified the evening hours of 7:30 to 9:30 on Sunday and 8 p.m. to 11 p.m. on week days, Monday to Saturday inclusive, with 1 hour Thursday mornings; and

Whereas the Federal Radio Commission notified Radio Station WLWL that it would have to broadcast on a 1020 frequency instead of 780 frequency and Radio Station WLWL appealed from said ruling, and on June 8, 1927, was assigned to an 810 frequency; and

Whereas on June 10, 1927 the Federal Radio Commission caused Radio Station WLWL to share the frequency 810 with a commercial Station WMCA; and

Whereas the hours on the air to be enjoyed by Radio Station WLWL were to be fixed by the commercial Station WMCA; and

Whereas in September 1928 the Federal Radio Commission assigned Radio Station WLWL to 1,100 frequency, together with the commercial Station WPG of Atlantic City; and

Whereas Station WLWL was assigned 15½ broadcasting-hours per week and WPG was assigned 110½ broadcasting-hours per week; and

Whereas the license of WPG was renewed despite the fact that, in violation of the rulings of the Commission, it had leased not only all its broadcasting hours, but had surrendered control over the programs and operations of its station to the Columbia Broadcasting System; and

Whereas there are 30 radio stations in the United States classified as educational, enjoying a total of 817 hours and 40 minutes of broadcasting time each week, or an average of 4 hours per day for each station; and

Whereas the broadcasting time assigned to educational radio stations amounts to but 2½ percent of all broadcasting time; and

Whereas it is the proud boast of the United States that its people are devoted to the cause of education and to freedom in the exercise of religious beliefs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby memorialized, to enact with all convenient speed, such measures as may be necessary to increase the broadcasting time of educational and religious associations to one quarter of all the radio-broadcasting facilities; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That Radio Station WLWL, owned and operated by the Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle, in the city of New York, State of New York, be granted a reasonable extension of its broadcasting time; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the Secretary of the United States Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to use their best offices to procure the enactment of such legislation as will accomplish the purpose of this resolution.

By order of the senate.

MARGUERITE O'CONNELL, Clerk.

In assembly, April 18, 1934.

Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the assembly.

FRED W. HAMMOND, Clerk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, which was referred to the Special Committee on Conservation of Wild Life Resources:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
IN SENATE,
Albany, April 20, 1934.

By Mr. Nunan

Whereas President Roosevelt's Committee on Wild Life Restoration has submitted a report embodying suggestions for action by the Federal Government to restore and enlarge the wild-life resources of the Nation; and

Whereas this report has been received with virtually unanimous praise from conservationists from every part of the State of New York and elsewhere throughout the United States; and

Whereas the conservation commissioner of the State of New York, after close examination of the report, has endorsed it enthusiastically: Therefore be it