

urging that the Civil War pension bill now pending be given prompt consideration; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6551. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of board of directors Creston (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce, indorsing the McNary-Haugen bill and recommending its passage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6552. Also, petition of board of directors Bedford (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce, indorsing the McNary-Haugen farm bill and recommending its passage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6553. Also, petition of the board of directors of the Des Moines (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce, indorsing the McNary-Haugen bill and recommending its passage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6554. Also, petition of citizens of Creston, Union County, Iowa, relating to legislation in favor of veterans of the Civil War and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6555. Also, petition of citizens of Clarinda, Page County, Iowa, relating to legislation in favor of veterans of the Civil War and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6556. By Mr. TILLMAN: Petition of different citizens of the third congressional district of Arkansas, asking for pension legislation for veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6557. By Mr. VESTAL: Petition of John W. Grimes and others, of Madison County, Ind., favoring the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6558. Also, petition of Omer Sutton and others, of Madison County, Ind., favoring the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6559. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of residents of the eighth district, urging legislation to increase pensions of veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6560. By Mr. WATRES: Petition by residents of Carbondale and Scranton, Pa., favoring Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6561. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of citizens of Reems Creek Township, Buncombe County, N. C., asking increase in Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6562. Also, petition of citizens of Cataloochee Township, Haywood County, N. C., asking increase in Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6563. By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of citizens of Sistersville, W. Va., favoring additional pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6564. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of citizens of Scottsdale, Westmoreland County, Pa., urging the passage of the Lankford Sunday rest bill (H. R. 10311); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

SATURDAY, February 12, 1927

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, the God of our fathers in all the experiences of our national history, we bless Thee for Thy guidance and for every help that has come to us in days of darkness and of doubt. But we know that Thou wert the God of the past, and as Thou wert thus recognized we would have Thee as the God of the present and of the future.

We bless Thee for the history of one connected in our national life, whose name and influence add luster to its history, and we pray, our God, that in all the way of life we may recognize that righteousness exalts a nation.

Hear us and help us, so that in the midst of life's problems we may realize that the God of the past is now with us and ready to help us in every hour of need. Direct us for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday last when, on request of Mr. CURRIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 4727. An act to provide for the widening of Nichols Avenue between Good Hope Road and S Street SE. in the District of Columbia; and

S. 4553. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay from a point in Baltimore County to a point in Kent County, in the State of Maryland.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gerry	Lenroot	Robinson, Ark.
Bayard	Gillett	McKellar	Schall
Bingham	Glass	McLean	Sheppard
Blease	Goff	McMaster	Shipstead
Borah	Gooding	McNary	Simmons
Bratton	Gould	Mayfield	Smith
Broussard	Greene	Means	Smoot
Bruce	Harrel	Necly	Stanfield
Cameron	Harris	Norris	Steck
Capper	Harrison	Nye	Stephens
Caraway	Hawes	Oddie	Stewart
Couzens	Heflin	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	Howell	Pepper	Tyson
Dale	Johnson	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Ferris	Kendrick	Pittman	Warren
Fletcher	Keyes	Ransdell	Watson
Frazier	King	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
George	La Follette	Reed, Pa.	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed for a few minutes to pay tribute to the memory of Abraham Lincoln.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Utah will proceed.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, STATESMAN

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, 80 years ago next December, Abraham Lincoln took his seat in the lower House of Congress, in what is now Statuary Hall in the National Capitol. He was elected as a Whig and a follower of Henry Clay. He entered the National Legislature at a momentous period. For a decade the Nation had been absorbed in industrial pursuits. Business and internal development were uppermost. Patriotism slumbered, national impulses seemed dormant.

A wild passion for war revived the spirit of Bunker Hill and New Orleans. The soldier supplanted the accountant; deed eclipsed the dollar. Few stopped to discuss the righteousness of war, to what end it might lead or its effect on the status of slavery.

Mr. Lincoln did not willingly enter into this military atmosphere. Albeit a patriot and as a Congressman elect, admonishing those who hastened to the front to "stand by the flag till peace came with honor," nevertheless he was one of thousands of sober, thoughtful, yet loyal, citizens, who looked far beyond a war of annexation to the addition of another slave State. Mr. Lincoln's background was an absorbing hostility to what he sincerely felt was a national peril.

While a man of peace and opposed to war with Mexico, Mr. Lincoln never failed to vote for any bill or resolution that had for its object the sending of supplies to our troops ordered to the seat of war. Once in the war he supported its prosecution.

With courage and faultless logic he challenged the President's justification of war and the shedding of the blood of American citizens on foreign soil.

Let him [the President] remember—

He said—

he sits where Washington sat; and so remembering, let him answer as Washington would answer * * * and if, so answering, he can show that the soil was ours where the first blood of the war was shed * * * then I am with him for his justification.

This, his first great speech in yonder hall, should have won him a high place, were it not for the shifting standard of public opinion that confounds the thing of the moment with the ultimate principle.

In reply to sharp criticism from his Whig constituents, he sent a letter revealing his sincerity of purpose, his soberness of thought, and his adherence to the purposes of the Republic. He insisted that the important function of the Constitution in leaving the declaration of war with Congress, precluded the right of any one man to bring the oppression of war upon the people. Mr. Lincoln was not so elated with patriotism

that he lost his standard of righteousness. This rare ability he displayed in later years.

From the beginning of his public career Mr. Lincoln possessed a national mind. The logic of the preservation of the Union led straight to the protection of American industry and labor. He sounded the depths of discussion by his quaint and original method.

He had profound sympathy for the toiler. He voted for a resolution instructing the Committee on Ways and Means to inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill increasing the duties on foreign luxuries of all kinds and "on such foreign manufactures as are now coming into ruinous competition with American labor."

He was in advance of the thought of his day in the matter of internal improvements. He attacked the opinions of those who maintained that the burden of improvements would be general while the benefits would be local, thus involving a pernicious inequality. Mr. Lincoln's reply displayed his political wisdom. He argued that if every good thing was to be discarded which might be inseparably connected with a degree of inequality in its application, then all government would have to be discarded.

One of the outstanding elements of Mr. Lincoln's character and mental process was his knowledge of human nature and his belief that no righteous cause can be consummated until public opinion is ripe for it. His attitude toward his one consuming thought, hostility to slavery, was that of deliberation and caution until he felt that the time to strike had come. In this can be found the key to his final triumph. He never hurried, never plunged thoughtlessly and recklessly; but when he reached a conclusion and struck a blow, he reasoned that the hour had come for radical action.

Mr. Lincoln's waiting policy is well illustrated when, after his failures to be elected United States Senator, he was offered the nomination of Governor of Illinois, but declined and was presented as a candidate for Vice President, against his wishes. For several years he practiced his profession and bided his time.

He was invited to the city of Boston to participate in anti-slavery exercises in that abode of radical sentiment. Although stirred by the eloquence of Seward and Sumner, and fired by the spirit of New England, he husbanded his anger and planned with wisdom what he knew were the most effective ways. He realized that progress is a slow and labored process, and that haste is often the companion of reaction.

Mr. Lincoln left a respectable but not eminent record of two years in Congress. He had lost the support of many of the Whigs. To not a few his political career had come to an inglorious end. Though zealous for action, he appeared to others to be resigned to his fate. But some unseen power gave him faith in himself and his cause. Like Washington, he marked out his own path. Behind his exterior melancholy was a sublime faith that his time would come.

The same year that Mr. Lincoln took his seat in the National House of Representatives Stephen A. Douglas took his seat in the United States Senate, which then occupied what is now the Supreme Court chamber. From the day that Mr. Douglas moved to Illinois from Vermont, in 1833, to the untimely death of Mr. Lincoln the lives of these two men were intertwined in a miraculous manner. No picture can exaggerate the contrast between these two intellectual giants. Mr. Lincoln felt this contrast keenly. He was an ex-Member of Congress, a defeated candidate for Senator—a failure—while Mr. Douglas was a Senator, a leader in his party—a success.

Mr. Douglas had few superiors in a finished political debate. Mr. Lincoln's speech was quaint, rough, and at times raw. Mr. Douglas was bold, belligerent, dominating, and magnetic. Mr. Lincoln was modest, retiring, and thoughtful. Mr. Douglas was immaculate in dress and appearance. Mr. Lincoln was careless in dress, long and lank of body.

The five years following Mr. Lincoln's congressional experience reveal a strong man struggling with a giant problem against what appeared to be insurmountable obstacles. He was a lonely soul fighting a sublime battle in which the destiny of a Nation was to be settled. These were splendid years of preparation. Mr. Lincoln the politician was slowly emerging into Mr. Lincoln the statesman. He was ready when he met Mr. Douglas in the first public discussion between the two giants. It was in October, 1854. The speech of Mr. Douglas was a national event. He was fighting for reelection to the Senate and was forced to defend his votes on the repeal of the Missouri compromise and the Kansas-Nebraska bill.

Mr. Lincoln's reply surpassed all expectations. A new and dauntless advocate appeared to contest the aggressive championship of Senator Douglas. Mr. Lincoln felt in his soul the truths he uttered, crushing with his logic and holding up to scorn the defender of iniquitous propositions.

In this first great encounter with Judge Douglas Mr. Lincoln displayed the shrewdness and statesmanship that characterized his whole career. He recognized the fact that a moral prophet is seldom the political leader of his time. There must be intelligent recognition of the times and conditions to accomplish results. He made no false step. He was scrupulously fair to his antagonist. He added to the strength of his logic and reasoning a compelling sympathy from his hostile listeners by avoiding personal abuse. His keen analysis exposed the sophistry of popular sovereignty. Thus he passed from the sordidness and turmoil of the court room and petty politics to the championship of an impelling principle. His historic utterance, "A house divided against itself can not stand," was the battle cry of a people pledged to freedom. Their leader was Abraham Lincoln.

Senator Douglas accepted Mr. Lincoln's challenge to a series of joint debates in Illinois to test the Senator's plausible arguments and to bring popular sentiment in that State to decide whether Senator Douglas or Mr. Lincoln was legally and morally right. It is recorded that Mr. Douglas accepted not without misgivings, for he alone realized the mental strength and power of his antagonist, and his mastery of logic.

I shall have my hands full—

Remarked Mr. Douglas—

He is the strong man of his party. He is as honest as he is shrewd, and if I beat him, my victory will be hardly won.

No one realized to what heights Mr. Douglas had climbed more clearly than Mr. Lincoln. Speaking of his handicaps, Mr. Lincoln said:

With me the race of ambition has been a failure—a flat failure; with him it has been one of splendid success. We have to fight this battle upon principles.

To review the historic Lincoln-Douglas debates would be far beyond the limits of this brief address. The genius of Mr. Douglas was rebuked by the plain, homely Mr. Lincoln. The elaborate oratory of the Senate never confused the Senator from Illinois. For the first time in his career the national Democratic leader was worried and perplexed.

Beyond the crowds that listened before those rude platforms in the Illinois clearings Mr. Lincoln saw, what Mr. Douglas did not see—a listening Nation. To this larger forum Mr. Lincoln addressed himself. He was eager for the office at stake; but of more importance than ambition was the hope of overcoming his rival in the eyes of the whole country.

Mr. Douglas may be Senator—

Said a friend.

Perhaps—

Rejoined Mr. Lincoln—

but I am after larger game. The battle of 1860 is worth a hundred of this.

Mr. Lincoln's defeat in the senatorial election was actually a victory for him. While the Senator had merely maintained his great prestige already established, his opponent had leaped at one bound into a national reputation.

In the two years intervening between these historic debater and the Republican National Convention in 1860, the tide of events was sweeping Mr. Lincoln on with tragic swiftmess. The convention passed over Seward, Chase, and other recognized leaders and nominated Mr. Lincoln. The same tide of events swept Mr. Douglas into the leadership of one wing of his party in the national convention. The debates with Mr. Lincoln compelled a division of Mr. Douglas's party and compassed Mr. Douglas's defeat, as Mr. Lincoln predicted. While the choice of Mr. Lincoln had back of it a consistent and uplifting righteous cause, the choice of Mr. Douglas meant a certain split. Be it said to the honor of Mr. Douglas, when the crisis came he turned from the consequences of his own sophistry and supported Mr. Lincoln and the Union.

It is a task far beyond the scope of this short address to analyze Mr. Lincoln's public addresses from the first in 1858 when he was nominated for United States Senator to his last inaugural in 1865. Through them all runs the grandeur of his cause, the sincerity of his purpose, the tenderness of his heart, and the divinity of his soul.

His first inaugural stands alone among American orations. It is as true to Lincoln as the reply to Hayne was to Webster. It is one of the most momentous messages in American history. It put in clear speech the question agitating the common mind. In his loneliness of soul he resolved that the hour for speech and action had come, that the time for compromise was over. In judging keenly of the drift of events he was wiser than the

pure politicians. Mingled with his political sagacity was a sublime communion with constitutional liberty and eternal justice. To a critic he replied:

If I had to draw a pen across and erase my whole political life from existence, and had one poor gift or choice left as to what would save me from the wreck, I would choose that speech and leave it to the world unerasable.

The closing words of his first inaugural address are a tender appeal and a vision of the Union.

The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battle field and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

Judge Douglas sat on the platform on the east portico of the Capitol with President Lincoln's hat in his lap when these words were uttered. Who can tell what thoughts were in his mind as he listened intently?

Mr. Lincoln's Gettysburg address has gone into the archives of classic literature. As some one has said, it is like a sacred poem. No American President had ever spoken words like these to the American people. America never had a President who found such words in the depths of his heart.

The closing words of his last inaugural address, March 4, 1865, are no less sublime. They reveal Mr. Lincoln as the Nation's redeemer and compassionate savior.

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Mr. Lincoln's political philosophy is worthy the study of every citizen, patriot and reformer, man or woman, who believes in the dawn of better days. No man in history longed more earnestly for the triumph of justice than Abraham Lincoln. He hated evil in all its forms; still his purpose was the preservation of the principles of the Republic. Such battles require leadership of the highest order. To husband strength, to bide the time and await the solemn moment for attack is political generalship, as essential in the Senate as on the battle field.

Mr. Lincoln gave due regard to the weight and potency of public opinion. He would not aid in the passage of a law not intended to be enforced or incapable of being substantially enforced. His one great principle behind self-government was law and order and observance of the law.

His guiding star was the Constitution and the law. He never believed that the Constitution and the law should be observed or not observed according to one's own liking. Often it is said that he departed from his own principle in denouncing the Dred Scott decision. Not so. He deplored the decision and waited patiently for a higher court of appeal—public opinion—to reverse it. He said:

We believe in obedience to and respect for the judicial department of Government. Its decisions on constitutional questions, when fully settled, should control * * * subject to be disturbed only by amendment of the Constitution as provided in that instrument itself. More than this would be revolution.

Mr. Lincoln believed in party organization and was a loyal partisan. He believed that parties are necessary in a self-governing republic. Having no sympathy with political anarchy or with independent group activity, he gave full credit to party government.

All that Mr. Lincoln accomplished was through party organization and united effort. Mr. Lincoln blended the enthusiasm of the idealist with the wisdom of the politician. He was the wisest politician in American history; consummate in strategy, a supreme friend and champion of democracy.

What would be Mr. Lincoln's views on the perplexing problems now confronting America? We can judge only by what he said and did.

Speaking in response to a serenade at the White House in November, 1864, he said:

Gold is good in its place, but living, breathing patriotic men are better than gold.

What would Mr. Lincoln say of law enforcement? In 1837, long before he became a national and sainted character, he said:

Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap. Let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges. * * * Let it be preached

from the pulpits, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. In short, let it become the political religion of the Nation.

Again he said:

If the time ever comes in America when a minority can frustrate the will of the majority, the result will be mobocracy upon the one hand or tyranny on the other. Freedom does not mean the right to do as one pleases.

What would Mr. Lincoln say of the modern doctrine of self-determination? In the midst of the bewildering problems of the Civil War, he said:

I am driven to my knees over and over again because I have nowhere else to go.

To Mr. Lincoln, man proposes, God disposes.

It was his faith in God that made him a guide, a prophet, and a seer.

What would Mr. Lincoln say of communism and similar creeds? He was the apostle of human rights, and as such insisted upon the right of the individual to acquire property and hold it under the protection of the law. He said:

Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable, is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently and build one for himself, thus, by example, assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built.

What would Mr. Lincoln say about government in the field of private business? He said:

In all that people can individually do for themselves, the Government ought not to interfere.

Mr. Lincoln believed that peace works from within out, rather than from without in. In this belief he closed his second inaugural address, and dictated the generous terms of surrender.

Mr. Lincoln's nationalism did not mean isolation but independence tempered with peace among all nations, and with commerce throughout the world.

Yonder stands the Lincoln Memorial, one of the most imposing and majestic edifices ever reared by the genius and the hand of man. Its marble columns, its classic design, its loggia wherein rests the heroic statue of Abraham Lincoln, seated as if in calm conference, is a fitting memorial of America's immortal son.

Of all the public structures in Washington, not excepting the Capitol and the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial is the most uplifting and inspiring. It breathes the tenderness and compassion of the martyred President. It tells in silent eloquence the story of a tragic life and a heroic death.

It reminds all that the spirit of Abraham Lincoln still hovers over the Capital of the Republic for which he gave the last full measure of devotion.

LAFAYETTE SQUARE

Mr. BLEASE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter and a report relating to the purchase by the Government of property around Lafayette Square.

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

COLUMBIA, S. C., February 10, 1927.

HON. COLE L. BLEASE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Some days ago I sent you in the form of a circular letter addressed to all Members of Congress for South Carolina an appeal for purchase by the Government of the property around Lafayette Square in order to preserve a proper and dignified environment for the White House. I wish to apologize for addressing you in that manner, but the necessity for prompt action before the adjournment of the present Congress and the pressure of other matters that day prevented my writing personal letters.

Let me again bring this important matter to your attention and urge your favorable consideration.

If action is not taken by this Congress, the cost of the property will be increased by many millions before another Congress will have time to act.

While this Congress is crowded with important matters to be completed in a very few days there is still time to act; a rider can do it, just as a rider last year destroyed the McMillan plan.

Let us preserve Hoban's beautiful White House and its setting, and not allow it to be swamped by towering and incongruous commercial structures.

I am inclosing a copy of a report of the chairman, which you have doubtless already seen, but which I commend to your careful consideration.

Your prompt response to my former letter and the announcement of your support is greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

CHAS. C. WILSON,

The Committee on Plan of Washington of the American Institute of Architects, representing South Carolina Chapter.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF WASHINGTON WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE SETTING OF THE WHITE HOUSE AND OF THE CAPITOL

The development of the National Capital is based on a plan made by L'Enfant under the personal direction of Washington, with the assistance of Jefferson. Subsequent disregard of this plan led to great confusion in street extensions and in location of public buildings. To meet this situation there was formed, in 1901, a commission of the foremost American planners—Burnham, organizing genius of the Chicago world's fair; McKim, architect of our finest buildings; St. Gaudens, greatest of American sculptors; Olmsted, foremost landscape architect. They developed a new plan closely following the original, modified only to meet existing conditions. The plan of 1901 is regarded as a masterpiece of planning.

For 25 years this plan of 1901 has been generally accepted as the controlling plan. It has guided the Fine Arts Commission in all its supervision of public-building development. It has had the support of the planning professions throughout the country. But for 25 years it has suffered from occasional attacks made possible by lack of general information or understanding of the plan.

To-day the fundamentals of the Washington plan are in jeopardy. Only immediate action will avert costly corrective measures of lasting regret.

The plan of 1901 called attention to the fact that the White House is one of our finest national monuments, but that it is a relatively modest, unpretentious structure in architectural mass and could easily be dwarfed or rendered insignificant if thrown into sharp contrast with large buildings. The plan also called attention to the ultimate importance of Sixteenth Street as a main approach to Washington from the north. It provided for both conditions by enframing Lafayette Square with dignified departmental buildings, uniform in mass, low enough to respect the White House, imposing enough to give an adequate first impression to the visitor.

For 25 years the general acceptance of this plan has prevented exploitation of the White House district. Only two commercial buildings have been erected. In 1925 the Carlton Hotel was scheduled for the corner of Sixteenth and H Streets, but the promoter, recognizing a civic obligation, agreed to build elsewhere. Two structures were launched in accordance with the plan of 1901; one the Treasury Annex, the other the chamber of commerce. The Treasury Annex was designed to cover the entire east side of the square, eliminating the Belasco Theater and the Cosmos Club, and one-third of the building has been completed. The chamber of commerce, though privately built, followed the established monumental type of the annex, making it harmonize with the great plan.

In 1926, at the end of the last session of Congress and over the protests of all professional planning groups, an amendment was forced on the public building bill to eliminate areas "north of Pennsylvania Avenue" from Government development. This removed the blanket protection of the plan, and immediately the results were evident. The historic residences at Sixteenth and H Streets are being demolished and are to be replaced by an apartment hotel; and plans are out for a second commercial office building, to be erected on the west side of the square, with a third to follow.

As matters now stand the future holds this prospect: The Treasury Annex, which must eventually be completed, will give an imposing monumental appearance to the east side of the square. On the opposite side will be tall commercial office buildings. Directly opposite the White House will appear one monumental structure—privately erected—one apartment hotel, one church, one commercial office building—erected by the Government—and one private residence. This is hodge-podge; the worst mix-up that could be devised; inexcusable in a city preplanned as a National Capital, replanned, zoned, supervised, and sponsored by many patriotic interests. The White House, its most cherished heritage, is architecturally affronted.

Is the plan of 1901 to be definitely and finally abandoned, or is it to be maintained? Delay means abandonment because of added millions of improvements, or makes future accomplishment extravagantly expensive, if not impossible. If order is to prevail, the ban against Government buildings on Lafayette Square should be lifted and the property in jeopardy acquired before the improvements are made.

If action is not taken by this Congress the damage will be done before another Congress convenes.

Exactly the same situation holds for the Capitol frontages. The seat of government is too important to be surrounded by commercial structures. The plan of 1901 urged purchase of surrounding properties. For 25 years improvements have been made; prices have mounted. The Government has already partially carried out the great plan. In addition to the Library of Congress the Senate and House Office Buildings have been erected. A second House Office Building and

a Supreme Court Building are in immediate prospect. The balance of the properties must eventually be acquired; why allow more improvements? Last year two office buildings, this year a hotel, apartment houses.

By act of Congress neither the planning commission nor the Public Buildings Commission nor the Fine Arts Commission can even consider the purchase of property fronting the Capitol or the White House north of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Four lines of legislative action suggest themselves—

1. Definite establishment of the future character of the Capitol and White House frontages.

2. Rezoning of the areas involved against further commercial development.

3. Authorization for the various commissions to include these areas in their planning.

4. Immediate acquisition of properties for which improvements are definitely protected.

The proposals are consistent with good planning, since additional sites must be provided in the near future. They are likewise consistent with a program of economy in acquiring, before the addition of millions in improvements, property which, in the opinion of the ablest planners throughout the entire country, should eventually be controlled by the Government.

This committee offers these recommendations relating to the Capitol and the White House solely on the merits of the cases, and without regard to pending legislation relating to the acquisition of the Pennsylvania Avenue triangle, which is likewise an integral part of the plan of 1901. The committee would regret to cause any complications in the public-buildings program, with which it is in full accord, but it regards the acquisition of the frontages of our two great national monuments as of equal or paramount importance. Accomplishment of one part of the great plan at the expense of two other elements is indeed "robbing Peter to pay Paul."

In his message of December 7 the President said:

"We are embarking on an ambitious building program for the city of Washington. * * * This program should represent the best that exists in the art and science of architecture. Into these structures, which must be considered as of a permanent nature, ought to go the aspirations of the Nation, its ideals expressed in forms of beauty. * * * Let it express the soul of America. Whenever an American is at the seat of his Government, however traveled and cultured he may be, he ought to find a city of stately proportion, symmetrically laid out and adorned with the best that there is in architecture, which would arouse his imagination and stir his patriotic pride."

Submitted by—

HORACE W. PEASLEE,

Chairman the Committee on Plan of Washington of the American Institute of Architects.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 7, 1927.

REGULATION OF RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I should like to submit a unanimous-consent request. I send it to the desk, and ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

It is hereby agreed by unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business Monday, February 14, it shall take a recess until noon Tuesday, February 15, and when the Senate convenes Tuesday, the conference report on the radio bill, H. R. 9971, shall be laid before the Senate for consideration, and that after 1 o'clock p. m. no Senator shall speak more than once nor more than 15 minutes on the report or any motion concerning the report, and the Senate shall take a final vote on the conference report and all motions relating thereto at not later than 2 o'clock p. m., Tuesday, February 15.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fletcher	Johnson	Oddie
Bayard	Frazier	Jones, Wash.	Overman
Bingham	George	Kendrick	Pepper
Blease	Gerry	Keyes	Phipps
Borah	Gillett	King	Pine
Bratton	Glass	La Follette	Pittman
Broussard	Goff	Lenroot	Ransdell
Bruce	Gooding	McKellar	Reed, Mo.
Cameron	Gould	McLean	Reed, Pa.
Capper	Greene	McMaster	Robinson, Ark.
Caraway	Harreid	McNary	Schall
Couzens	Harris	Mayfield	Sheppard
Curtis	Harrison	Means	Shipstead
Dale	Hawes	Neely	Simmons
Dill	Heflin	Norris	Smith
Ferris	Howell	Nye	Smoot

Stanfield
Steck
Stephens

Stewart
Trammell
Tyson

Walsh, Mass.
Walsh, Mont.
Warren

Watson
Wheeler
Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-six Senators having assented to their names, a quorum is present. The clerk will read the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Washington.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

It is hereby agreed by unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business Monday, February 14, it shall take a recess until noon, Tuesday, February 15, and when the Senate convenes Tuesday the conference report on the radio bill (H. R. 9971) shall be laid before the Senate for consideration, and that after 1 o'clock p. m. no Senator shall speak more than once nor more than 15 minutes on the report or any motion concerning the report, and the Senate shall take a final vote on the conference report and all motions relating thereto at not later than 2 o'clock p. m., Tuesday, February 15.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the consideration of this unanimous-consent request, but I should like to state that on yesterday the question of the time limit on unanimous agreements was decided both ways by two different occupants of the chair. I do not ask the Chair for any ruling on that matter now, but I should like to understand what is contemplated by the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and if my understanding of it is correct I shall object to it.

I wish to know this: Under the proposed agreement, if a Senator offers an entirely new amendment, something that the committee has not considered at all, something that no other Senator knows anything about, as was done here yesterday on several occasions, I should like to know if the proposed agreement would keep any other Senator from discussing that new amendment, something that nobody else has heard of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will call attention to the fact that while the Senator's remarks would be relevant in other cases, this is a conference report, and amendments can not be presented to a conference report.

Mr. BLEASE. I understand that, Mr. President; but the proposed agreement also says "all motions relating thereto." Suppose some Senator makes a motion which is entirely new matter. Would the proposed agreement preclude any other Senator from discussing that new matter? Otherwise, I think the agreement is in proper form; but when an entirely new amendment is offered, such as was offered yesterday by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] on the McNary-Haugen bill, amendment after amendment embodying entirely new matter, I do not think a unanimous-consent agreement should preclude a Senator from discussing such new matter.

In the future I shall object to any unanimous-consent agreement that so provides, so far as I am personally concerned.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that the condition which arose yesterday could not possibly arise, I understand, under the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, because under the rules a conference report can not be amended. As I understand, the Senator has reference to a case yesterday where, while he was in the chair, some Senator had consumed the 15 minutes allowed under the unanimous-consent agreement on the pending amendment, and he then asked for 15 minutes more on the bill; and, as I understand, the Senator from South Carolina held that he was not entitled to it.

Although the custom here has been different, probably, in most of the debates under similar unanimous-consent agreements, I thought at the time that the Senator from South Carolina, then presiding, was absolutely correct in his decision. It has been the custom when we have had similar unanimous-consent agreements applying to bills, where an amendment was in order, for a Senator to discuss the amendment for the length of time allowed and then to say, "Now, I will take my time on the bill." It has always seemed to me that that procedure was absolutely contradictory of the unanimous-consent agreement, and I confess I was delighted yesterday when the Senator from South Carolina held in accordance with what seems to me to be the only proper course to pursue.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think the practice to which the Senator has just referred, of permitting a Senator to consume his time on the pending amendment and then to speak on the bill, where the unanimous-consent agreement provides for a limitation of time on amendments and on the bill, has resulted from unanimous consent rather than from any interpretation of the rule or construction of the agreements themselves. Undoubtedly, under such arrangements, the limitation applies to

the pending proposition, and when one has consumed his time upon the pending provision, whether it be the bill or an amendment, he is not entitled, as a matter of right, to further time.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the Senator from Arkansas say that, because I know the practice to which he refers has been followed here for a good while. As a matter of fact, when a bill is pending, and some Senator makes a motion to amend it in any particular, and that motion is stated, it is the question then pending before the Senate, and, strictly speaking, perhaps, one can not, as a matter of fact, talk on the bill. Senators may say what they please, under the rules, but they are talking on the pending motion, which is a motion to amend, and must wait to get their 15 minutes, or whatever the limitation is, on the bill, until there is no amendment pending. That is really the only time when a Senator is allowed to use his time on the bill.

We have followed the contrary practice so frequently, just running along, no one objecting, that when the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE] then presiding, decided promptly that the Senator then asking for the additional time was not entitled to it, under the unanimous-consent agreement, I was glad to hear him make that decision; and I think it is a decision which Presiding Officers ought to follow, because that is the only proper practice, it seems to me, in enforcing a unanimous-consent agreement. It does not take away from a Senator the other 15 minutes, or 10 minutes, or 30 minutes, whatever the time may be, because there will always come a time, there must come a time, before the bill is acted upon, when no amendment can be pending.

In this particular case, where the question is the adoption or the rejection of a conference report, amendment can not be made. There might be a motion to recommit, or something of that kind, but outside of that the same condition can not arise.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, on behalf of the special campaign fund committee I desire at this time to submit a report.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think the unanimous-consent agreement pending may be agreed to without further debate, if the Senator will consent that that shall be done.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am perfectly willing to wait for a few minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has heard the request for unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, this is the first I have ever heard of this unanimous-consent agreement. The Senator from Washington and I have talked about this bill at considerable length, and I had no knowledge that he was to ask for a unanimous-consent agreement this morning. I have not had opportunity to examine the form of this unanimous-consent agreement. I have not had any opportunity to discuss with those who I know are opposed to this conference report their desires with regard to debate.

I have no desire to filibuster, I will say, in connection with this matter. I have a desire to filibuster, but I do not intend to filibuster. I make that remark because of the pleasant look on the face of the Vice President. I do feel that this matter is sufficiently serious to warrant some debate on it. I think there are more Senators now who understand the measure than did understand it, but I believe there is still a chance for more of them to understand it than do now understand it.

I am receiving many telegrams from my State urging me to vote for this conference report, and informing me that things will all go to pieces, that there will be a terrible situation in this country that can not be coped with unless this report is adopted. Those telegrams come from people, most of whom, I know, know nothing on earth about this bill. Some of them, in fact, have told me that while they know nothing about the bill they think it ought to be passed immediately.

Mr. President, I supported the bill which passed the Senate. That bill had in it numerous provisions affording protection against monopoly and against discrimination, against the mistreatment of listeners in, and those things that we felt were necessary. Those matters have practically all been stricken out of the bill now reported, and this is a monopolistic bill which is dangerous in the extreme. I still have hope that this body will realize that, and will send the bill back to conference, with instructions that the life of the measure shall be limited to the last day of the next session.

Therefore I suggest to the Senator from Washington that before urging the acceptance of a unanimous-consent agreement which we have had no chance to look into, he had better withdraw it.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I want to say that I took the first opportunity to get the floor, because I know there is a motion pending, and I thought I might not be able to get it in later.

I am perfectly willing to withdraw the request temporarily, and consult the Senator further, but I wish we could have it acted on to-day, if possible, so that we might know where we stand.

Mr. PITTMAN. I object.

REPORT ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES (PT. 4, REPT. NO. 1197)

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, on behalf of the Special Campaign Funds Committee, I submit a report. I desire to speak for a moment on the report which I have submitted.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, under the rule, of course, the report submitted by the Senator from Missouri should go over. But if the Senator expects that he will take only a few minutes in explaining it, I shall not ask for that order now. However, I reserve the right to demand the regular order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I understand the Senator is merely submitting the report.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, there has been more time taken up this morning in discussing a rule that was not before the Senate than I shall take in discussing this report.

I am perfectly willing not to discuss the report. I thought that a few words of explanation would aid the Senate, and save it some work.

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection to that; but I simply wanted to know whether Senators intended to debate it or not, and to give notice that if Senators do intend to debate it to any extent, I shall demand the regular order. I have no objection to the Senator explaining the report.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I have no desire to debate the report. At the same time, I have no desire to be told just what I can talk about.

This report which is filed is not to be taken as the final report of the committee touching the duties that have been assigned to it, because the work of the committee is not yet completed.

I simply wanted to make this statement to the Senate. The report deals with the recalcitrancy of certain witnesses and calls attention to the particular testimony they gave and the questions they refused to answer. It is divided into two parts, that which relates to the Illinois situation and that which relates to the Pennsylvania situation.

In this report the committee does not recommend any particular action to the Senate, but leaves that whole question open for future action by the Senate. The purpose of submitting the report in this way, without a recommendation, is that the Senate may have the opportunity to read the evidence and the comments of the committee touching the action of the witnesses, so that on Monday, when we hope to bring in a recommendation, the Senate may be prepared to act in the light of the record which we here disclose.

On behalf of the committee I am inviting the attention of the Senate particularly to this report, because, busy as all Senators are, the question at issue is a highly important one, and it ought to receive the best thought of the Senate.

The committee will take the responsibility of making its recommendations, but it does not want to assume the responsibility that naturally devolves upon the Senate, which is that the Senate shall make its own decision after proper consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the committee make no recommendation in this report?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Not in this report. We will make a recommendation, as I have said, in a resolution which we will bring in Monday.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand it, this report calls the attention of the Senate to witnesses who have refused to answer questions?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I should think that the committee ought to recommend to the Senate what action it desires to have the Senate take in the matter.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I have stated that the committee expects to bring in a resolution of that character on Monday, but for the present we are submitting a report for the consideration of the Senate, together with the findings of the committee touching the action of certain witnesses.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator expect to get it up again Monday, then, and ask for the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I hope to do so. The committee's findings can be read in a few moments by the Members of the Senate. They will be found running from page 1 to page 3, and at that point follows the particular testimony of the witnesses referred to. It is very brief.

There is a further comment of the committee on pages 16 and 17, closing up the Illinois situation, and there is the final statement of the committee on pages 33 and 34. So that Senators who do not care to read the evidence can read the findings of the committee and get the conclusions of the committee as to the facts. We wish, however, to invite the attention of the Senate to the entire report.

Mr. OVERMAN. Has it been printed?

Mr. REED of Missouri. It is printed and ready for distribution, so that all Senators can get copies of it.

Now, Mr. President, in view of the pressure of business and the desire of the majority leader to proceed, I shall not at this time enter into any discussion of the merits of the question at issue, but allow that to remain until the committee brings in its recommendations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will lie on the table for the present.

NATIONAL-BANK BRANCHES

Mr. PEPPER and Mr. DILL addressed the Chair.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I wanted—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. May not a Senator, before the hour of 1 o'clock, demand the regular order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is the presentation of petitions and memorials. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to direct the attention of the Senate to the situation which exists with regard to H. R. 2, the banking bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. PEPPER. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Will not the Senator let the routine morning business be transacted? I have a motion that I want to present.

Mr. PEPPER. I am about to make a motion, and I shall try not to delay the Senator unduly.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand it, if the Senator makes the motion which I understand he is going to make, it would interfere with morning business and we would not have an opportunity to transact routine business.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that I am within my right, on the arrival of the hour of 1 o'clock, in moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a certain matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 1 o'clock has arrived and the Senator may make his motion.

Mr. PEPPER. I make the motion to proceed now to the consideration of a motion laying upon the President's table, which is to the effect that the Senate recede from certain Senate amendments to H. R. 2 and that the Senate concur in the amendments made by the House to certain Senate amendments to that measure. I make that motion and ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The regular order having been demanded prior to the hour of 1 o'clock, does that preclude the regular order from being carried on after 1 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The rule provides that after the conclusion of regular morning business or after the hour of 1 o'clock a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill is in order. The motion is made after the hour of 1 o'clock and accordingly it is in order at this time. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the motion is not in order until the conclusion of the routine morning business.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that Rule VII is in the alternative, reading:

Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the chair, or until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived.

Clearly, under the express provision of the rule, it is in order after 1 o'clock to make such a motion as the Senator from Pennsylvania has made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the point of order raised by the Senator from Nebraska. The Chair holds the point of order not well taken.

Mr. NORRIS. I presume we have not yet reached that stage, but in order to reach it, I may as well present it now. I presume it is the theory of the Senator from Pennsylvania that the motion is not debatable.

Mr. PEPPER. It is not.

Mr. NORRIS. I make the point of order that such a motion is not debatable when the Senate is taking up the calendar under Rule VIII, and that the pending motion is debatable.

Mr. PEPPER. I call the Chair's attention, if that were at all necessary, to the final provision of Rule VIII, which is to the effect that all motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. NORRIS. That provision follows other statements in Rule VIII and it is a part of Rule VIII that when we are considering the calendar under Rule VIII a Senator can make a motion at any time to consider a bill notwithstanding objection, and that when such a motion is made it is not subject to debate. It does not apply to the present case. We are not under Rule VIII, because we have not started to consider bills under Rule VIII.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds the point of order not well taken. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, does the Chair hold that we can not debate the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable under Rule VIII which provides that—

All motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, when this matter was up last night—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege. I submit that I am not going to be railroaded in this fashion.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the motion is not debatable.

Mr. WHEELER. When this motion was put last night I said that I would object unless it could be agreed that I should speak this morning, and the Senator from Pennsylvania agreed that he would ask the Senate that I be permitted to speak.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator can speak when the matter is before the Senate—

Mr. WHEELER. I know that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And he can not speak when the matter is not before the Senate. The Senator from Pennsylvania could not enter into an agreement that the Senate should bind itself to hear the Senator from Montana out of order.

Mr. PHIPPS and others. Regular order!

Mr. HEFLIN. It is not subject to a demand for the regular order. The Senator from Montana has a right to make his statement as a question of personal privilege. He has a right to state to this body whether or not the Senator from Pennsylvania had this agreement with him. The Senator from Pennsylvania is in charge of the bill. Let the Senate know what it is.

Mr. WHEELER. I say that the Senator from Pennsylvania did make that agreement. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] was present and, as I understand it, consented to it. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], as I understood it, was present and understood and agreed to it. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if I am not right about it.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I was not present when the agreement was made, if it was an agreement. I was told afterwards that the Senator from Pennsylvania had stated that he would ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Montana might speak for an hour on the question. As soon as I ascertained that that would carry us beyond the hour of 2 o'clock, I signified my purpose to object to it.

Mr. PEPPER. The exact fact is that last evening, after the Senator from Montana had announced his desire to speak on the pending motion, he came to me and asked whether I, as far as I was concerned, would be willing—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate is out of order. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HEFLIN. I demand the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. I understand that he would vote as I shall vote on this matter, and I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. I am informed that he would vote as I shall vote, and therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WILLIS. My colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], is unavoidably absent from the Chamber. He is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. If my colleague were present he would vote "yea" on this motion, and I understand the junior Senator from New York would also vote "yea."

Mr. McMASTER. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], is confined in the hospital. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. GILLETT. I understand that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with whom I have a general pair, would vote "yea" if he were present. Therefore I shall vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BRATTON. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON]. I am informed that if he were present, he would vote as I intend to vote, and I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

My colleague, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], is necessarily absent on account of illness. He is paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I am informed that both these Senators would vote "yea" if present and voting on this question.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS]. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] has a general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

I also wish to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST], the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. SACKETT]. If present, each of these Senators would vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I desire to announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] is necessarily absent on official business. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. STEPHENS. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. HARRISON] is necessarily detained on business of the Senate. He has a general pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE]. I am informed that both Senators, if present, would vote "yea."

Mr. BAYARD. I wish to state that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is detained on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—58

Ashurst	Gillett	McKellar	Sheppard
Bayard	Glass	McLean	Simmons
Bingham	Goff	McMaster	Smith
Blease	Gooding	McNary	Stanfield
Bratton	Gould	Mayfield	Steck
Bruce	Greene	Means	Stephens
Cameron	Harrell	Oddie	Stewart
Capper	Harris	Overman	Trammell
Caraway	Hawes	Pepper	Tyson
Couzens	Howell	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Johnson	Pine	Warren
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Watson
Ferris	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.	Willis
Fletcher	Keyes	Robinson, Ark.	
George	King	Schall	

NAYS—9

Dill	La Follette	Norris	Shipstead
Frazier	Neely	Nye	Wheeler
Heflin			

NOT VOTING—28

Borah	Ernst	Metcalf	Shortridge
Broussard	Fess	Moses	Smoot
Copeland	Gerry	Norbeck	Swanson
Deneen	Hale	Pittman	Underwood
du Pont	Harrison	Reed, Mo.	Wadsworth
Edge	Jones, N. Mex.	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Edwards	Lenroot	Sackett	Weller

So Mr. PEPPER's motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider Mr. PEPPER's motion that the Senate recede from certain Senate amendments to House bill 2, and that the Senate concur in amendments made by the House to certain Senate amendments to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The motion of Mr. PEPPER is as follows:

I move that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 1, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 35, and that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 11, 26, 30, 36, 37, 38, and 39, and to the amendment to the title to the bill (H. R. 2) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the consolidation of national banking associations," approved November 7, 1918; to amend section 5136 as amended, section 5137, section 5138 as amended, section 5142, section 5150, section 5155, section 5190, section 5200 as amended, section 5202 as amended, section 5208 as amended, section 5211 as amended, of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and to amend section 9, section 13, section 22, and section 24 of the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in order to save time, I desire to state to the Senate that I shall object to unanimous-consent agreements fixing time for final vote upon important measures that may be proposed during the remainder of this session of Congress.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. In view of the notice which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has just given, I desire to suggest that within a very short time it would be a very good precedent to apply cloture on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I rose for the purpose of asking, in view of the vote that has just been taken, a unanimous-consent agreement to fix a date for voting upon the pending motion, but, in view of the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], I pursue an alternative course and now send to the desk a motion to close debate in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII, signed as therein provided.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania to close debate is as follows:

[H. R. 2]

Motion to close debate under Rule XXII on the motion proposed by Senator PEPPER to recede from certain Senate amendments to H. R. 2 and to concur in certain House amendments to Senate amendments to the same measure.

CLOTURE MOTION ON BANKING BILL

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, move that debate be brought to a close upon the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 1, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 35 to the bill (H. R. 2) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the consolidation of national banking associations," approved November 7, 1918; to amend section 5136 as amended, section 5137, section 5138 as amended, section 5142, section 5150, section 5155, section 5190, section 5200 as amended, section 5202 as amended, section 5208 as amended, section 5211 as amended, of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and to amend section 9, section 13, section 22, and section 24 of the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes; and that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 26, 30, 36, 37, 38, and 39, and to the amendment of the Senate to the title of said bill:

Carter Glass, Wm. J. Harris, Thomas F. Bayard, Duncan U. Fletcher, Sam G. Bratton, Morris Sheppard, Henry F. Ashurst, Daniel F. Steck, Wm. Cabell Bruce, Woodbridge N. Ferris, E. I. Edwards, M. M. Neely, Lee S. Overman, A. A. Jones, Harry B. Hawes, H. D. Stephens, John B. Kendrick, Joe T. Robinson, L. D. Tyson, Earle B. Mayfield, T. H. Caraway, Kenneth McKellar, E. D. Smith, Key Pittman, F. M. Simmons, Jos. E. Ransdell, F. R. Gooding, Peter Norbeck, Walter E. Edge, Geo. P. McLean, James E. Watson, David A. Reed, George Wharton Pepper, W. B. Pine, David W. Stewart, A. R. Gould, Tasker L. Oddie, Ralph H. Cameron, R. B. Howell, Frank B. Willis, Guy D. Goff, Frederic M. Sackett, Chas. L. McNary, Frank L. Greene, Thos. D. Schall, Rice W. Means, Arthur R. Robinson, Arthur Capper, W. L. Jones, Robert N. Stanfield, Reed Smoot, L. C. Phipps, O. E. Weller, F. H. Gillett, Samuel M. Shortridge, Frederick Hale, Simeon D. Fess, Richard P. Ernst.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire whether the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania, to invoke cloture and prevent free debate, is signed by the necessary number of Senators?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The necessary number of Senators have signed the motion.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, when will the vote be had under the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the following calendar day but one. That would bring the vote on Tuesday next, one hour after the Senate shall meet.

Mr. ASHURST. The Chair holds, then, that Sunday is not a calendar day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sunday is not construed to be a legislative day.

Mr. ASHURST. I understand that, but the rule says "calendar day."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sunday is not taken into consideration.

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

APPOINTMENTS TO FEDERAL OFFICE

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to present a motion which, under the rule of the Senate, has to lie over for one day. I move that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be discharged from further consideration of Senate Resolution 338, which was referred to that committee on the legislative day February 1, calendar day February 2, 1927.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Would the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Nebraska at this time displace the unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is out of order; unless unanimous consent is given, it can not be considered.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Did the Senator from Nebraska ask unanimous consent?

Mr. NORRIS. I claim the right to offer this motion as a matter of privilege. It is a privileged motion which is provided for under the rules, and I am not asking to take it up. Under the rule it goes over one day. I think I have a right, under the rule, to offer the motion, and I am therefore not asking unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I make the point of order that the Senator can not offer the motion while the floor is held by another Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I can do so with his consent, and I have obtained his consent.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. But the Senator from Pennsylvania can not yield the floor for such a purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I desire to make the suggestion that we do not want to get into the frame of mind indicated by the suggestion of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania. During the course of the remaining days of the session it will be necessary, for the convenience of all Senators, to relax the rule which forbids a Senator holding the floor yielding for certain purposes. I think the motion of the Senator from Nebraska should be received; and I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska to advise the Senate as to the subject matter of the resolution from which the committee is to be discharged if his motion shall prevail.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I will be very glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The resolution is one reported by me from the Judiciary Committee, and provides a direction to the Judiciary Committee to investigate the charge of the sale of public offices by officers of political committees.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will my colleague yield to me for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to my colleague.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to say in reply to the statement of the Senator from Arkansas that I agree with every word he has said; that we must relax the strictness of the rules if the public business is not to suffer; but it occurs to me that the relaxation ought to be bilateral, and I resent very much the treatment to which my colleague has been exposed this morning.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I hope the junior Senator from Pennsylvania has no reference to my attitude when he refers to the treatment accorded to his colleague.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No; I have not.

Mr. NORRIS. I assure the Senator that while I am opposed to the motion the senior Senator from Pennsylvania has made, I have never interposed any tactics which would be in the nature of a filibuster or anything of that kind. I am willing that the Senate shall take a vote; I have no objection to that. The objection that I raised this morning arose because I thought the rules had been violated, but the Senate has decided otherwise and I accepted that decision.

I am not asking the junior Senator from Pennsylvania on my account to waive a single technicality of any rule that he wishes to invoke. If he has reason to make an objection to the motion which I have made, it will not offend me if he makes it. I claim the right to make the motion as a matter of privilege. If the Senate shall decide that I have not that right and shall continue every day from now until the 4th of March, as has been done this morning, to prevent the transaction of routine morning business, and can get the Senate and the Chair to carry out that kind of a program, they can preclude me from making the motion; but, even if that is done, I am not asking for any relaxation of any rule on my account. If I can not get what I want I will go without it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I did not intimate that the Senator from Nebraska had been discourteous to my colleague, but I think the situation which has been developed here has been highly discourteous to him, and I resent it. But in that statement there is no implication against the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KEYES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KEYES. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has made the motion to discharge the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from the consideration of the resolution referred to by him. It has just come to my attention that the resolution is not in legal form. I shall be only too glad to take up with the Senator from Nebraska that aspect of the case. I certainly have had no thought whatever of delaying a report on the resolution, and I think that when the law is called to his attention, he will agree that the resolution will have to be amended.

USE OF WATERS OF THE RIO GRANDE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not desire by pressing the debate on the motion to recede and concur to shut off the presentation of any matters which may be in order until 2 o'clock. I shall be glad to yield the floor to Senators who have routine business to present and go on with the debate when the matter takes its proper place before the Senate at 2 o'clock, provided such action will not in any way displace the matter that is now before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That could be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Taking advantage of the suggestion which the Senator from Pennsylvania has just made, I wish to call up Senate Joint Resolution 159 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. If there be any debate upon it whatsoever, I will withdraw the request and will not press the joint resolution, but it is a measure that should be passed without delay. It is a joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], which carries out the request which was made by the President and by the Secretary of State concerning the extension of the appointment of three individuals to furnish data on the Rio Grande and the lower Colorado Rivers. If there is any objection to the joint resolution, I shall not press it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not want to object, but I hope the Senator will not at this moment ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the joint resolution. It has just been brought to my attention, and I should like to examine it, because it affects a matter which is under consideration in both this branch of Congress and the branch at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, in that the Senator is in error; but because I do not wish to trespass upon the courtesy of the Senator from Pennsylvania, I shall not press the matter at the moment.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator, because it would not be possible for me to agree to any unanimous-consent agreement which would have the technical effect of displacing the measure now before the Senate.

BELLE FOURCHE AND CHEYENNE RIVERS

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGHAM in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. KENDRICK. I ask that Senate bill 4411 be laid before the Senate, and I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House and that conferees be appointed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that Senate bill 4411 be laid before the Senate for the purpose of moving to disagree to the amendment of the House and securing the appointment of conferees. Is there objection?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Frazier	McKellar	Sheppard
Bayard	George	McLean	Shipstead
Bingham	Glass	McMaster	Simmons
Bleasie	Goff	McNary	Smith
Borah	Gooding	Mayfield	Steck
Bratton	Gould	Means	Stephens
Broussard	Harris	Neely	Stewart
Bruce	Harrison	Norris	Trammell
Cameron	Hawes	Nye	Tyson
Capper	Heflin	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Johnson	Overman	Warren
Couzens	Jones, Wash.	Pepper	Watson
Curtis	Kendrick	Pine	Wheeler
Dale	Keyes	Ransdell	Willis
Dill	King	Reed, Pa.	
Ferris	La Follette	Robinson, Ark.	
Fletcher	Lenroot	Schall	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from Pennsylvania had yielded to the Senator from Wyoming, who made a unanimous-consent request. Does the Chair understand that the unanimous-consent request has now been withdrawn?

Mr. KENDRICK. I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a short letter from Mr. Arthur Charles Jackson, president of the International Longfellow Society, including the poem of Edwin Markham on Lincoln, the Man of the People.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGHAM in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

WASHINGTON, February 12, 1927.

MY DEAR SENATOR FRAZIER: The stately white marble Lincoln Memorial in Potomac Park was dedicated with impressive ceremonies May 30, 1922.

In its central hall is the colossal seated statue of Lincoln—above it is the following inscription:

"In this temple
As in the hearts of the people
For whom he saved the Union
The memory of
Abraham Lincoln
Is enshrined forever."

At the dedication ceremony, on Decoration Day, 1922, the only speakers were President Harding, Chief Justice Taft, Edwin Markham, and Robert R. Moton. In presenting the Memorial to the American people, Chief Justice Taft defined it as—

"A shrine at which all can worship, an altar upon which the supreme sacrifice was made for liberty; a sacred religious refuge in which those who love country and love God can find inspiration and repose."

The audience present was estimated at 100,000, and it is believed fully 1,000,000 more were listening in.

Edwin Markham read his Lincoln, regarded as the greatest of all Lincoln poems, as follows:

"LINCOLN, THE MAN OF THE PEOPLE"

By Edwin Markham

"When the Norn-mother saw the whirlwind hour,
 Greatening and darkening as it hurried on,
 She bent the strenuous heavens and came down
 To make a man to meet the mortal need.
 She took the tried clay of the common road—
 Clay warm yet with the genial heat of earth,
 Dashed through it all a strain of prophecy;
 Then mixed a laughter with the serious stuff.
 It was a stuff to wear for centuries,
 A man that matched the mountains, and compelled
 The stars to look our way and honor us.

"The color of the ground was in him, the red earth;
 The tang and odor of the primal things—
 The rectitude and patience of the rocks;
 The gladness of the wind that shakes the corn;
 The courage of the bird that dares the sea;
 The justice of the rain that loves all leaves;
 The pity of the snow that hides all scars;
 The loving kindness of the wayside well;
 The tolerance and equity of light
 That gives as freely to the shrinking weed
 As to the great oak flaring to the wind—
 To the grave's low hill as to the Matterhorn
 That shoulders out the sky.

"And so he came.
 From prairie cabin up to Capitol,
 One fair ideal led our chieftain on.
 Forevermore he burned to do his deed
 With the fine stroke and gesture of a king.
 He built the rail pile as he built the State,
 Pouring his splendid strength through every blow,
 The conscience of him testing every stroke,
 To make his deed the measure of a man.

"So came the captain with the mighty heart;
 And when the step of earthquake shook the house,
 Wrenching the rafters from their ancient hold,
 He held the ridgepole up, and spiked again
 The rafters of the home. He held his place—
 Held the long purpose like a growing tree—
 Held on through blame and faltered not at praise.
 And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
 As when a kingly cedar green with boughs
 Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
 And leaves a lonesome place against the sky."

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR CHARLES JACKSON,
 President the International Longfellow Society.

NATIONAL BANK BRANCHES

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. PEPPER'S motion to recede from certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2, and that the Senate concur in the House amendments to certain Senate amendments to that bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it seems to me that I may possibly be able to facilitate the consideration by Senators of the pending motion if I state briefly just what the points are upon which the two Houses are now in disagreement, thereby narrowing and bringing within a very small circle the issues which will have to be voted upon when the motion is finally disposed of by the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know whether it is within the view of the Senator or not; but at some time before he closes I wish he would state just what this bill does in the way of indorsing the principle of branch banking.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be very happy to comply with that request.

Mr. President, this bill was originally passed in the House, was messaged to the Senate, and the Senate made 39 amendments. Conferees were appointed, and the conference resulted in disagreement, because the House had passed an overriding resolution instructing the House conferees on certain points upon which the Senate had expressed itself so clearly that the Senate conferees did not feel that they could recede. The conference having resulted in disagreement, the House, instead of asking for a further conference or withdrawing specifically its overriding instruction, passed a resolution in which the House expressed its recession from the majority of the points of difference covered by the Senate amendments, concurred with the Senate in those cases, adhered to a few of the original

provisions of the House in spite of Senate amendments, and proposed amendments to a few of the Senate amendments, and, as amended, approved them.

That resolution having come to the Senate, the parliamentary situation was that in substance we had before us a conference report; the legislation was all but perfected; but in form it was not a conference report, because the conferees had disagreed, and the thing before us was a resolution of the House of Representatives receding from certain of its original objections to Senate amendments, insisting upon certain of the points in disagreement, and amending on others. The motion, therefore, that was made was not a motion that had to do with a conference report, but it was a motion that the Senate concur in the amendments made by the House to the Senate amendments, and that the Senate recede on the points upon which the House stood firm.

Specifically, the matters involved were these:

Thirty-nine amendments were made by the Senate. On 26 of these the House yielded to the Senate by the resolution I have just described. In the case of six points of difference the House insisted on its position, and in the case of the remaining seven the House proposed amendments to the Senate amendments. The pending resolution, if it shall be passed, will have the effect of concurrence by the Senate in those seven House amendments to Senate amendments, and of yielding to the House on the six points upon which the House stands firm.

The subject matter which is brought before the Senate by this resolution is, for the most part, unimportant. With the exception of, say, 5 of the 13 points, all of them have to do with mere numerical changes of sections, section numbers, the arrangement of paragraphs, and matters of that sort which can not give rise to debate.

Of the remaining matters, only three are of capital importance. Two, while matters of substance, are of minor importance.

The capital matters are these: The Senate, by amendment, added to the bill as it passed the House a provision modifying those terms of the Clayton Act which place a limitation upon interlocking directorates. The Senate proposed and passed an amendment, which, if acquiesced in by the House, would have liberalized the system of interlocking directorates as between State and national banks. The House refused to accept the Senate proposition, preferred the law as it stands upon the statute books to-day; and if the pending motion prevails, and this bill becomes law, no change will be made in the existing law respecting interlocking directorates.

The second matter of capital importance was this: Under the terms of the bill as it passed the House, as amended by the Senate—the amendment of the Senate in that particular having now been concurred in by the House—it is provided that national banks in cities having not less than a certain number of inhabitants may have branches in the same city in which the parent bank is located.

In some cases, notably the case of the city of Cleveland, the metropolitan area is larger than the political area of the city, and the Senate approved of a proposal to allow branch banks to be established in the same metropolitan area as that in which the parent was situated and gave to the Comptroller of the Currency, under certain restrictions that were specified, the right to define that metropolitan area, which was a little larger in extent than the technical political area.

That provision of the Senate amendment was disagreed to by the House; and if this measure shall pass and become a law, the right to establish branch banks will be limited strictly within the political limits of the municipality in which the parent is situated, without the contiguous-territory provision.

Mr. BORAH rose.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. As I understand the bill, if it is passed as now proposed, it will give the right to national banks to establish branch banks within a city in which the parent bank is located?

Mr. PEPPER. Provided that there is in the State where the question arises a legalized system of branch banking available for State institutions.

Mr. BORAH. In case the State has not provided for branch banking, do I understand then that the national banks, under this proposed law, could not establish branches?

Mr. PEPPER. They could not.

Mr. BORAH. In instances where the State has provided for branch banking, is there any limit to the number of banks which a parent bank may establish within a State?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; there is. There is a very carefully worked out scale. There can not be any branch in a city with less than 25,000 population. There may be two, I think it is, branches up to 50,000, and possibly three up to 100,000, and

beyond that at the discretion of the Comptroller of the Currency; but there is a carefully worked out scale of limitation.

When I said to the Senator from Nebraska a few moments ago that this bill will not authorize national banks to establish branches in States which do not extend such privileges to their own institutions, I did not want to be understood as meaning that the question as to the policy of the State in that regard might be settled as of the date of the passage of this act. On the contrary, the principal point of contention between the House and the Senate had to do with whether the situation should be frozen by the so-called Hull amendments, which, if adopted, would have had the effect of making it impossible for a national bank hereafter to establish a branch in a city if the law applicable to State banks was passed in the State after the date of the approval and signature of the pending bill.

Because both Houses are in concurrence on that subject, and it is removed from the realm of controversy here as it now stands, if a State does not to-day or in the immediate future authorize its own institutions to have branches, then no privileges are conferred by this bill upon national banks. If a State at any given time adopts a provision applicable to its own banks, then the national banks may take advantage of the provisions of the State law, but only in so far as concerns branches within the restricted municipal areas I have described.

Mr. BORAH. What would be the effect if a State which now gives authority for branch banking, under its law, should withdraw that authority?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that subject has been a good deal considered. My own judgment is that since this measure is designed to promote equality of opportunity for national banking associations and State banking associations, if a State were to pass a law providing that thereafter no branches should be established, it is perfectly clear to me that under this proposed law no branch bank could thereafter be established by national banks. If the State were to undertake to close up existing branches in the State, giving rise to all sorts of questions of vested rights and confiscation, it would be for the Comptroller of the Currency to decide what was the fair thing to do in exercising his power to close down branches, which is very widely given to him under this measure.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator will pardon me for asking another question—

Mr. PEPPER. I hope the Senator will ask such questions as occur to him.

Mr. BORAH. I am more interested in this question of branch banking than in any other matter contained in the bill. As I understand, the bill is designed to give national banks authority to establish branch banks in cities where the parent bank is located in States where the States permit branch banking?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; either now or hereafter.

Mr. GLASS. And it leaves to the States, I may add, the right to determine whether they will have branch banks.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from Virginia for that suggestion. It operates to call attention to the reason why the Senate and the Senate conferees were opposed to the Hull amendment. We thought they represented an unwarranted attempt on the part of the Federal Government to determine for the individual States what their branch-banking policy should be.

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

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

Mr. KING. The Senator has doubtless seen a statement in a leading financial journal of New York to the effect that this bill would be an invitation for States which do not now have branch banks to engage in such enterprises, and the further statement that the bill, in States which preclude branch banks and limit banks merely to the parent, in municipalities or throughout the State, permitting, as it does, branch banks within the limits of the municipality, would authorize the comptroller to grant permission to have branch banks within the limits of a municipality, and to the number provided in the bill, notwithstanding the fact that the State banks might not have branch banks at all.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I can not concur in the latter interpretation of the bill. It seems to me to be abundantly clear that no authority whatsoever is given to the Comptroller of the Currency or to any national banking association to establish any branch whatever anywhere unless institutions in the State, chartered under its laws and doing banking business therein, are lawfully authorized to establish branches and maintain them, and notwithstanding that the State may authorize for its own institutions state-wide branch banking, only then may the national banks have branches within the municipal limits as heretofore explained.

Mr. GLASS and Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Virginia. Then I will yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. GLASS. Not only is that the provision of this proposed enactment but the Supreme Court, in the Missouri case, has decided that a national bank may not establish a branch in a State which prohibits branches to the State banks.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield now to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. As I understand the law in Massachusetts, it limits the number of branch banks of State banks to two. Does this proposed legislation limit the number of branch banks of national banks to two?

Mr. PEPPER. This proposed law does not authorize a national bank to establish any more branches, even within the municipal area, than are permitted under the law of the State, and if there is a limitation in the local law, that is ipso facto applicable to the national situation.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am very glad to hear that. So that the limitation of two banks would be applicable to national banks?

Mr. PEPPER. That is clearly my judgment, and I think that is the design of the framers of the bill.

Mr. BORAH. Do I understand from that that in a State like Massachusetts, where the parent State bank can have only two branch banks, a national bank could have only two branch banks?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President; the act is so drawn—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is not the general impression of the bill. I will be glad to have the Senator explain it.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the view which I entertain. I do not know that the question can be decided authoritatively; every Senator must make up his own mind; but as I interpret the provisions of the bill on the subject of branch-banking privileges to national banks, there is no possibility of disturbing that equality of opportunity which is the object of the law. The purpose is, not to put national banks at an advantage as compared with State banks, but to bring them up to an equality of opportunity, and put them on the same plane, and I should think it clear that where the State law contains a limitation applicable to State institutions, that limitation ipso facto becomes applicable to a national bank.

Mr. BORAH. Now, may I ask the Senator to tell me just what was the effect of the Hull amendments?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I shall be very happy to answer that question.

I think perhaps the clearest way to answer it is by taking a supposititious case. The State of Pennsylvania, for example, is opposed to branch banking. We have no branch banking law. State institutions are not permitted to have any branch banks, by law.

If the Hull amendments had prevailed and this measure had been passed with those amendments in it, then if, at a future date, at the next session of the Pennsylvania State Legislature, if you please, the State of Pennsylvania should enact a law authorizing its own banks to have branch-banking privileges, the national banks in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh and elsewhere could not take advantage of that State law because of the accident that it was not on the statute books at the date when this bill passed and should be signed by the President. In other words, the attempt of the Hull amendments was to freeze the situation as of the date of the passage of this bill, in the hope that by so doing it would shut off anything like drives by branch banking advocates on State legislatures, to lead them to pass branch banking laws for State institutions, in order that national banks might get the benefit of them.

Mr. BORAH. Would the Hull amendments have permitted branch banking in States where branch banking was already allowed?

Mr. PEPPER. Oh, yes, Mr. President. The Hull amendment distinctively had the quality that it did not affect the substantive provisions of the bill as to branch banking. It had the specific effect that it limited the authority of the national bank to have the branches which the act specified, limiting the authority to those cases in which, as of the date of the passage of this bill, the State in question already had on its statute books the enabling legislation applicable to its own institutions.

When the bill was before it the Senate, by the very large vote of 60 to 17, rejected the Hull amendment on the theory that it was not the business of the National Government by legislation to influence one way or the other the policy of a

State legislature as respects the branch-banking policy to be set on foot in the State by that legislature. In point of fact, I think that when we consider the practical aspects of the matter it will be realized that the danger of such drives on State legislatures was very much exaggerated because, by the terms of the proposition, it will be clear that neither this bill nor the Hull amendment has anything to do with the privileges of the State institution. If there is to be a drive for the benefit of the State institutions, that drive will eventuate irrespective of anything we do or fail to do here.

So far as the national banks are concerned, since the branch-banking privileges in the most favorable cases are limited to cities with 25,000 inhabitants or over, it follows as a mere matter of statistics that there is nothing in it for the great body of national banks in the towns and cities and country districts of the State to advocate any of the legislation of the sort feared, because under the terms of this bill they do not get the right to have any branch banks at all.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McLEAN. I think it was also felt that if a State which now prohibits branch banks should change its policy and permit State banks to have such branches, the national banks of the large cities would be compelled to retire from the system and reorganize under State charters, because otherwise they could not compete with those banks having branches.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask just one further question?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is familiar, I have no doubt, with what is known as the Bank of Italy of California?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. I am informed that that bank has 98 branch banks.

Mr. PEPPER. It certainly has branches in the neighborhood of 100. We had a very elaborate series of hearings last year before the Committee on Banking and Currency in which, among other things, all the facts about the Bank of Italy were brought out and at the time I remembered the details. I can say to the Senator, without consenting to those particular figures, that there is a great branch-banking system connected with that institution.

Mr. BORAH. I may not be exactly correct as to the 98, but the number is enough.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. In what respect does the Senator conceive that this bill would be to the advantage of the Bank of Italy of California?

Mr. PEPPER. The Bank of Italy is a State bank. Its authority to have whatever branches it has or may have hereafter is derived from the State law, which is in no way affected by anything we do here. In one particular the pending bill would operate as a restraint upon State banks to the extent that if a State bank wants to convert itself into a national bank or consolidate with a national banking association, it may bring into the consolidation or conversion only those branches which it has in existence at the date of the passage of the bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, the Bank of Italy, as I understand—

Mr. PEPPER. I am going to ask the Senator just to let me finish this thought and then I will yield to him.

The State bank may not go out and hereafter establish branches under the State law and then convert itself into a national bank by consolidation or conversion and bring in those future established branches. So there is no way that occurs to me at the moment in which this legislation is of advantage to the Bank of Italy, but I can think of ways in which it would restrain the spawning by it of more branches in the future.

I yield now to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. I was just going to say that the Bank of Italy, as I understand it, has over 200 branches, probably nearly 300, and under this bill it can come into the national banking system with all those branches.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator is in error in that regard. I do not mean as respects figures, because it is true that there are a great many branches under the control of the Bank of Italy in addition to those which are technically branches within the meaning of the statement of the Senator from Idaho. My information is that the Bank of Italy has, in its capacity as a kind of holding company, the stock of some other institutions which themselves have branch banks, and that through its holding of the stock of the other institutions or

banks it has a large number of branches of the sort referred to by the Senator from Alabama in addition to those which are the direct technical branches of the institution itself.

Mr. GLASS and Mr. KING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. GLASS. As a matter of fact, the testimony before the committee was that the Bank of Italy has approximately ninety-odd branches in the State of California. Its holding company does not operate in the State of California, but outside of the State of California in the United States. This bill is distinctively restrictive upon the operations of the Bank of Italy. In other words, should it convert into a national bank it may not retain any of its branches outside of the cities of California, none of its county or country banks. On the other hand, it may not remain a member of the Federal reserve system, which it is now, and then, if it desired to become a member, undertake to bring in any branches which may be established hereafter.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Virginia or the Senator from Pennsylvania—

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Idaho may recall that I promised to yield to the Senator from Utah immediately following the Senator from Virginia. I shall be glad to yield next to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

Mr. KING. I was going to ask the Senator if it would not be more accurate to say that the Bank of Italy would derive some benefit from the legislation if it were a member of the Federal reserve system now, in that its present branch banks would be recognized; but banks in California which are members of the Federal reserve system or hereafter might become members of the Federal reserve system, and those now in existence which have branch banks, would be precluded from having branch banks other than those within the corporate limits of the parent bank, as indicated by the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. It is true, as implied in what the Senator from Utah has just said, that if a State institution, whether in California or elsewhere, has, in virtue of the local law, up-State branches at the date of the passage of the bill, it may by conversion or consolidation acquire a Federal character and bring those existing branches into the consolidation; but neither in California nor elsewhere may the State institution bring into the consolidation, or acquire the status of a national bank by conversion, and retain, in the consolidated or converted life, branches established up State after the passage of this bill.

Mr. GLASS. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania think that the Bank of Italy is not now a member of a Federal reserve system? The Senator from Utah seems to assume that it is not.

Mr. PEPPER. My impression is that the Bank of Italy is a member of the Federal reserve system.

Mr. GLASS. It is a member.

Mr. KING. I did not mean to imply that. I used it as an illustration.

Mr. GLASS. It is a member, but it may not remain a member if, after the passage of this bill, it undertakes to establish any branches not provided for in the bill.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask this question? Suppose after the passage of the bill the Bank of Italy concludes to change its bank into a national bank; could that national bank, for which it takes a charter or which it then becomes, then have 96 or 98 branches in California?

Mr. GLASS. I do not think so under the terms of the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I should be inclined to differ from the Senator from Virginia on that point.

Mr. GLASS. Does the Senator have in mind subsection (b)?

Mr. PEPPER. Under existing provisions of the Revised Statutes, if a State institution with branches converts itself into a national bank, it may retain the branches that it has. We do not change the law in that regard.

Mr. GLASS. No; we do not.

Mr. PEPPER. So that in the case put by the Senator from Idaho of the Bank of Italy converting itself into a national bank, the Bank of Italy, if the bill which we are now discussing were never enacted into law, would still have the right to bring into that consolidation the branches which it now has. That is the provision of the Revised Statutes to-day.

Mr. McLEAN. But those branches would be under the supervision of the Comptroller of the Currency, which is not the case now.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. BORAH. Am I to understand that at the present time, if the Bank of Italy should convert itself into a national bank, the Bank of Italy could have 96 or 98 branches?

Mr. PEPPER. The Bank of Italy, under the Revised Statutes as they stand to-day, may upon conversion into a national banking association or upon consolidation with a national banking association retain whatever branches it lawfully had as a State institution at the date of the conversion or consolidation.

Mr. GLASS. So that under the terms of the bill it would derive no advantage in the world with respect to the establishment of branch banks or of membership in the Federal reserve system?

Mr. PEPPER. In answer to the original question of the Senator from Idaho, I said, not so clearly, but in substance, the same thing which has just been said by the Senator from Virginia. I can think of ways in which the bill, if passed, would be restrictive in its effect upon banks of that sort, but I do not see how it is going to give them enabling powers.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator from Wisconsin will excuse me for a moment, I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question.

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. In view of the fact that, according to newspaper reports, the Bank of Italy is extending its branches and ramifications not only throughout California, but into foreign countries, I should like to know, in case the Bank of Italy should convert itself into a national bank, what restraining power there would be under this bill against extending its branches?

Mr. PEPPER. The question asked by the Senator from Idaho is a very important one and the answer is important. The branches of a State banking institution which is not nationalized are subject only to the jurisdiction of the State banking commission or secretary of banking or whatever he may be, but the instant that institution converts itself into a national banking association or by consolidation merges its life with a national banking association that instant its branches, if it has any legally established, become subject to the supervisory power of the Comptroller of the Currency and that supervisory power is tremendously far-reaching and effective.

Mr. MCLEAN. But it could not have an additional branch outside of the city limits.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. The case is as he suggests.

Mr. NORRIS rose.

Mr. HEFLIN. Now, Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska, and then I will yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question. I find myself in just a little difficulty as to whether I can make myself plain, but to my mind the matter is quite important. Using the same bank as an illustration which other Senators have been using, I desire to ask, Will this bill, should it become a law, give to the Bank of Italy any advantage so far as branch banking is concerned over any other bank not now a member of the system which may come in after the bill shall have become a law? Do I make myself plain?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President, the Senator makes himself plain. I take it that the question in his mind is something like this: Assuming the Bank of Italy to have, as is charged, monopolistic tendencies, whether there is anything in this measure which will enable it to protect itself in an existing monopoly and shut the door in the face of anybody else with similar aspirations?

Mr. NORRIS. And who may want to come in.

Mr. PEPPER. Who may want to come in. I can not see, Mr. President, any way in which such a result could be worked out. We are now talking about California, because that is a notable instance of a State with branch banking, and any banking institution of the State of California, so far as the law goes, has a right to establish as many branches as it chooses to establish and to maintain itself as a State institution with such branches. It is true that if at any given moment two State institutions convert themselves into national banks, and one of them shall have more branches than the other, the one that has the greater number of branches will enjoy this advantage over its competitor, that neither of them thereafter may establish any branches except within the limits specified by this proposed act.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand. It seems to me that, as I look at it, the Senator discloses that a bank now in with branches

would have an advantage over the bank that is now out but comes in after the passage of the proposed law in regard to the establishment of branches. In other words, is it not true that the Bank of Italy now has many branch banks that it would not be allowed to organize, should this bill be passed, if it did not already have them?

Mr. PEPPER. That is true under the existing law as well as under the bill now under consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. The practical consideration, it seems to me, that presents itself is this: The bank now having branches that comes in or is in with such branches has an advantage over the bank—and it may be its competitor—that wants to have branches but is not organized and does not come into the Federal reserve system until after the passage of this proposed law.

In other words, if, after this bill were passed, the Senator and I were going to organize a bank to compete with the Bank of Italy, and we undertook to organize branch banks in the various places where our competitor has branch banks, would we not be precluded under the law from organizing quite a number of them, while our competitor would be allowed to retain his branches, because it already had them?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if we organized as a State institution, we could take advantage of the local law and do exactly what the Bank of Italy has done. We could meet our competitor, branch for branch, all through the State.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that.

Mr. PEPPER. But when it comes to federalizing and nationalizing—

Mr. NORRIS. That is the point.

Mr. PEPPER. It is true, Mr. President, that the moment that the State institution converts itself into a national bank or consolidates with a national bank, at that moment it becomes restricted in respect of the branches which it may thereafter establish.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and those restrictions, as I understand—and I want to be informed if I am in error—those restrictions which the competing bank would have to observe do not apply now to the Bank of Italy and its branches, and if this measure should become a law, would not apply, because they are already established.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator states the matter accurately. Of course, Mr. President, the logic of the situation to which the Senator has called attention is that a State bank desiring to compete with the Bank of Italy, assuming that the Bank of Italy had nationalized, would retain its State status, develop its branches as numerous as it pleased, and carry on whatever commercial warfare it choose, meeting branch with branch.

Mr. NORRIS. But it would be outside.

Mr. PEPPER. It would be outside.

Mr. NORRIS. And it would have to remain outside the Federal reserve system. If it came in, it would have to give up some of its branches.

Mr. PEPPER. It would have to surrender some of its branches.

Mr. NORRIS. In other words, the number of branches that the parent bank may take with it will be different after the law is passed from what it is now. Is not that true?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; the branches which the converting or consolidating bank of State origin may retain will, after the passage of this law, be such branches only as it had in lawful operation at the time of the conversion or consolidation. I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Suppose a bank in lawful operation under the State law should, with its branches, apply for a charter and come into the Federal reserve system. If it had a hundred branch banks, what would be the status of it after it got into the system?

Mr. PEPPER. If a State institution operating in a State which authorizes by law state-wide branching has as of the date of the passage of the pending measure any number of branches whatsoever, it may, upon converting itself into a national banking association or consolidating with a national bank association, become a national banking association and retain the branches to which I have referred.

Mr. HEFLIN. It may bring its branches in with it. I have in my hand an item from the Los Angeles Examiner of November 26, 1926, from which I read this statement:

If the measure agreed upon by the American Bankers' Association in their convention at Los Angeles last May becomes a law, the Bank of Italy interests will naturally further expand.

The measure referred to is the McFadden bill without the Hull amendments. That newspaper seems to have the under-

standing that a bank can expand still more if it gets into the system under the McFadden bill.

Mr. PEPPER. If that is the meaning of the writer of that news item or editorial, I think he misconceives this bill. I can not think of any way by which the Bank of Italy upon the passage of the bill under consideration will gain any additional right to expand beyond that which it has to-day or would have if this bill never were enacted. On the contrary, I can think of many ways in which its liberty of expansion will be limited by the measure which we are discussing. The thing which will happen is the thing to which the Senator from Nebraska has acutely directed attention, and that is that the branch-banking institutions which have already very large families of children will be at an advantage compared with those whose children are not yet in being but are later brought to birth, because it is only those that are in being at the date of the passage of this bill which can be retained upon conversion or consolidation.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask the Senator a question. Suppose the Bank of Italy—

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield in a moment to the Senator from South Carolina. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has been claiming my attention for some moments, and I yield first to him.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if, under the bill as passed by the House, the Bank of Italy could only become nationalized on condition that it drop all of its branches outside of its home city?

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator referring to the original bill?

Mr. LENROOT. I am referring to the bill that was passed by the House.

Mr. PEPPER. I think that is true, Mr. President, as the bill came here originally.

Mr. LENROOT. Then the Senate struck that out and substituted for it this language:

Nor shall any such State bank or banks entering into such consolidation be located at a greater distance from such national banking association than is authorized by the laws of the State in the case of a consolidation or merger of two or more State banks.

I understand those are amendments that have been accepted by the House. Am I correct in that?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct, Mr. President. Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin, if I may, that under the law as it stands to-day—

Mr. LENROOT. I understand that; but the House bill would have prevented the Bank of Italy from becoming nationalized except on the condition that it gave up its branches outside of its home city.

Mr. PEPPER. I think that is true, Mr. President, in the form in which the bill passed the House in the first instance.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to go a step further with reference to acquiring—

Mr. GLASS. Right on that point, may I intervene and ask the Senator from Wisconsin of what advantage could it possibly be to the Bank of Italy in those circumstances to nationalize?

Mr. LENROOT. I was just getting at the facts.

Mr. GLASS. It is already a member of the Federal reserve system, and it has its branches. It seems to me that nothing could induce it to put itself under the provisions of the House bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Wisconsin is just taking that institution as a type.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes, and I am just trying to get at the facts now and not arguing the effect of them.

With reference to the Senate amendment and as to its effect upon the Bank of Italy, is it not true that under the amendment which has now been accepted the Bank of Italy could organize State banks in every place in California where it saw fit, and then, having organized the State banks, could take them over, and they would be lawful under this bill?

Mr. PEPPER. I am not entirely sure that I understand the Senator's question. He asks whether the Bank of Italy might not organize State banks in various parts of California and then take them over?

Mr. LENROOT. After they became nationalized.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator mean to ask whether the Bank of Italy after the passage of this bill might under the State law establish additional branches?

Mr. LENROOT. That would be the effect of it; and would not the prohibition found in the bill against the establishment of branches by the Bank of Italy after being nationalized be circumvented by other provisions of the bill by which they would organize State banks and then consolidate those State

banks with the Bank of Italy, and would they not thereafter, in effect, be lawful branches?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is touching now a matter of very great importance—

Mr. LENROOT. I think so.

Mr. PEPPER. But one with which neither the committee nor the House nor the Senate has dealt.

Mr. LENROOT. The House dealt with it.

Mr. PEPPER. I think not, Mr. President.

Mr. LENROOT. I think so.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is now dealing with the subject of chain banking.

Mr. LENROOT. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. PEPPER. He is putting a case in which an institution becomes, through stock ownership or other intercorporate relation, the controlling owner of scattered institutions, each of which exists on its own charter and has its own capital stock, which may or may not be held by the central organization. We had a lot of evidence before us respecting the dangers of chain banking, but we did not think we could add to our troubles by considering them.

Mr. LENROOT. No; that, perhaps, we could not deal with; but I want to know the fact as to whether under this bill that separate ownership might not be consolidated, and in effect extend the system of branch banking in a State that did not prohibit it?

Mr. PEPPER. Under existing law, in the case put by the Senator, the Bank of Italy might establish branches in addition to those that it has, effect a consolidation, and then consolidate itself with a national bank; or, if the bill in controversy becomes law, it might effect direct consolidation without the intermediate step.

Mr. LENROOT. That is the fact I wanted to get. Of course, under the House bill that could not have been done.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not clear about that, Mr. President. As I read the language of the House bill, it seems to me that there is nothing in that language which would have prevented the State institution from acquiring, by stock ownership, the control of any number of banks in a State.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no; that might be, but they could not merge them with the institution. They might have an ownership through stock control, but they still would have independent corporate existences.

Mr. PEPPER. I thought the Senator was looking for loopholes in the bill through the means of which it might be circumvented.

Mr. LENROOT. No; not in that way; but the bill does prevent the extension of branches in the future.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LENROOT. My point was that those controlling a parent bank might organize a State bank, and then, under the provision of the law, consolidate with the parent bank and have a lawful branch.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct, sir; and of course it is no answer to the implied objection of the Senator that that point is not now in controversy between the Houses—

Mr. LENROOT. No.

Mr. PEPPER. Because that is aside from the question that the Senator is raising; but it will be remembered that while this question of branch banking is the subject matter in which most Senators are interested, the fact is that the two Houses are now together on the subject of branch banking. There is no point in controversy respecting that whole subject, saving only the point I mentioned a while ago relating to the inclusion of contiguous territory, by action of the comptroller, within the limits of the metropolitan area in which the parent may establish a branch. The House took the conservative, the restrictive view on that subject, and rejected the Senate amendment; and if the pending motion is agreed to, the Senate will recede from its amendment on that subject and accept the original provisions of the House bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Just one further question.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Is there anything left in disagreement between the two Houses that affects even remotely the question of branch banking?

Mr. PEPPER. Only the question of contiguous territory.

Mr. LENROOT. I meant aside from that.

Mr. PEPPER. That is all.

Mr. President, it is very hard in this kind of a desultory discussion to keep one's thread. I began in an effort to state what the three major points of difference between the Houses are and the two minor points of difference, regarding all the others as negligible, because they are merely clerical in their nature and have to do with section numbers.

I had mentioned the insistence by the House on its view regarding the interlocking-directorate question; and, if the pending motion is agreed to, the Senate will yield to the House on that matter, and the law will stand as it now stands under the Clayton Act.

The second point of substantial difference which I mentioned was the contiguous-territory provision.

The third point of substantial difference is that which deals with the subject of the purchase and sale of investment securities. The House took a more conservative view than the Senate on that subject; and the provisions of the existing law will stand if the pending motion is agreed to, saving that the Comptroller of the Currency is given much more power to grasp the situation and control it than at present.

Mr. SMITH. Has the Senator explained the contiguous-territory provision?

Mr. PEPPER. In answer to the question of the Senator from South Carolina I will say that before he entered the Chamber I did explain that the pending motion, if agreed to by the Senate, will have the effect of excluding from the bill the Senate amendment on the subject of contiguous territory, and leaving it, on that point, in the form in which it originally passed the House, with some verbal changes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Utah?

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

Mr. KING. Before the Senator concludes his observations respecting the investment banking features of the bill, I desire to say that complaint has been made and some rather important criticism has been directed against the bill because it is contended, first, that it gives too much power to the banks to buy investment securities, and particularly to loan to brokers, and it will thereby encourage stock speculation; that the bill seems to be more interested in furnishing the brokers money for their speculative purposes than it is interested in some other matters that might be more meritorious. Secondly, it is contended that the bill also contains provisions which may prove very dangerous by freezing the assets and permitting too large a share of the deposits and the assets of the bank to be invested for a long period of time—to wit, five years—in real estate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let me say that so far as the last point is concerned, the two Houses are not in disagreement. We had before us a lot of testimony on the question whether a short-term mortgage, which the banks under the existing law may take, or a longer-term mortgage, was in fact the more liquid; and the weight of the testimony was to the effect that you can deal with a mortgage that has three or four or five years to run more effectually and more readily than you can with one that is going to mature inside of a year or shortly thereafter. That, however, is not a point which was in controversy.

On the subject of investment securities, which is dealt with in the first part of the Senator's question, let me say that if any such criticism as the Senator has echoed could be justly directed against part of this bill, it would have been against the Senate amendment. If the pending motion is agreed to, the Senate will recede from its amendment and adopt the conservative provisions of the House bill, which contain no grant of power at all to national banks to engage in the purchase and sale of investment securities, and merely recognize the existing practice, but give to the Comptroller of the Currency a good deal of supervisory and regulatory power in respect thereof.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that the existing practice has been abused by the banks, and that there have been too liberal loans to speculative organizations and to brokers, and too liberal expenditures by the banks in the purchase of stocks and bonds and investment securities?

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure the Senator has had my experience, and that is of hearing of this dangerous liberality in the making of loans by banks, bankers, and so forth, but that it has never actually occurred in his experience or mine.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if it be conceded that that criticism has foundation in fact, this provision of the proposed act puts a limitation upon it, in that it confides to the Comptroller of the Currency a power which he has not hitherto had of inspection and scrutiny of these very things. In other words, the intent of it is to scrutinize and restrict rather than to expand.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; it contains in its present form no grant of power to the corporation, and it does strengthen the arm of the Comptroller of the Currency and enlarge his grasp in regulating that activity.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, did not the McLean amendment attempt to modify the danger of a bank accepting certain securities as collateral in the reserve system and going out into other territories under the law and exhausting their assets—that is, their available money? Was there not introduced here about three or four years ago what is now known as the McLean amendment, giving the board of governors the power to establish a base line beyond which a bank would be penalized by a graduated, progressively increasing rate of interest?

Mr. PEPPER. There is such a provision of law as that to which the Senator refers, but I do not understand that that is in any way disturbed by the contemplated legislation.

Mr. GLASS. The progressive-rate-of-interest provision was repealed three years ago.

Mr. SMITH. Oh, no.

Mr. GLASS. Yes; it was.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think that, so far as it is possible for me to do so, I have accomplished the purpose with which I rose, which was merely to state in compact form, and for convenience of reference in the pages of the Record, the principal points which are in real controversy between the two Houses.

I have tried to show—and I hope successfully—that there are only three major points of difference and two minor points, and that in other respects the pending motion, if passed, would result in action by the Senate more conservative than the action which would have been taken had the Senate amendments on those points prevailed.

I think, therefore, Mr. President, that I can well yield the floor to those better able to discuss this matter than I.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNary in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bayard	Goff	McMaster	Schall
Blease	Harrel	McNary	Sheppard
Broussard	Harris	Mayfield	Shipstead
Bruce	Harrison	Neely	Smith
Cameron	Hawes	Norris	Smoot
Capper	Heflin	Nye	Steck
Couzens	Howell	Oddie	Stephens
Curtis	Johnson	Overman	Stewart
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Pepper	Trammell
Dill	Keyes	Phipps	Tyson
Ferris	King	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	La Follette	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
George	Lenroot	Ransdell	Warren
Gerry	McKellar	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Glass	McLean	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler

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

SENATOR FROM ARKANSAS

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I present a privileged document, being the certificate of election of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], and ask that it be received, read, and filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The certificate will be received, read, and filed.

The Chief Clerk read the certificate, as follows:

Executive Department Proclamation

STATE OF ARKANSAS.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

Know ye that whereas at the general election held November 2, 1926, pursuant to the statute made and provided, the following Democratic candidate for United States Senator received the following votes: T. H. CARAWAY, 28,166, which was a majority of the votes cast for United States Senator.

Now, therefore, I, Tom J. Terral, Governor of the State of Arkansas, by virtue of the power and authority vested in me under the constitution and laws of said State, and acting in my official capacity, do hereby declare the following to have been elected as United States Senator at the past general election held November 2, 1926: T. H. CARAWAY.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of State in the governor's office at Little Rock, Ark., this, the 15th day of December, 1926.

TOM J. TERRAL, Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

JIM B. HIGGINS, Secretary of State.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the early passage of the so-called McNary-Haugen farm relief bill, which were ordered to lie on the table. (See resolutions printed in full when laid down by the Chair in Senate proceedings of Thursday, February 10, 1927, page 3402.)

Mr. WILLIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Clyde, Ohio, praying for the prompt passage of the so-called White radio bill without amendment, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH of Montana presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of an act, entitled "A resolution expressing the desire of the people of the State of Montana to His Excellency the President of the United States of America that he take steps to negotiate a treaty with the Dominion of Canada in furtherance of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway," enacted by the twentieth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by J. E. Erickson, governor of said State, on the 7th day of February, 1927.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 8th day of February, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State*,
By CLIFFORD L. WALLAR, *Deputy*.

Senate Joint Resolution 2, introduced by Shelver, expressing the desire of the people of the State of Montana to His Excellency the President of the United States of America that he take steps to negotiate a treaty with the Dominion of Canada in furtherance of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway

Whereas a joint board of engineers, representing the United States and Canada, have officially and unanimously declared ship-channel connection between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic by way of the St. Lawrence to be practical; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence Commission of the United States, appointed to determine the need of such a waterway, has unanimously declared, in its report to the President, made December 27, 1926, that—

"The construction of the shipway from the Great Lakes to the sea is imperative both for the relief and for the future development of a vast area in the interior of the continent"; and that—

"It has been estimated that the values of a single year to the farmers alone would equal the capital cost of the waterway"; and that—

"The economic importance of the improvement would be far greater than the savings made upon the actual tonnage transported, important though that would be"; and

Whereas the growth of the State of Montana, the development of her agricultural and mineral resources, her present prosperity, and her future welfare all demand permanent relief from the existing high transportation costs to and from the markets of the world and require that freedom to enter into world commerce, now denied to her by reason of distance from the Atlantic Ocean—a situation resulting in a combined rail-and-ocean transportation cost, prohibitive to many of her potential industries and oppressive to those industries which now exist; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence waterway would give to the State of Montana a sea base 1,400 miles nearer to her eastern border than at present and by such removal would permanently lower her rail-and-ocean costs of transportation to and from world markets, would increase the demand for her agricultural products, would stimulate the development of her mineral wealth, would invite new enterprise, and, generally, would assure to her citizens an enlarged and abiding prosperity: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do most earnestly urge upon the President of the United States of America the imperative national need of such waterway, and that we do further express to him the desire of the people of the State of Montana that immediate steps be taken for the negotiation of a treaty with the Dominion of Canada in furtherance of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway.

W. S. McCORMACK,
President of the Senate,
G. T. DAVIS,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 7, 1927.

J. E. ERICKSON, *Governor*.

Filed February 7, 1927, at 2.21 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State*.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which was ordered to lie on the table:

Concurrent Resolution 1, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to restore and maintain equality to agriculture

Whereas the protective tariff system of the United States, established to protect all the industries of our country, has failed to func-

tion in such a way as to protect the producers of certain farm commodities of which there has been an exportable surplus, so that at times our farmers have been required to sell such commodities in a competitive world market, while by reason of such protective tariff system they have been required to purchase most of their necessities in a stabilized and highly protected domestic market, with the result that there has been a great and increasing disparity in the prices our farmers receive for what they sell with those which they have had to pay for what they buy, creating a real crisis, which has for a long time existed and does still exist, not only in the Nation's agriculture, but in all industries dependent on agriculture; and

Whereas to remove such disparity in prices and to provide and maintain equality to agriculture with the other industries of this country, it is absolutely necessary that our farmers receive an American price based on an American standard for their product consumed domestically and a world price only for the exportable surplus consumed abroad: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States at its present sitting and without further delay be, and the same is, urgently petitioned to enact such legislation as will extend the protective system and the benefits thereunder to the farmers, regardless of a surplus of any farm crop, whereby they will receive an American price for what is consumed domestically independent of the world price for the surplus, and that only in such manner can equality to agriculture be restored and maintained;

That to secure this end and to provide the necessary relief, and thereafter to maintain agricultural prosperity, legislation sponsored by the Mid West farm organizations providing for the creation of a Federal farm board and an export corporation thereunder, the segregation of the exportable surplus of all farm commodities and the collection of an equalization fee on each commodity affected is indispensable and should be speedily enacted into law; be it further

Resolved, That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the chairmen of the Agricultural Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to each Member in Congress from Minnesota.

JOHN A. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

W. I. NOLAN,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 13th day of January, 1927.

JOHN L. LEVIN,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 18th day of January, 1927.

GEO. W. PEACHEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved January 20, 1927.

THEODORE CHRISTIANSON, *Governor*.

Filed January 20, 1927.

MIKE HOLM, *Secretary of State*.

I, Mike Holm, secretary of state of the State of Minnesota and keeper of the great seal, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house file No. 8, as shown by the records in my office.

[SEAL.]

MIKE HOLM, *Secretary of State*.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD also presented resolutions adopted by the State Agricultural Society of Minnesota, protesting against the passage of the bills S. 4944 and H. R. 15540, which propose to make changes in the farm loan act, under which the Federal land banks and intermediate credit banks are now operated and which "tend to remove from the stockholders of these banks their operation, control, and inspection as now performed by the Federal Farm Loan Board," etc., which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the State Agricultural Society of Minnesota, favoring the passage of the so-called McNary-Haugen farm relief bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the State Agricultural Society of Minnesota, favoring the establishment of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence ship channel and the taking of immediate steps for the negotiation of a treaty with Great Britain and Canada to effectuate such end, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Faribault, Willmar, and Moorehead, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased compensation to employees of the United States Custodian Service, with a minimum wage of \$1,200 per annum, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minneapolis and Willmar, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the prompt passage of legislation granting increased pensions to

Civil War veterans and their widows, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Hutchinson, Faribault, Morristown, Warsaw, Willmar, and Brainerd, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. DALE, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16461) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1468) thereon.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 1130) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Wayne County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Detroit, State of Michigan, two obsolete brass cannons (Rept. No. 1472); and

A bill (H. R. 10504) to amend the act approved June 4, 1897, by authorizing an increase in the cost of lands to be embraced in the Shiloh National Military Park, Pittsburg Landing, Tenn. (Rept. No. 1473).

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. STEWART. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 5620) granting the consent of Congress to John R. Scott, Thomas J. Scott, E. E. Green, and Baxter L. Brown, their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River, and I submit a report (No. 1469) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment was, on page 1, line 10, after the word "opposite," to insert "in the State of Illinois," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to John R. Scott, Thomas J. Scott, E. E. Green, and Baxter L. Brown, their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between a point at or near the northern city limits of the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, and a point opposite in the State of Illinois, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon John R. Scott, Thomas J. Scott, E. E. Green, and Baxter L. Brown, their successors and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches and terminals as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in condemnation and expropriation of property in such State.

SEC. 3. The said John R. Scott, Thomas J. Scott, E. E. Green, and Baxter L. Brown, their successors and assigns, are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. After the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Missouri, the State of Illinois, any political subdivision of either of such States, within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches, and any interest in real property necessary therefor, by purchase or by condemnation in accordance with the laws of either of such States governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation. If at any time after the expiration of 20 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value, (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property, (3) actual financing and promotion cost, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interest in real property, and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

SEC. 5. If such bridge shall be taken over or acquired by the States or political subdivisions thereof as provided in section 4 of this act, and if tolls are charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches, to pay an adequate return on the cost thereof, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period not to exceed 25 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient to pay the cost of acquiring the bridge and its approaches shall have been provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper care, repair, maintenance, and operation of the bridge and its approaches. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for operating, repairing, and maintaining the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 6. The said John R. Scott, Thomas J. Scott, E. E. Green, and Baxter L. Brown, their successors and assigns, shall within 90 days after the completion of such bridge file with the Secretary of War a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge investigate the actual cost of constructing the same, and for such purposes the said John R. Scott, Thomas J. Scott, E. E. Green, and Baxter L. Brown, their successors and assigns, shall make available all of its records in connection with the financing and the construction thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to actual original cost of the bridge shall be conclusive, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 7. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to John R. Scott, Thomas J. Scott, E. E. Green, and Baxter L. Brown, their successors and assigns, and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

SEC. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. STEWART. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 5598) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Ohio River approximately midway between the city of Owensboro, Ky., and Rockport, Ind., and I submit a report (No. 1470) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge authorized by act of Congress approved June 12, 1926, to be built across the Ohio River between the city of Owensboro, Davless County, Ky., and Rockport, Spencer County, Ind., are hereby extended one year and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS TUG FORK

Mr. STEWART. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 5588) granting the consent of Congress to the Big Sandy & Cumberland Railroad Co. to construct and maintain and operate a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River, at Devon, Mingo County, W. Va., and I submit a report (No. 1471) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment was, on page 2, after line 6, to insert the following sections:

SEC. 2. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted

to the Big Sandy & Cumberland Railroad Co., its successors and assigns, and any corporation to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise is hereby authorized to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Big Sandy & Cumberland Railroad Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Virginia and authorized to do business in the State of West Virginia, and operate railways in Kentucky, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at Devon, Mingo County, W. Va., where the said Tug Fork forms the boundary line between the States of West Virginia and Kentucky, in accordance with the provisions of the act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters, approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the Big Sandy & Cumberland Railroad Co., its successors and assigns, and any corporation to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act, is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Big Sandy & Cumberland Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at Devon, Mingo County, W. Va."

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 12, 1927, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following bills:

S. 4727. An act to provide for the widening of Nichols Avenue between Good Hope Road and S Street SE., in the District of Columbia; and

S. 4553. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay from a point in Baltimore County to a point in Kent County, in the State of Maryland.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A bill (S. 5686) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 5687) granting an increase of pension to Margery Warren (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWES:

A bill (S. 5688) granting an increase of pension to Lucy R. Steckel (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McMASTER (for Mr. NORBECK):

A bill (S. 5689) granting a pension to Martha E. Jones; and A bill (S. 5690) granting a pension to Louise Schmit; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH:

A bill (S. 5691) granting a pension to George C. Ezell; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5692) granting permission for the laying of pipes for the transmission of steam along the alley between lots Nos. 5 and 32, in square No. 225; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 5693) to correct the naval record of Marion R. McLelland; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 5694) granting a pension to Dennett H. Mosely; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 5696) to amend the United States grain standards act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 5697) to amend sections 311 and 313 of the tariff act of 1922, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

COMMEMORATION OF DEDICATION OF RUSHMORE MOUNTAIN, S. DAK.

Mr. McMASTER. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill and to occupy a short time explaining the purpose of the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received.

The bill (S. 5695) authorizing the coinage of silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the dedication of Rushmore Mountain, located within Harney National Forest, S. Dak., for the carving thereon of a heroic monument commemorating the deeds of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt in the founding, preservation, and territorial expansion of the Republic, and in memory of Calvin Coolidge, President of the United States of America, in whose administration this memorial was begun, was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator asks unanimous consent to address the Senate for a short time. Is there objection. The Chair hears none, and recognizes the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McMASTER. I desire to say, Mr. President, that my colleague [Mr. NORBECK], who is confined in a hospital at the present time, is the real father of the bill which I have just introduced. He has devoted much work and displayed great enthusiasm in his indefatigable efforts to laying the foundation plans for this great memorial.

In 1925 Congress passed an act authorizing the State of South Dakota, through a commission, to undertake the building of a monument of national character to be located in the Harney National Forest in the famous Black Hills section of South Dakota. The original object of the memorial was to commemorate the birth as well as the preservation of the Republic through the carving of two colossal statues of Washington and Lincoln; but, owing to the fact that there has been great national interest aroused in the erection of the memorial, it has been decided to enlarge its historical import by including not only the formation and preservation but the development, expansion, and growth of the Republic.

The State of South Dakota occupies a peculiar position from a historical standpoint in that great drama of the development of that vast empire in the West that is comprised within the area known as the Louisiana Purchase. The story of the relation of South Dakota to those great epoch-making events is as follows:

In 1742 the King of France, seeking to outflank the British colonies on the west and the north, dispatched to America that intrepid explorer Cavalier La Verendrye. From Quebec he moved southward, and finally reached the point on the Missouri River which is opposite to the city of Pierre, where is now located the capital of South Dakota.

There on a lonely eminence he planted a plate of lead bearing the inscription that all the territory lying to the north and to the south and to the west should henceforth come under the jurisdiction and into the possession of France. The establishing the facts concerning this event through the diary of La Verendrye assisted France materially in maintaining its claim to that great empire of the West. Only a few years ago the leaden plate was unearthed, and this priceless historic relic now reposes in the Capitol Building of the State of South Dakota.

In 1756 this territory was ceded by France to Spain and in 1803 Spain transferred it back again to the First Consul of France, Napoleon Bonaparte. Then it was that Jefferson, through his foresight and wisdom, brought about what is known as the Louisiana Purchase. Then came the settlement in the southwestern country, out of which developed the Republic of Texas, which soon became a part of the Union. Then came the Mexican War, then the acquisition of California and the purchase of Oregon.

I wish to say in this connection that the sculptural features of the proposed memorial consists, first, of a colossal portrait of George Washington, chiseled in granite, 60 feet high, on the right of which will be a colossal portrait of Thomas Jefferson, who conceived the importance of the Louisiana Purchase; and to the left a portrait of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, and also a portrait of Roosevelt, because of the fact that he brought about the consummation of the construction of the Panama Canal, which fulfills the prophecy of Christopher Columbus. In the background of these sculptures, chiseled in granite, will also be an entablature vividly portraying the rapid sequence, the great historic events of the Republic of Texas being admitted to the Union, the acquisition of California, the acquisition of the Oregon Territory, the purchase of Alaska from Russia, and also the cession of the Floridas by Spain.

In a word, Mr. President, the object of this great memorial is to commemorate by a story carved in stone one of the most colossal events in all history—the birth, the preservation, the development, and expansion of this Republic.

On account of the national character of this memorial, on account of its historical importance, the bill which I have introduced asks that Congress cause to be struck at the United States mint certain suitable memorial coins which will assist the committee in the great work it has undertaken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT TO SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ODDIE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the second deficiency appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1927, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

Under the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Mines, insert at the proper place the following:

"For mineral mining investigations, \$25,000; for economics of mineral industries, \$40,000; for operating mine rescue cars and stations, \$55,500; and for investigating mine accidents, \$35,000."

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that on February 10, 1927, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 3634. An act providing for the preparation of a biennial index to State legislation; and

S. 3928. An act authorizing the designation of an ex officio Commissioner for Alaska for each of the executive departments of the United States, and for other purposes.

BELLE FOURCHE AND CHEYENNE RIVERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4411) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of South Dakota and Wyoming with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Belle Fourche and Cheyenne Rivers and other streams in which such States are jointly interested, which was, on page 2, line 6, after the word "into," to insert:

Provided, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the reclamation fund \$1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay the expenses of such Federal participation.

Mr. KENDRICK. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. JONES of Washington, and Mr. KENDRICK conferees on the part of the Senate.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND PREPAREDNESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TYSON

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, on February 11 my colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TYSON], delivered a notable address at the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, his subject being "National defense and national preparedness." I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The address is as follows:

I desire to express my appreciation of the honor you have conferred upon me in inviting me to be present and address you on this occasion.

The subject of my discourse to-day is the most important that can occupy the attention of any people and one that has occupied the attention of every nation of the world, great and small, from the beginning of time down to this good hour.

I believe that I am well within the bounds of truth when I say that in proportion to the consideration and the persistent attention that has been given to this subject have the greatness and permanency of all the nations of the world been measured.

The oldest and the truest of all maxims is that "self-preservation is the first law of nature."

We have several tragic examples of ancient nations now existing which have never been prepared for war.

China and India, together, have over 700,000,000 human beings; they contain more than two-fifths of all the people of the earth, and yet India is a subject nation to another nation with one-sixth of its population and situated nearly 10,000 miles away. China, the most populous nation of the world, has been for a hundred years the prey of a dozen

European nations of one-tenth its size and population. All due to the lack of preparedness for war and of national defense.

It can be truly said that not more than five nations of the world to-day with a combined population of less than 300,000,000 people are dominating and practically controlling the rest of the world of 1,800,000,000 people.

Madame Chairman, let me repeat that this is now, always has been, and always will be the greatest subject that can occupy and hold a nation.

The whole earth is strewn with the wreck and ruins and decay of peoples, of nations, of empires, mostly due to inadequate preparedness or inadequate provisions for national defense.

Assyria, Babylon, Rome, Greece, Carthage, Egypt, China, India, Arabia, the Mussulman Empire, where are they? If we are wise, we will profit by their example.

The United States of America is the most remarkable Nation that history records. In the course of 150 years we have risen from a small and insignificant Nation to be the greatest, the most powerful, and the richest Nation of the world.

It has been said that all the nations of the world hate us. I am not willing to believe that they go as far as that, but I do believe most of the nations of Europe greatly dislike us at this time. It is most unfortunate that this is true, and there is no justification for most of it, but I believe much of it is due to our attitude and action in regard to the League of Nations. Our allies of the World War believe we were guilty of an act of perfidy in not going into the League of Nations, thereby failing to do our part to maintain the peace of the world.

They feel that the League of Nations was largely our plan—at least it was the plan of our leader—and that it was through his influence that the treaty of Versailles was signed, containing the covenant of the league, and that all the Allies signed and ratified, thereby binding them, and that, although we signed the treaty through our representatives, we refused to ratify and left them to carry out and be bound by a treaty into which we had induced them to enter and then refused to be bound ourselves. This, added to natural jealousy and the debt question, is the cause of their dislike.

Madame President, 10 years ago the United States of America had a world-wide reputation for standing only for the right. Within that time she put 5,000,000 men into the World War; spent \$40,000,000,000 of treasure; loaned the Allies \$10,000,000,000; sent 2,000,000 of her sons 3,000 miles across the sea to fight in the greatest war of all time and saved the freedom of the world.

And yet to-day it is said she has not a friend in all the world.

If that be true, Madame President, taking example by the past and looking to the future of our country and realizing the great struggle in which nearly the whole world was involved so recently, it behooves us to take no unnecessary chances, and we should leave nothing undone which should be done to properly prepare our country for any defense that it may be necessary to make.

While by far the greatest part of my life has been spent as a civilian, at the same time I was trained for a soldier and I have served actively in all the wars in which this country has been engaged since I became of age.

I hate war. It is the most horrible and the most dreadful scourge that has ever afflicted mankind, and no nation ought ever to consent to make war unless attacked and until all honorable means have first been tried to prevent war.

No one ought to be a pacifist. There are many misguided persons who feel that we should not fight under any circumstances, and their whole propaganda is peace at any price. That is the surest way of ultimately causing war and bringing disaster to a nation.

There are some who are opposed to all force. They believe that all physical force is wrong; that public opinion alone should always control, and if left alone that public opinion will finally solve all problems and solve them in the right way.

Madame President, I will agree that public opinion in the long run will prevail in a democracy, but the question is, What is public opinion and when do you know what public opinion is?

Before public opinion can become known it must be resolved into law, and the law is the only thing that can be enforced. There are two things required to enforce a law. First, public opinion; and second, physical force.

Public opinion alone never enforced a law. Physical force may do so temporarily, but it can not for a long period prevail over public opinion except by great and overpowering physical strength and numbers.

It is said that might does not make right, but there is one thing that we must always remember, and that is that we can not have right for any length of time unless it is backed up by the power of physical might.

Every decree of a court is based upon law which is the expression of public opinion, and this must have in its last analysis the physical power of the sheriff and his posse to insure obedience.

And so the peace and order of society in any nation finally rests upon the power of its armed forces.

National preparedness and national defense are inseparably associated with the Army and the Navy. The condition and organization of these two branches of the two great services are the things that are most considered when we speak of preparedness and national defense, but they are not by any means the only things to be considered, for the day has come, as shown in the last war, that now not only the men and women engaged in the actual operations of war but the whole Nation behind the lines, including factories, farms, and every activity of a nation is used in war, and the elements and conditions obtaining behind the lines are as vital to success as those even in the very battle front.

Unfortunately for us the United States has gone into every war of importance that she has fought almost wholly unprepared. Of course, it was to be expected that we would have little if any preparation in our struggle against England in the Revolutionary War, but we declared war on Great Britain in 1812, 30 years afterwards utterly unprepared, and nothing but good fortune and the fact that Britain was in the throes of a desperate struggle with Napoleon kept us from a great disaster.

Our country had no army worthy of the name so far as size was concerned in 1861 when it went into one of the greatest struggles in history. Had the United States had an army of 50,000 men and 3,000 trained officers the battle of Bull Run, of course, would have been another story; that war would have been much shorter; vast treasure and untold suffering and countless lives might have been saved.

But, Madame President, we learned nothing even from that war, for nothing was done for 30 years to prepare for any future war so far as the Army was concerned.

It will be observed that the intervals between wars in our country have been about every 30 years.

We had begun to realize the necessity for having a Navy and we had built a fairly good Navy when the Spanish American War came so suddenly upon us.

We had done practically nothing in the way of preparation. We had only 25,000 men and 2,000 officers in the Regular Army and these were scattered in small posts and detachments over this great country from Maine to California.

There were but small supplies of arms and ammunition. There was no surplus clothing, no medicines, no organization of those things so essential for an army.

At that time the United States was already one of the richest Nations of the world, and yet the volunteer army that came crowding to the colors, in overwhelming numbers, from every part of the country was one of the poorest supplied and the poorest equipped armies that ever went to battle.

This was the first army that the United States had ever sent across the sea. We sent 15,000 men to Cuba, 5,000 to Porto Rico, and several thousand 10,000 miles away, to the far-off Philippine Islands.

Never have the sons of America flocked more readily or more enthusiastically to the colors than they did in the Spanish-American War.

And while few of them died in battle, hundreds died from unsanitary surroundings, ignorance and neglect by reason of the want of medical supplies, and proper medical treatment.

The Navy fortunately was efficient and well supplied and won two great victories in Manila Bay and at Santiago, and thus enabled the Army to win the battles on land and end the war.

Few people appreciate the value of the Spanish-American War to the American people. Aside from any material advantage that we gained, it brought home to us the necessity of preparedness, especially in sanitation and medical supplies, and many other essentials of war.

And not only that, but the organization of the Spanish-American War veterans and their activities in helping to bring to the attention of the country the necessity for preparedness for war had a very salutary effect upon the country and was one of the greatest ultimate influences in securing the passage of the national defense act or reorganization of the Army in 1916.

In 1904 the Spanish-American War Veterans wrote into their constitution as among the objects of their organization, "To encourage and promote the maintenance of an adequate Military and Naval Establishment in our country and an efficient military and naval force in the several States, with a proper system for organizing a volunteer Army in time of war; to educate our people to a sense of the necessity for making provision for national defense, and to the importance of educating and training the youth of our land, so that they may be able sufficiently to serve their country and defend the flag in time of war."

This was the first public utterance in behalf of a national defense act.

In this act three different departments were provided:

First, the Regular Army and this Army was to consist of 175,000 men.

Second, it provided for a Reserve Officers' Training Corps, so that students at colleges might have proper military training, and

Third, it provided for citizens' military training camps and Reserve Corps officers to be attached to the service in time of great emergency.

By reason of the lesson of the Spanish-American War we had supplies and full preparation made to equip 500,000 men when we went into the World War. While this amount of supplies was thought to be ample, it was soon found that they would be only a fraction of the amount that would be required, for by October, 1917, we had over a million men enlisted in the service, and in a few months thereafter 2,000,000, and by the middle of the following summer 4,000,000.

Now, with the lessons of the past, if a catastrophe should overtake us by virtue of our failure to prepare, we would have only ourselves to blame.

I am glad to be able to say to you, however, that although we are not prepared as well as we ought to be, at the same time, I believe we are fairly well prepared to meet the probable contingencies that may arise in the near future.

The World War caused us to pass what is known as the national defense act in 1920, two years after the war closed. This act was drawn under the supervision and by the direction and the approval of our great commander in the World War, Gen. John J. Pershing, who was at that time the Chief of Staff of the United States Army. This act provided for an Army of 280,000 men. It provided for a National Guard of 435,000 and a Reserve Corps of an indefinite number of men, which would take in all the man power of the Nation and make them available for national defense.

In this act we laid out and defined a national military policy, and that policy was and is that the United States must always have an adequate national defense.

This was the first time that we had laid out and defined a national military policy for this country, notwithstanding the fact that we had been a Nation for more than 140 years.

The forces provided for in the national defense act of 1920 have not been maintained, however.

The Army for 1927 is fixed at 118,750 men, and about 10,500 officers.

There has been a great deal of dissatisfaction and criticism as to the air forces of the Army and the Navy. Last year the Congress passed a bill providing for a great increase in the air forces of both the Army and the Navy, and a great number of new planes and a greatly increased personnel in both the Army and the Navy is to be made, to be extended over a period of five years.

When these new planes are built and this additional personnel is provided, it is believed that the air forces of the Army and the Navy will at least compare favorably with any other nation of the world and be adequate for the national defense.

In addition to the forces provided for above, there is in many States now an effective organization of National Guards, which is supported jointly by the States and the United States. These troops are for the use of the States first, and when needed can be called into the service of the United States.

There is a large force of reserve officers, and at least 1,000,000 men who would be available from the World War.

There has never been a time when the Regular Army officers were so well trained or when they worked so hard or were so efficient. To-day the Army is a great school and every officer is examined at intervals and he has to stand high or he is dropped. The only question is, are there enough men and are there enough officers to meet any emergency that is likely to arise?

The Army and the Navy are the agencies for our preservation as a Nation. It will be all right if we have more than we need in a war, but what if we did not have enough and the war should be lost?

I have not spoken of the Navy, and, of course, the Navy is as important if not more important than the Army in the matter of preparedness, because the Navy is the first line of defense, and if a war comes there is no time to build a navy. It must be ready to go right into battle and protect the country while the Army is concentrating or preparing. Of late there has been much discussion as to the condition and size of our Navy. At the close of the World War we had the greatest Navy in the world either built or building.

It has been said that if we had completed all the ships that we scrapped under the terms of the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments and had we built a sufficient number of cruisers, submarines, and other auxiliary ships to round out the Navy, which we would probably have done had it not been for the conference, we would have had a navy powerful enough to withstand the combined navies of the world now in existence. This would have guaranteed us absolute protection from the sea, but it would have cost an enormous amount of money. The ships we scrapped had already cost \$150,000,000, and it would have cost \$250,000,000 more to complete them.

Much complaint has been made about the sinking of these ships, but if we have no war in the next 10 years, and there seems little prospect of any, the United States has saved not less than \$500,000,000 by the armament conference, to say nothing of showing her great desire for and will to sacrifice for peace.

While the limitation of armaments was confined to two classes of ships—battleships and carriers—and while we have not yet been able to get the nations of the world to agree to extend it to other classes

of ships, we still have the hope that there will be another naval conference at some time in the near future at which we may extend the limitation of armament to all classes of ships. This will be a great boon to peace and the economical administration of the Governments of the world.

As you will remember, the limitations of armaments conference provided that the ratio for ships in regard to capital ships and carriers should be on the basis of 5-5-3—Great Britain 5 and the United States 5, Japan 3, France and Italy each 1.67. That is to say, Great Britain and the United States were to be equal, Japan was to have 3 for every 5 we had, and France and Italy 1.67 for each ship we had. It is true that Great Britain and Japan have greatly increased the number of their ships which are in the classes where there were no limitations and we have not increased ours, but our example has without doubt had a great influence on the armaments of the world.

Without doubt the American people expect us to keep up the ratio of 5-5-3—that is, our Navy to be kept up to the point where it is as strong as the British Navy and where it is at least two-fifths stronger than Japan. While it is true that the Navy is perhaps to-day not as strong as it should be, at the same time it is believed by a great many, and especially by the President of the United States, that we have an adequate navy and one sufficiently large to meet all the needs of this country for national defense at this time.

Now, we must always take into account the cost of everything, and the present ships of the Navy cost the United States Government the enormous sum of \$883,000,000, and if they had to be replaced to-day they would cost \$1,200,000,000. It is estimated that this great fleet will have to be entirely replaced, even if nothing more is added, during every 20 years, as the efficient life of ships of the Navy is, on the average, 20 years.

The best authorities which we have in Congress in regard to the Navy feel that while our Navy is not the greatest in the world, that it is perhaps adequate for the present needs, but in view of the fact that we have just provided for several additional cruisers, and as the sentiment of Congress seems to be for a strong navy and to keep our ratio up to the 5-5-3, I do not feel that Congress will permit our Navy to fall below what it is to-day.

Personally, I do not believe it is absolutely necessary for this country to maintain as great a navy as Great Britain. We have no such impelling reasons. Great Britain's whole future and Empire itself is based upon her naval forces, as she has colonies and possessions in every part of the world which she must protect with her navy. Her food supply is brought from other countries. She could not live a week without ships coming into her harbors every day.

Not so with America; we have only Porto Rico, Panama, and Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippines as our foreign possessions, and I believe we need a navy for our protection superior only to that of Japan, but we must always maintain a navy greatly superior to Japan. Of course, a navy as large as that of Great Britain would be very gratifying to our pride but it would cost an enormous sum of money, which is not necessary now as I see it, and it would be a waste of money.

As for our Army, while perhaps it would be better to have a large army, at the same time I believe that 125,000 men will meet our needs for the present.

The number of officers, perhaps, is not large enough, 10,500 in the Regular Army, but we are doing more to train officers in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps than ever before, and we have tens of thousands of officers for the present who would be available, who were in the World War, and in addition, as I have said, there are so many men who went to the World War that for the next 10 years there will be in this country a trained force of at least 1,000,000 men that will be available in any emergency which might arise.

The Army and the Navy are the two most expensive departments which we have in all our Government, and they will remain so as long as we remain properly prepared. It is a financial burden, however great, which we must carry. It is an insurance policy for the future security and safety of the Nation, and while we should be careful to see that we do not pay a higher price for our insurance than we need to, we should ever be willing to pay as much as is necessary.

The Army and the Navy cost the country now something between \$650,000,000 and \$750,000,000 per year. War is the most expensive proposition that has ever been presented to mankind. We not only have to spend vast sums of money in maintaining an army and navy in times of peace, but if there should be war, we have to expend still greater amounts for the war, and then the pensions and compensation which we should pay to those who are wounded and disabled in the service of our country are an added source of expense which will always be with us.

While there is a great cry on the part of many for the greatest navy in the world and a larger army, we must not be taken off our feet, but we must be reasonable and not waste money, but must ever conserve our resources for in the last analysis it is money and resources that win wars. It was the great money power of the

United States and its capacity to loan money to the Allies, that won the last war, and money and resources will win the wars of the future, and that is something we must never forget.

I am for peace—the American people are for peace, but every sensible American, man and woman, must realize that we do not want peace at any price. We must ever be ready to do right by all the nations of the world, but we must at all times be ready and willing to fight for the just rights of our citizens in every part of the world whenever necessary, in order to maintain our dignity and honor as a nation. In order to do that we must be prepared by land and sea to maintain and preserve the great place which we have attained in the world.

I do not believe that Great Britain would make war upon us. We have been at peace with her for more than 100 years, and there is much more reason now for Great Britain to remain at peace with us than ever before. I feel there is no possibility of any war with France, Spain, Italy, or Germany—in short, no other country of the world, with the exception of Japan, who would possibly consider the idea of making war upon us. Japan is the only possible menace to the United States, the Philippines being so close to her that they are really a hostage; but I can not conceive that Japan could be so unwise and foolish as to make war upon us. We want only peace and good will toward her; and while she could give us trouble, perhaps, for a considerable length of time, we would ultimately ruin Japan because of our great resources and our ability to maintain ourselves for so long a time, something which Japan could not do. Furthermore, the commerce which Japan has with us is the greatest she has with any nation, and the stoppage of this trade with us would ruin her financially.

China is a great undeveloped mass of people, and one that may develop into a world power, but that is a long time in the future. No nation can be great that can not have a large navy, and China has no navy. It would take her a very long time to develop one, if ever.

If we had war with any South American nation, we would have to go to them and not wait for them to come to us, and we could take our time and fight them at our leisure.

We should cultivate friendly relations with all the Latin-American people, and let them realize that ours is a country which desires to help and build up and to maintain the Monroe doctrine, not alone for ourselves but for all the nations of the Western Hemisphere as well.

We must show to the world that while we are not militaristic neither are we pacifists, but that we are willing to go as far as any other nation in the matter of the limitations of armaments.

At the same time, we must keep up the spirit of our people. We must let the Regular Army and Navy, the National Guard, and the Reserve Corps realize that they are ever objects of our most solicitous attention; that we intend to give them everything that they should have, and we must have a large and still larger force of trained officers ever ready to meet any emergency.

When the National Guardsmen, the reserve and emergency officers, and the private soldiers realize that the Nation appreciates their services and that when they go forth to battle and come back sick, wounded, and disabled they will receive consideration at the hands of the Government commensurate with the service which they have rendered, we can feel that the proper spirit of preparedness will prevail, that Congress will always provide the necessary funds, and that we need not fear for our country, for it will ever be protected by a loyal and devoted people.

Madame President, there is another kind of preparedness which we must consider which is no less essential, and on this form of preparedness the late President Harding made the most forcible presentation which I have ever seen. On March 4, 1921, in his inaugural address he said:

"If war is again forced upon us, I earnestly hope a way may be found which will unify our individual and collective strength and consecrate all America, materially and spiritually, body and soul, to national defense. I can vision the ideal republic, where every man and woman is called under the flag for assignment to duty for whatever service, military or civic, the individual is best fitted; where we may call to universal service every plant, agency, or facility, all in the sublime sacrifice for country, and not one penny of war profits shall inure to the benefit of private individual, corporation, or combination, but all above the normal shall flow into the defense chest of the Nation. There is something inherently wrong, something out of accord with the ideals of representative democracy, when one portion of our citizenship turns its activities to private gain amid defensive war, while another is fighting, sacrificing, or dying for national preservation.

"Out of such universal service will come a new unity of spirit and purpose, a new confidence and consecration, which would make our defense impregnable, our triumph assured. Then we should have little or no disorganization in our economic, industrial, and commercial systems at home, no staggering war debts, no swollen fortunes to flout the sacrifices of our soldiers, no excuse for sedition, no pitiable slackness, no outrage of treason."

President Coolidge also said:

"A sound selective service act giving broad authority for the mobilization in time of peril of all the resources of the country, both persons

and materials, is needed to perfect our defensive policy in accordance with our ideals of equality."

Let Congress also adopt a just and fair policy that will assure to our National Guard and the great bulk of our civilians the same treatment and consideration for their injuries in defense of their country that it accords to the Regular Army and Navy.

Congress has accorded the privileges of retirement for injuries received in the World War to every class of officers except the civilians who fought as an emergency Army officer.

There were nine classes of officers who fought in the World War—the regular officer, the provisional officer, and the emergency officer of the Army; the regular officer, the provisional officer, and the emergency officer of the Navy; the regular officer, the provisional officer, and the emergency officer of the Marine Corps.

The officers in every one of these classes who were injured have been permitted to be retired under the same conditions as the Regular Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps; in all, eight classes of officers, except the emergency officers of the Army; and yet, although the emergency officers of the Army are many times in number and suffered more than any other class of officers who went to the World War, Congress has refused to give them retirement.

It is the greatest and most glaring injustice that has ever been done to any class of the Nation's defenders in the history of this Republic.

There is now pending in the Senate and House a bill to remedy this great and glaring injustice; and yet, while it has been before Congress since 1919, we have not been able to pass it, by reason of obstructive tactics on the part of some Members of the House and Senate.

As long as injustices of this kind are permitted, the morale of the old Army and the future Army are necessarily greatly impaired.

Madame President, the question is, What can your organization do to promote preparedness and national defense?

I take it that this great patriotic organization will be glad and willing to do all in its power to forward and promote everything that conduces to the defense of the Nation.

You must first and foremost give your vigorous support to the military and naval policy of the country, as outlined by the experts of the War and Navy Departments and enacted into law by the Congress of the United States.

We do not need a large standing army, but we need to carry out a military policy and a system of defense suited to our needs and to the genius of our people.

It is not enough to merely put our policy on paper. The defense of our country lies largely in the hearts, minds, and hands of our people. We must be ever watchful and jealous in guarding our national defense.

Some would render this great Nation impotent in the training of our youth in our schools and colleges and summer camps. The success of the training of our youth in this country is not so much in the conduct of those who are immediately in charge of this training, but it is in the attitude of our citizens toward it. Notwithstanding the great value of training the youth of our country to be prepared for war in a proper and legitimate way, the attitude of some of our people toward it is most extraordinary, and has a tendency to nullify the efforts of the military instructors for efficient preparedness.

Is it fair to our young men to send them into battle untrained and unfit to cope with the rigors of war?

It is our plain duty to support with all the power at our command the training of our youth, as well as the National Guard men in the various States, so that we can build up a military strength and a knowledge of the horrors of war in the minds of our citizens that will go far toward avoiding a resort to armed force.

The particular vehicles for imparting military training to the young men of the Nation are the Reserve Officers' Training Corps units in schools and colleges and the citizens' military training camps held each summer. We have some 323 Reserve Officers' Training Corps units located at 223 institutions. The total enrollment is about 120,000. We conduct citizens' military training camps throughout the United States each summer with an enrollment of about 80,000. These numbers are not so important. The important matter is that the men and women of this Nation should be fully alive to the vital necessity of this phase of preparedness and should give it their full moral support, and resist all attacks made upon it with a full knowledge that such attacks emanate from minds that would render us defenseless.

There are no organizations in this country that can do more to encourage a proper spirit toward the effort which is now being made, especially by the War Department, to train the youth of our country than your own patriotic societies, and let me in closing say to you that it is the greatest duty which you can perform to the country in aid of a proper preparedness for national defense.

FARM RELIEF—CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I am not in a position under the parliamentary rule, I appreciate, to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill known as the McNary

bill passed the Senate on yesterday, for the reason that I voted in the negative on the final passage of the bill. So I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which that bill was passed be reconsidered, and then I shall ask unanimous consent for its return from the House to the Senate, and I want to make a statement in connection with my request.

One of the amendments which every friend of the measure had agreed upon, which was approved, as I understand it, by every representative of every farm group, was that pertaining to the equalization fee being applied after the product entered into transportation or commerce. In other words, it was to eliminate that very objectionable feature which had been carried in the other bill, and which was in the bill as reported out by the committee, applying the equalization fee at the gin in the case of cotton. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], at the instance, I presume, of the chairman of the committee, offered an amendment to the bill on yesterday, to which no one thought there was any opposition, reading as follows:

In the case of cotton, the term "processing" means spinning, milling, or any manufacturing of cotton other than ginning; the term "sale" means a sale or other disposition in the United States of cotton for spinning, milling, or any manufacturing other than ginning, or for delivery outside the United States; and the term "transportation" means the acceptance of cotton by a common carrier for delivery to any person for spinning, milling, or any manufacturing of cotton other than ginning, or for delivery outside the United States; occurring after the beginning of operations by the board in respect of cotton.

On page 21, line 10, strike out the word "The" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "In the case of basic agricultural commodities other than cotton, the"

I am not making this suggestion frivolously, and I shall not press it if it does not appeal to Senators here. If it can be gotten around in some other way, very well, but there were Senators who voted for the bill yesterday in the belief that that amendment had been adopted. I know I thought it had been adopted. I suppose the chairman of the committee thought so. I am sure the author of the amendment thought it had been adopted. Yet the RECORD discloses the remarkable fact that it was not adopted by the Senate.

It does seem to me that it is a matter of extreme importance to have that amendment incorporated in the bill, and it would not disarrange anything if the measure should be brought back here and the vote reconsidered. I do not think there is a Senator here who would raise any other objection to the bill, and I do not think it would delay the bill in the slightest, or that it would precipitate any further discussion; but it merely should be incorporated, so that when the House substitutes the Senate bill that amendment will be before them.

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

Mr. Harrison. I yield.

Mr. McKellar. As appears on page 3513 of the RECORD, I offered an amendment to strike out, on page 20, from line 22, through line 2, on page 21, and to insert in lieu thereof the provision of which the Senator speaks.

Mr. Harrison. Yes; and the amendment was not adopted.

Mr. McKellar. It will be remembered that those amendments were read but not adopted at that time. Afterwards they were voted on in order, and when it came to the amendment referred to, the RECORD, on page 3517, shows the following, about one-third of the way down the page:

Mr. McKellar. I offer a further amendment, which I ask may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20 of the bill, strike out lines 22 to 25, both inclusive; and on page 21 of the bill, strike out lines 1 and 2, in the following language.

Then the Chief Clerk read. Thereupon the amendment which I offered was actually adopted, as shown by the RECORD, but it does not show the reading of the amendment by the clerk. It seems to me that all that is necessary to be done is to correct the RECORD. The amendment was offered, the amendment was read and read twice, and all that is necessary is to correct the RECORD by showing the true fact.

Mr. Harrison. Of course, if the amendment was adopted—

Mr. McKellar. If the Senator will excuse me, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD may be corrected to accord with the actual fact.

Mr. Harrison. That is all right. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that this matter was called to my attention by a Member of the House. I read the RECORD very carefully, and I could not find where that amendment had ever been adopted. It is of such importance that it ought to be corrected.

It may be that the House would adopt it; I do not know. They ought to do so.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, if I may make a suggestion, it seems to me it is a very bad precedent to set to alter the formal record which has been made of the action of the Senate, particularly on votes of this importance. It appears to me, therefore, that the procedure suggested by the Senator from Mississippi is preferable.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, if this amendment was adopted, my unanimous-consent request is not necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. The amendment was actually agreed to. Senators will remember that there was another amendment which was defeated.

Mr. HARRISON. I had not seen that the amendment was adopted.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was adopted, and there is no reason in the world why the Record should not be corrected.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It does not appear in the Record that it was adopted, and in order that our record may be unimpeached, would it not be better to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Mississippi and allow the bill to be brought back by unanimous consent and the vote reconsidered?

Mr. McNARY. I would object to that procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATSON in the chair). The Senator from Oregon objects to the request of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, what is the amendment that is proposed to be reconsidered?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read the amendment. On page 20, line 22, strike out through line 2 on page 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(2) In the case of cotton, the term "processing" means spinning, milling, or any manufacturing of cotton other than ginning; the term "sale" means a sale or other disposition in the United States of cotton for spinning, milling, or any manufacturing other than ginning, or for delivery outside the United States; and the term "transportation" means the acceptance of cotton by a common carrier for delivery to any person for spinning, milling, or any manufacturing of cotton other than ginning, or for delivery outside the United States; occurring after the beginning of operations by the board in respect of cotton.

Mr. BRUCE. Did the Senator say the amendment was adopted?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was adopted.

Mr. BRUCE. Then I have no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. The Record shows that it was adopted, but it does not show what the amendment is. It does not show that the clerk read the amendment and no one can tell what the amendment was at that particular time. That is the trouble about the proposition.

Mr. OVERMAN. What does the bill show as it went to the House?

Mr. HARRISON. The bill in its amended form has not yet been printed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under these circumstances I ask unanimous consent that the Record may show the true fact, that the amendment set forth on page 3513, to which I have called attention, was actually agreed to on page 3517.

Mr. McLEAN. Are we to understand that the Senator is making that as a motion?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I am asking unanimous consent that the Record may speak the truth; that is all.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator indicate where the amendment occurs?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATSON in the chair). The Chair desires to state that he is informed by the clerks at the desk that the amendment was finally adopted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and the Record shows it was finally adopted. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will look on page 3517, about one-third of the way down in the left-hand column in the small print—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; I see it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now, if the Senator will turn back to page 3513, at the middle of the page, he will see the amendment which was adopted. The clerk apparently, according to the Record, only read that part of it which was stricken out and did not actually read that part of the amendment which was adopted or the language which was inserted.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator allow this matter to go over for a few minutes until I have an opportunity to study it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Very gladly.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, was there a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the amendment was adopted on a division and not by yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, I renew my request for unanimous consent to correct the Record by adding on page 3517 the amendment actually adopted as shown on page 3513 of the Record, and in order to be certain about it I read the amendment.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator please state upon what page the amendment should have been inserted?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is to be inserted immediately after the paragraph under "(2)," about one-third of the way down on page 3517; in other words, after the word "cotton," and just before the words "The Vice President." I ask that the permanent Record be changed according to the correction made. The language to be inserted is:

(2) In the case of cotton, the term "processing" means spinning, milling, or any manufacturing of cotton other than ginning; the term "sale" means a sale or other disposition in the United States of cotton for spinning, milling, or any manufacturing other than ginning, or for delivery outside the United States; and the term "transportation" means the acceptance of cotton by a common carrier for delivery to any person for spinning, milling, or any manufacturing of cotton other than ginning, or for delivery outside the United States; occurring after the beginning of operations by the board in respect of cotton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that if he will ask that immediately before the words "The Vice President," where he puts the question, there be inserted the words "and insert the following," and then follow with the language to be inserted, the Record would be complete.

Mr. McKELLAR. I accept the suggestion made by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BLEASE. I would like to know what the original bill itself shows.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have sent for the amendment and for the bill as amended.

Mr. BLEASE. I think the matter ought to go over until Monday, so I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, I have found the original amendment to which I referred and have shown it to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE]. I want to renew the request I made a while ago, that on page 3606 of the Record, after the paragraph marked 2, which was stricken out, to insert the amendment which was actually adopted, as follows:

(2) In the case of cotton, the term "processing" means spinning, milling, or any manufacturing of cotton other than ginning; the term "sale" means a sale or other disposition in the United States of cotton for spinning, milling, or any manufacturing other than ginning, or for delivery outside the United States; and the term "transportation" means the acceptance of cotton by a common carrier for delivery to any person for spinning, milling, or any manufacturing of cotton other than ginning, or for delivery outside the United States; occurring after the beginning of operations by the board in respect of cotton.

The clerk informs me that that amendment was actually adopted, and we all remember that it was actually adopted. So I am asking that the permanent Record shall show that action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). The correction will be made in the Record as requested.

NATIONAL BANK BRANCHES

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. PEPPER's motion that the Senate recede from certain Senate amendments to House bill 2, and that the Senate concur in amendments made by the House to certain Senate amendments to the bill.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, the motion is pending and if no one desires further to discuss it I would like to have a vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. HEFLIN obtained the floor.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

REGULATION OF RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. DILL. A number of Senators have asked me what my purpose is regarding the taking up of the conference report on the radio bill. In the light of statements made on the floor that it would be impossible to get a unanimous-consent agreement to take it up, I desire to give notice that, because of the great pressure upon the part of the people of the country for radio legislation, I shall move to take it up as soon as the banking bill is disposed of. I want to take just a moment now to explain the situation as it exists to-day regarding radio stations.

The Department of Commerce officials informed me this morning that there are 721 stations now licensed; that there are 160 in process of construction which, if no law is enacted, will undoubtedly be licensed as soon as they make application. They have information that 328 more stations are in contemplation. So that in the natural development of events there will be approximately 1,200 stations on the air by July 1. If this is permitted to occur it means that the ordinary radio set in this country will be practically worthless except for mere local reception. I feel, therefore, that it is my duty to bring the conference report on the radio bill before the Senate at the earliest possible date and I shall make the motion to that effect at the first opportunity.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. HOWELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Bayard	Gooding	McMaster	Sheppard
Blease	Harrelld	McNary	Shipstead
Broussard	Harris	Mayfield	Smith
Bruce	Harrison	Neely	Smoot
Cameron	Hawes	Norris	Steck
Capper	Heffin	Nye	Stephens
Couzens	Howell	Oddie	Stewart
Curtis	Johnson	Overman	Trammell
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Dill	Kendrick	Philpps	Walsh, Mont.
Ferris	Keyes	Pine	Warren
Fletcher	King	Ransdell	Watson
Frazier	La Follette	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
George	Lenroot	Reed, Pa.	
Glass	McKellar	Robinson, Ark.	
Goff	McLean	Schall	

Mr. WATSON. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] is unavoidably absent from the city.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators having answered to the roll call, there is a quorum present.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that several Senators who desire to speak on the pending motion will not be ready to address the Senate until Monday. I would be perfectly willing to have an executive session at this time if that would be satisfactory to other Senators.

Mr. HEFLIN. That will be perfectly agreeable to me.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 14, 1927, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 12, 1927

COUNSEL OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Ralph B. Fleharty, of the District of Columbia, to be additional counsel of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, to be known as the people's counsel.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 12, 1927

MEMBER OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Col. Edward H. Schulz.

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER IN THE ARMY

Capt. Morris Keene Barroll, jr., to Ordnance Department.
First Lieut. Arthur Richardson Baird to Ordnance Department.

Capt. David Wilson Craig to Field Artillery.
Capt. John Jacob Bethurum to Field Artillery.

Maj. Fred Warde Llewellyn to Judge Advocate General's Department.

Capt. Marion Irwin Voorhes to Cavalry.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY

Don Longfellow, first lieutenant, Medical Corps.
William Paul Holbrook, first lieutenant, Medical Corps.
Harvey Cecil Maxwell, first lieutenant, Medical Corps.
James Ogilvie Gillespie, first lieutenant, Medical Corps.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

Charles Bertody Stone, jr., to be colonel.
Louis Cass Brinton, jr., to be lieutenant colonel.
Lucien Samuel Spicer Berry to be major.
Loyd Van Horne Durfee to be captain.
Desmond O'Keefe to be captain.
Hal Marney Rose to be captain.
Frank Charles McConnell to be first lieutenant.
Dale Phillip Mason to be first lieutenant.
Donald Fowler Fritch to be first lieutenant.
John Ter Bush Bissell to be captain, Field Artillery.
James Madison Callicutt to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.

PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

Nemesio Catalan to be first lieutenant.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Edna J. McGowan, Belmont.
Henry Metzler, Fowler.
Bert W. Miller, Hilts.
Emerson B. Herrick, Lodi.
Warren N. Garland, Oakdale.
Sherman G. Batchelor, San Bernardino.

COLORADO

Ama Hill, Arapahoe.
William A. Russom, Bristol.
John L. Nightingale, Fort Collins.
Theodore Stremme, Gypsum.
Orion W. Daggett, Redcliff.
Merrill D. Harshman, Wiggins.

ILLINOIS

Louis Lindenbauer, Camp Point.
William D. Chambers, East Moline.
Richard W. Miller, Hamilton.
Walter V. Berry, Irving.
Albert O. Kettelkamp, Nokomis.
Fred A. Sapp, Ottawa.
George S. Faxon, Plano.
Katherine Adams, Riverton.
William H. Fahnstock, Rushville.

IOWA

Oscar W. Larson, Odebolt.
Joseph C. Allen, Zearing.

MARYLAND

Roscoe C. McNutt, Falston.
Charles W. Foxwell, Leonardtown.

MISSOURI

Everett Drysdale, Butler.
George L. Pemberton, Charleston.
John R. Edwards, Dawn.
Edwin H. Laubert, Mayview.

NEBRASKA

Harry A. Riley, Spalding.
Wayne Mead, Western.

NEW JERSEY

Timothy J. Nevill, Carteret.

NEW MEXICO

C. E. Gibbs, Madrid.

PENNSYLVANIA

Harry A. Borland, Indiana.

RHODE ISLAND

William H. Godfrey, Apponaug.

WASHINGTON

Maud E. Hays, Starbuck.
Orien L. Renn, Touchet.
Ira S. Fields, Woodland.

WISCONSIN

Charlotte G. Johnson, Amherst.

WYOMING

Reuben A. Faulk, Lusk.
Alma N. Johnson, Yoder.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, February 12, 1927

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Brightly beams our Father's mercy and all glory be unto His excellent name. It is boundless, flowing through the world far and wide. Vouchsafe unto us this day the blessing of Thy guidance that our walk may be acceptable unto Thee. Give, Oh give us the repose of mind that believes that all things work together for good to them that love Thee and keep Thy commandments. Provide a way of happiness and peace for the discouraged, the wounded, and the sick. Bless us with hunger for righteousness, wisdom, and all other virtues that lift us to the best service for our country and the good of our fellow men. Through Christ our Savior. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed Senate bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4808. An act to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4411) entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of South Dakota and Wyoming with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Belle Fourche and Cheyenne Rivers and other streams in which such States are jointly interested," and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. JONES of Washington, and Mr. KENDRICK.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as indicated below:

S. 4808. An act to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MAJ. CHARLES BEATTY MOORE

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill S. 5259, an identical House bill having been unanimously reported by a committee of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 5259) granting permission to Maj. Charles Beatty Moore, United States Army, to accept the following decorations, namely, the Legion of Honor tendered him by the Republic of France, and the officers' cross of the order Polonia Restituta tendered him by the Republic of Poland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, our Committee on Foreign Affairs has a whole lot of bills just like this, and I do not believe we ought to single out and pass one of these without passing others when we have such a lot of them in our committee.

Mr. OLDFIELD. The Committee on Military Affairs, it seems, had this bill and reported it unanimously. This young man is a very high-class young man, in the war—

Mr. BEGG. That is practically true of every one before the committee.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I suggest that the gentleman from Ohio report out those bills and pass them. There are bills we have passed similar to this. You can thrash out those entitled to consideration and those that are not just as this was thrashed out in the Committee on Military Affairs here.

Mr. BEGG. Who is going to present these decorations? I have not read the bill.

Mr. OLDFIELD. France and Poland—

Mr. BEGG. How does the Committee on Military Affairs get jurisdiction?

Mr. OLDFIELD. It was referred to that committee, and it has been reported out unanimously. He is a son-in-law of Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. BEGG. And they also come to the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. OLDFIELD. I hope the gentleman will not object in this particular instance.

Mr. BEGG. I am going to ask the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas if he will not withdraw his request for to-day until we have a little chance to look it over.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. BEGG. I do not want to be forced to object to it this morning. I may change my mind.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I withdraw the request for the time being.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a statement by Major Mills, prohibition administrator of New York, in answer to certain charges made against him on the floor of the House.

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

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not hear what the matter was.

Mr. FISH. It is a statement made by Mr. Mills in answer to certain attacks made upon him on the floor of the House.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, it does not seem to me that the House ought to continue to fill the RECORD up at this time when it is such a voluminous document with a lot of outside and extraneous matter, and because I have objected to these matters before, I feel compelled to object.

Mr. FISH. It is in answer to charges made on the floor of the House by a man who can not come and answer them here.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I will think the matter over, but for the present I object.

Mr. HALL of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of North Dakota with respect to the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence waterway.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota in regard to the St. Lawrence waterway. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERHILL. What is the use in having it printed in the RECORD twice? A note of it will appear in the back of the RECORD anyway. If the gentleman wants to place it in the basket, all right. There is no necessity of having it printed twice in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to prefer a unanimous-consent request, for the immediate consideration of a bridge bill, in connection with which there exists an emergency. I am doing this, Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MOREHEAD], and he assures me that there is quite an emergency connected with it.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman assures the Chair that there is a distinct emergency connected with this bill the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. DENISON. It is the bill H. R. 16282, granting the consent of Congress to the Nebraska-Iowa Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENISON. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is in the usual standard form of bridge bills of that character. There are no committee amendments; and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as having been ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and passed.

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

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

The motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing some remarks I made before the Holy Name Society of Holy Trinity Church, this city, on February 10, on Abraham Lincoln.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting an address delivered by him on Abraham Lincoln. Is there objection?

There was no objection.
The remarks are as follows:

There is double impulse which prompts me to select Abraham Lincoln as my topic for to-night's address. My primary reason is perhaps that this occasion happens to be so near the anniversary of his birth. Also, and not the least of the motives which inspire me, is the fact that Lincoln was a man of deep religious sentiments. It is eminently proper, therefore, that I should hold up as a model for the stimulation of the young men of this society the great and noble statesman who in his private life was always a virile exponent of those habits of clean living and wholesome conversation for which you men so conspicuously stand.

He had a fondness for quaint and amusing stories, but they were always notably free from anything coarse or suggestive. Profanity was his aversion. And this also brings him into close harmony with the aim of your society to instill in the hearts of the youth of our land a reverence for God and abstinence from uncleanness in thought, word, or deed.

HIS RELIGIOUS TRAINING

I know that a distinguished atheist once tried to elicit, perhaps, some comfort for his own hopelessness, by making the charge that Lincoln was an agnostic; but anyone who will take the trouble to peruse the speeches and addresses of this great man will discern the clear, bright light of his intensely religious soul.

When at Springfield, Ill., on the 11th of February, 1861, his neighbors gathered around him to wish him God speed on his journey to Washington to take upon his shoulders the responsibility of the Presidency he gave utterance to this solemn and reverent farewell:

"Trusting in Him who can go with me and remain with you and be everywhere, for good, let us confidently hope that all will be well. To His care commending you, I hope in your prayers you will commend me, friends and neighbors, an affectionate farewell."

No agnostic could have uttered such sentiments as those.

Among all the utterances of great men in all history, what is there to equal in diction, in sublimity of thought, or in deep religious fervor, that beautiful peroration on the occasion of his second inaugural address?

The great fratricidal conflict was drawing to a close. He had suffered much, and if he had been of common clay, with the mean resentments of a petty mind, he could never have given utterance to this beautiful and eloquent aspiration:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we are in—to bind the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphans, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

NOT A KNOW-NOTHING

Like all great men, who are themselves genuinely religious, he had an aversion to intolerance and profoundly believed in the equality of all men before the law, regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. In 1855, when the serpent of religious intolerance showed its slimy head—even as it does to-day—Lincoln was charged with being a "Know-Nothing." At that time this was not altogether a term of reproach for the Know-Nothing Party had grown to greater proportions than even the Ku-Klux movement has attained to-day. In fact, they were sufficiently organized to carry the elections in Massachusetts and in Delaware in 1854, and in 1856 nominated candidates for President and Vice President of the United States.

Lincoln, when charged with belonging to this organization, spurned the accusation with his customary vigor in the use of strong language. He said:

"I am not a Know-Nothing; that is certain. How could I be? How can anyone who abhors the oppression of negroes be in favor of degrading classes of white people? Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a Nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal.' We now practically read it: 'All men are created equal, except negroes.' When the Know-Nothings get control it will read: 'All men are created equal, except negroes and foreigners

and Catholics.' When it comes to this I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty—to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure and without the base alloy of hypocrisy."

HIS ORIGIN AND EARLY LIFE

Having now a picture of the soul of the man, let us look back into his origin and early history. On both paternal and maternal sides he was of old Virginia stock. His grandfather, Abraham Lincoln, was one of those early pioneers who left his environment in the Old Dominion to establish a new home in the wilderness. He set his hearthstone in Kentucky, but inside of two years the life of this rugged pioneer was quenched out in an encounter with the Indians.

THOMAS LINCOLN

His son, Thomas Lincoln, the father of Abraham Lincoln, grew up in this primitive atmosphere in constant struggle with the forces of nature. Of course, he was without the amenities of a "dressed-up civilization," but he was a rugged, sterling character. Some modern historians, ever on the alert to detect flaws in historic characters, have said that he was ignorant, uncouth, and shiftless. That is a vile, unwarranted charge. He may have been "uneducated," but he was not "ignorant." He may have been "homely," but he was not "uncouth." He may have been "unfortunate," but he was not "shiftless."

His education had a greater diversity than could have been obtained in books. He knew the birds of the air and the beasts of the earth—their seasons, their habits, and their uses. He knew the virtues of the soil and the art of planting. He could use his hands and could construct a boat, a wagon, or a sleigh, build a log-cabin and fashion its furniture. But above all, he was a good, wholesome, honest, God-fearing man. He had to combat the hostile elements of a primitive environment which yielded nothing more than a bare living. Under these adverse circumstances he married Nancy Hanks, a woman of noble character, and endowed the world with one of the greatest men in all history.

Abraham Lincoln was born of this union on February 12, 1809, at Nolin Creek, Hardin County, Ky. Brought into the world in such an environment as this and deriving his blood through such stock, we can easily account for the courage, the frugality, the self-denial, and the tenderness which distinguished him in later life.

When 7 years old, his father sold his humble farm and determined to make a new home for his little family across the Ohio. The price that he got for his farm was 10 barrels of whisky. Do not let this shock you! Whisky in those primitive regions was then a medium of exchange. It was equivalent to money. Remotely distant from markets for his produce, it could not be shipped over rough roads, so the only alternative was to turn nature's golden corn into indifferent whisky, and that was universally used as a means of barter and sale.

He put all his household belongings on a little boat, including his "money," and set forth on his Argonautic journey down Salt Creek. It does not appear that this historic stream was ordinarily perilous, but, in some manner, the wedges holding the barrels in place gave way and all of Tom Lincoln's "cash" rolled off into the waters.

Arriving on the other side of the Ohio River, the place selected for the new home was on Little Pigeon Creek, about 16 miles north of the Ohio and located within the present township of Carter, Ind. It was not long after their arrival there that the devoted soul of Mrs. Lincoln passed out of her weary body—the body of a pioneer wife, worn out with the fatigues and labors of establishing a new home in the wilderness.

In this hour of grief, the young boy assisted his father in the making of the coffin which was to hold the remains of his beloved mother. The father sawed a log into boards, planed and fashioned them and the parts were held together with rough wooden nails that young Abe whittled out with his penknife. Such were the rough inconveniences of life in those early days.

In the following year, Tom Lincoln brushed up a bit, fitted himself in his best togs, and went on a long journey to Elizabethtown, Ky. He well knew where he was going and what was his object. When he returned with a new wife his neighbors were not surprised. He had married an old sweetheart, herself by this time a widow—Mrs. Sally Bush Johnston. Let no one say that the man, who could conduct such a courtship and carry off his prize in such short order, was shiftless.

Young Abraham was fortunate in his new mother. She was a woman of education, loving and devoted, and her kindness to him was ever keenly appreciated. He was now about 10 years of age and knew nothing of the advantages of education. She taught him his letters and stimulated in him a fondness for reading. Once started, the young student became an enthusiast for learning.

He wrote his spelling lessons with a piece of burnt stick on scraps of paper, on the bark of trees, on the back of an old wooden shovel, and, in fact, wherever he could obtain a suitable surface, so that his father often gave signs of irritation at his zeal.

The next step was to get books. Of course, there was the family Bible, and that was a never-ending source of edification and encourage-

ment. He learned the parables by heart. He obtained a copy of Æsop's Fables, and his subsequent fondness for anecdote attests the good he obtained from that old classic.

His mind reached out and got knowledge because he wanted it. He was not coddled, as you can well imagine, as I believe boys are to-day. He knew the value of learning, and with this simple, rudimentary knowledge of his letters he spelled himself, by dint of hard labor, into the real treasures of the world.

He secured a copy of Weem's Life of Washington and read it diligently. This gave him the groundwork of American history. He also obtained a copy of the Arabian Nights, which he read with much amusement and comfort.

His father, Tom Lincoln, often deplored his spending so much of his time over the Arabian Nights, calling them "all derved lies." The young son replied, "Well, dad, they're derved good lies."

Dennis Hanks, a cousin and 10 years older than Abe, lived with them around this interesting period and is responsible for many interesting recollections. He lived to be over 90 years of age, and in 1889 his reminiscences of Lincoln's boyhood were collected by Eleanor Atkinson at Charleston, Ill., where the old man spent his declining years. Her book is worth reading.

After Lincoln was admitted to the bar and his fame in winning juries by his common sense and humor began to be spread, Denny on one occasion said:

"Abe, where did you get so many blamed lies?" And, as Denny tells the story, Lincoln replied:

"Denny, when a story larns you a good lesson it aint a lie. God tells truths in parables. They're easier for common folks to understand and recollect."

But before he reached the attainment of membership at the bar he had a long road to go—an arduous, rough road of trials, at all kinds of work. He worked as a clerk in a store, did rough farm labor for the neighbors, and spent a period as a deckhand on a river boat. But in the meantime he studied. He taught himself surveying and earned something at that. His tastes were versatile and the scope of intellectual curiosity almost universal. Neither did he neglect his body. He grew up strong and hardy—6 feet 4 inches in height and of athletic build. He was ready with his tongue and could address a popular gathering in an appealing way.

He moved to Macon County and then to New Salem, Sangamon County, Ill. In New Salem his versatility was put to good use. He clerked in a store, did surveying, and acted for awhile as postmaster.

At this time the Black Hawk War broke out and he enlisted as a private, but was almost immediately elected as captain of his company. On his return from the war he interested himself in politics, and his readiness in stump-speaking soon earned for him the nomination for the assembly. He was beaten, but, as he said, in his own brief autobiography, it was the only time he failed in a direct appeal to the people. The next time he ran, which was at the next election in 1832, he was triumphantly elected and his political life began.

He was reelected twice again to the Illinois Legislature. In the meantime, in 1837, he was admitted to the practice of the law. From thence onward his progress was steady and uninterrupted. As a lawyer he was a success, but although he occupied a position of prominence at the Illinois bar and was much sought after in jury cases, the financial rewards were never abundant. This was less due to his want of success than to the fact that he was never avaricious for money.

In 1846, at the age of 37 years, he was elected to Congress. He was distinguished for his earnestness and the strength of his convictions. He voted to abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia and against the Mexican War. After his one term in Congress he settled down earnestly to the practice of law and became known as one of the leading figures at the bar.

The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act repealing the Missouri Compromise reawakened his interest in public affairs. He was immediately pitted against Stephen A. Douglas, the "Little Giant." He became a candidate for the United States Senate. When he was beaten—in the legislature, of course—he was not a bit abashed, but, in his quaint way, said that he "was after bigger game." He was looking forward to the presidential nomination. The Lincoln-Douglas debates during the senatorial campaign, though not winning him the election, put him in the forefront as "available timber" in the great campaign of 1860. From that time onward he was an avowed candidate and made speeches throughout the North and East which defined the issues of the great coming conflict. In his speech at Cooper Union, New York City, on February 27, 1860, he outlined his faith in the supremacy of moral principles in these resounding words:

"Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

At the Republican convention held in Chicago May, 1860, this unpolished country boy was chosen as the candidate for President over such sophisticated statesmen as Seward, Chase, Stanton, and Bates.

He was elected at the election in November, 1860, by an overwhelming plurality. Nevertheless, he was a minority President. His opponents were Breckenridge and Douglas from the two wings of the

shattered Democratic Party and John Bell, who led the remnants of the old Know-Nothing Party to final defeat and obliteration.

Yes; he was a minority President, even as Wilson was! But there was a marked difference between the two men. Wilson had not the faculty of fraternizing with his fellow men, not that he was inconsiderate or unkind, but he was so direct and sincere that he failed to understand that even big men had to be humored and cajoled. Lincoln, on the other hand, knew how to deal with men.

I studied law in the office of Gen. Daniel E. Sickles, who was a great admirer of Lincoln. When he dropped into reminiscent mood, as he would often do, he used to delight in dwelling upon Lincoln's urbanity. As an example of this, he told how the Great Emancipator, when the situation between the White House and the Senate grew strained, would drop into Charles Sumner's office and greet him with the flattering request: "Sumner, brew me a cup of tea which only you can brew."

Over the teacups, then, the two statesmen would iron out all the differences, and the legislation or other matters would go through without further hitch!

Lincoln, in other words, was not afraid to play with those who differed with him. You know he appointed his political rivals for the Presidency as members of his Cabinet and got along with them famously.

General Sickles also resented the slander, encouraged by a hostile press that Lincoln was homely, awkward or uncouth. One of these vicious sheets called the Great Emancipator "a hideous baboon." Sickles claimed that he had an athletic figure and that his face was of classic outline.

In the splendid address of Governor Yates in the House of Representatives, on February 12, 1921, he tells a story of the kindly relations between Sickles and Lincoln and as it also gives strength to my thesis as to Lincoln's religious fervor, I will put it in Governor Yates's own words. This is the way that Sickles told the story to President McKinley:

On the day after the Battle of Gettysburg when Major General Sickles was carried to Washington desperately wounded his first caller was President Lincoln and after he inquired all about the battle General Sickles said:

"Mr. President, what do you think of Gettysburg?"

Mr. Lincoln replied:

"Well, Sickles, I will tell you. When I heard that General Lee was marching with his vast army on Gettysburg, and that the safety of the Capital, North, and of the whole Nation was imperiled, I went into a little room that I have at the White House, where nobody goes but me, and I just got down on both my knees and I prayed to the Lord God Almighty as I never prayed before, and I told Him that this was His people and that this was His country, and these were His battles we were fighting, and that we could not stand any more Fredericksburgs or Chancellorsvilles; and I told Him that if He would stand by me I would stand by Him."

And Sickles says that the President ended with the statement:

"After that, Sickles, I somehow had no more fear about Gettysburg."

During the trying hours of the great Civil War, the character of Lincoln was revealed in all its greatness. His soul was bared to, but never pierced, by the shafts of criticism. His humanity and simple mannerisms endeared him to all who came in contact with him and his unflinching humor and keen sense of the perspective of events enabled him to appraise all things at their true relative value.

His versatility was shown in his criticism of generals and military movements. For instance, when Hooker allowed Lee to steal away from his front at Fredericksburg so that before he knew it the head of Lee's column had swept up the Shenandoah Valley, Lincoln wired Hooker: "If the head of Lee's army is at Martinsburg and the tail of it on the plank road between Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville, the animal must be very slim somewhere; could you not break him?"

In the hour of his great triumph, the hand of a fanatical assassin struck him down. His untimely death affected North and South alike. A generous foe appraised him at his true worth and the grief of the Nation in mourning was the true portent of a united Nation. The words of Richard Henry Stoddard, the poet, well expressed the thought of all the world:

"Hold warriors, councillors, Kings! All now give place

"To this dead benefactor of his race."

The beauty of Lincoln's life is that there is nothing to be found in it which there is need to extenuate, or for which apologies have to be made. Living in a period of great conflict and deep animosities—indeed a principal in that conflict—his character was so just, so sincere, so intensely patriotic that even his enemies were won over, and to-day it may be justly said that there is no personage in American history whose character is more admired or whose memory is more revered.

NO QUORUM—CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a quarter of a minute to make an announcement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the voice of our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW] has been heard from one side of the United States to the other in behalf of sobriety and honesty and uprightness and good citizenship. It is a distinct loss to the country and to this House that he is soon to leave us. He is to make his farewell speech in this House this morning. I think there should be a quorum present. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 28]

Andrew	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sosnowski
Anthony	Fredericks	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Stephens
Appleby	Free	McSwain	Strong, Kans.
Arentz	Frothingham	Manlove	Strong, Pa.
Ayres	Gallivan	Mead	Strother
Beedy	Gilbert	Mills	Sullivan
Bell	Gold	Montague	Sweet
Bowman	Goldsborough	Montgomery	Sweet
Boylan	Gorman	Moore, Ky.	Taber
Britten	Graham	Moore, Ohio	Tinkham
Britter	Harrison	Morin	Toiley
Butler	Houston	Nelson, Wis.	Vare
Carew	Hudson	Newton, Mo.	Vinson, Ga.
Carter, Calif.	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connell, N. Y.	Wainwright
Celler	Johnson, Ky.	O'Connor, La.	Walters
Cleary	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Watres
Cramton	Kahn	Oliver, N. Y.	Wetford
Crosser	Kendall	Perlman	Weller
Crowther	King	Phillips	Weish, Pa.
Crumpacker	Knutson	Prall	Whitehead
Cullen	Kunz	Quayle	Wilson, Miss.
Curry	Kurtz	Reed, N. Y.	Woodrum
Davenport	Lee, Ga.	Robinson, Iowa	Woodyard
Deal	Lindsay	Rouse	Wright
Dempsey	McClintic	Seger	
Dickstein	McFadden	Somers, N. Y.	
Doyle			

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-nine Members are present, a quorum.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to announce that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WRIGHT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES] are unavoidably detained because of attendance at a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have five legislative days within which to file minority supplemental views on Senate bill 3641.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that leave be granted for five legislative days within which to file minority supplemental views on Senate bill 3641. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LESSONS FROM LINCOLN'S CREED

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW] for one hour. [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the Congress, I ask you to accept my unmixed gratitude for this high and exceptional honor you have voted me in extending to a southern Democrat the privilege of communing with you in this high and ardent hour concerning national lessons from Lincoln's creed, and thus sending these lessons beyond this historic Chamber to the whole country.

It is not a far cry to the well-springs of sacred sentiment for a son of Georgia, a son of the South—the son of a Confederate soldier, to find a wealth of patriotic inspiration in the birthday of Abraham Lincoln? [Applause.] Himself a Southerner by lineage and birth, Lincoln was so broadly American in his lofty ideals, his human sympathies, and his deathless achievements that he is at once, like George Washington and Robert E. Lee, the heritage of all Americans [applause] and the inspiration of all mankind. [Applause.] Born in a humble dirt-floored cabin in Kentucky 118 years ago to-day, he taught,

with many other pioneer builders of this Republic, that half-forgotten lesson—that America is the premier land of all the world for virile, personal, and national stimulus and measureless opportunity. [Applause.] Cradled in poverty, baptized in early sorrow, and nourished and nurtured in the enriching school of frontier adversity, Abraham Lincoln furnished to every worthy ambitious American boy that inspiring lesson, that from the "American log cabin" to the White House of the Nation, there is a great "Appian Way" along which the awakened, fair-minded American people ask but one question—not "Who was your father?" but "Who are you?" Not, "Where did you come from?" but "Where are you going?" [Applause.]

W. I. Van Name said of Lincoln:

The boy grew early into the man. He had only the meager schooling that the frontier afforded; but he had read every book, it is said, within 50 miles. He knew his Bible, Shakespeare, and Burns, Aesop's Fables, and Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress. He studied American history—he committed to memory the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

[Applause.]

Do we wonder, then, that he thus became an early disciple of human freedom?—as good a Democrat as he was a Republican, and a better American than he was either. [Applause.] Certainly, then, it is no breach of the proprieties for a patriotic, southern Democrat to pay tribute to, and learn lessons from, the life and creed of Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.]

THE ILLINOIS TRIO—LINCOLN, CANNON, AND BRYAN

Remembering that Lincoln grew up in Illinois and came from that great Commonwealth to serve his country and humanity, I feel, somehow, that I can hardly proceed to discuss the vital lessons of this hour without a passing mention of those other immortal sons of Illinois, almost as famous and widely beloved as Lincoln—William J. Bryan and Joseph G. Cannon. [Applause.] Each was essentially a commoner—a leader who never lost the human touch—who loved to—

Live by the side of the road
And be a friend of man.

Walking even yet with tender, reverent tread in the fresh footprints of our long-time colleague, "Uncle Joe" Cannon, and finding the flowers of love blooming everywhere he stepped, we rejoice to remember that notable spiritual transformation that marked the closing years of his remarkable life. Having won the highest honors the Nation could give him save that of the Presidency, "Uncle Joe" found as he journeyed down "that slope that leads to the place of common sleep," when the sands of time were crumbling under his unsteady steps—ah, he learned that great truth uttered by John Quincy Adams in his "Wants of man"—"What most I want is the mercy of my God." And letting down by faith on the Rock of Ages he beckons to his colleagues from that new-made grave in Danville, saying: "Be ye also ready, for the night cometh."

William J. Bryan, that other marvelous member of this Illinois trio, told me with this own lips how he laid the foundation stone of his own life's pyramid on that same Rock of Ages when he was a boy of 14, and, studying reverently the Bible of his devout parents, of Lincoln and Cannon from his childhood, he fed his regenerating faith on the bread of life, building that stalwart stature of Christian manhood, which enabled him to tower, unsullied, above the ruins of three presidential defeats and stand at life's sunset the acknowledged moral and spiritual leader of the political world. [Applause.]

If Cannon, who voted for the eighteenth amendment, and Bryan, who did so much to secure its enactment, were here to-day, I believe they would indorse the text and the spirit of this hour—that it is better far to celebrate Lincoln's birthday by a coronation of his ideals than by historic recital, however illuminating, of the domestic and public incidents of his monumental life. Especially is this true when we remember how well that fascinating and inspiring task has been done in recent years by honored Members of this House, Governor YATES and Mr. RATHBONE, of Illinois, who knew Lincoln, or whose parents knew him intimately while he was growing in awkward, rugged grandeur toward his unapproachable place in the gallery of the world's immortals. [Applause.]

GIVE THE SOUTH MY LOVE

Treasured, indeed, among all sons and daughters of the South are those golden words as told us by the gentleman from Illinois, Governor YATES, when President Lincoln sent that Federal official, William Pitt Kellogg, to New Orleans, saying the day before he died, "Make love to those good people in the South for me." Ah, if only such a man with such a heart could only

have lived! [Applause.] The suffering, misunderstood South would have missed, we verily believe, the indescribable horrors of reconstruction [applause]—far worse to endure than the war—and “the ambiguities in the Constitution that could only be wiped out by a baptism of blood” as President Harding eloquently said at the dedication of the Lincoln Memorial, made clear and final in the tragic arbitrament of war, would have brought the North and the South back together in understanding fellowship far earlier than was humanly possible after the great-hearted Lincoln was gone! [Applause.]

And ah, my colleagues, as I think of all that my beautiful Southland suffered—as I think of the chasm of bitterness and misunderstanding which the exploiting carpetbagger dug, and so long maintained between the honest patriotic people of both sections, I have a new quarrel with the liquor traffic which Lincoln predicted would bring to America the next great national battle after the abolition of slavery; for it was in a saloon, a liquor shop in Prince Georges County, Md., where the assassination of Abraham Lincoln was planned. As I think of that horrible night, that baleful den of devilish intrigue, and that tragic spot here in Washington where the kindly Lincoln fell, I feel like nationalizing and paraphrasing that frantic cry of Lady Macbeth as she saw the tenacious blood on her guilty finger: “Out, out, damned spot!” to remove the stain on the beautiful flag that Lincoln loved and saved! [Applause.]

This is Lincoln's creed:

Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well wisher of posterity swear by the blood of the Revolution never to violate in the least particular the laws of the country and never to tolerate their violation by others. As the patriots of Seventy-six did to the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and laws let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor. Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty.

Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap; let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in the legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice.

In short, let it become the political religion of the Nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay of all sexes and tongues and colors and conditions sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.

[Applause.]

This sacred reverence for religion and law was taught by a great human mountain peak who said:

All I am or ever expect to be I owe to my angel mother.

What an awakening, appealing lesson to purposeful childhood and consecrated parents evermore!

The heart of this creed, “Let reverence for law be the political religion of the Nation,” is part of my text to-day, but it would be incomplete if it did not rest on that great bedrock of Bible truth which Lincoln reverently loved. Listen as I read it to you from the Word of God:

Woe to him that buildeth a town with blood and establisheth a city by iniquity. Behold, is it not of the Lord of Hosts that the people shall labor in the very fire and the people shall weary themselves for very vanity; for the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.

Woe to him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him and maketh him drunken; also that thou mayest look on their nakedness.

This terrific arraignment of organized government, the city, and the individual unit of that government, the citizen, for complicity in protected vice and for collectively or personally passing that blighting sin to others is found in the second chapter of Habakkuk from the twelfth to the fifteenth verse, inclusive.

CALLING THE NATION'S LEADERS

Oh, that the Nation's leaders—political, social, and commercial leaders—would speedily learn that neither governments nor individuals can trample the Word of God—can defy the authority of God, and get away with it. Woe to that government—municipal, state, or national—that is established by iniquity! Woe to that individual that giveth his neighbor drink—whether with the hand or the ballot or by inattention to civic and patriotic duty—by patronizing bootleggers, by harboring bootleggers, by winking at bootleggers—in short, by surrendering, through mental indolence, moral reluctance, or immoral connivance, to lawbreakers, drinkers, and liars in their organized defiance of the laws of God and man! Then think

of that sublime picture, “When the glory of the Lord shall cover the world as the waters cover the sea.”

Listen! Even if there should be some irreverent men who hear me from the floor or the gallery, or who read these printed words, do you think the glory of the Lord can cover any spot where debauching, intoxicating liquors are made or sold or consumed? An honest answer to that sane, vital question will stop every drinker who hears my voice—every distant man or woman with a conscience who reads these earnest, honest words. And no man who personally violates the law of God and the law of man can blame anybody but himself if his son surpasses the copy set for him by his father, or if his daughter breaks his heart by marrying a man who does.

WHY I SPECIALIZE IN HUMANITY

If some of my genial colleagues, as well as some of my critics, who playfully refer to what they and some newspapers are pleased to term my “radical dryness” would like for me to tell in this—practically my farewell address to Congress—why I have specialized on prohibition enforcement since I have been a Member of this body, I answer, without hesitation, that it is largely because I specialized in it before I came to Congress, having fought the old-time diabolical saloon on countless fields of forensic carnage, north, south, east, and west. My friends used to laughingly tell me that I never really made a speech until I saw a barroom on one side, a home on the other, and a hesitating voter in the middle of the road.

I wore this white badge of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union when I was out in the thick of the fight; and, frankly, I found good reason for not taking off this badge after I got to Washington. [Laughter.]

But the great underlying, overpowering reason is the fact that I could not quit loving humanity because I became a Member of Congress. We all know that every Congressman worth the name is a specialist. Some lawmakers tinker with the tariff, others with other forms of revenue; some battle for justice to the Army, others are “rocked in the cradle of the deep” as they dream and work for the Navy. Still others are “up in the air” with radio and aviation, while others are down on the ground with agriculture. I am, and have been, for all of these in their proper relationships, but I, without apology—indeed, with great enthusiasm I stand essentially and fundamentally for the great first cause of all these other forms of legislation. I stand for humanity. [Applause.]

I remind my friends in Congress and my critics on the outside that all revenues are in vain, all the Army and Navy are in vain, all economic development is in vain, and the flag itself waves in vain if there are no sober, loyal boys and girls coming on as the “seed corn of the Republic.” [Applause.]

It is related that when Robinson Crusoe counted over the money he had brought from that sunken ship to that uninhabited island he threw it on the ground and said with impatient gesture: “The worthless stuff!” Why was it worthless? There were as many carats or grains of value in that money as if it were lying on the counter of the Bank of England, but there was nobody on that lonely island that wanted it. And all the railroads and factories and mines and even banks in America would not bring a dollar if sold on the steps of the Capitol to-day if there were no sober, intelligent boys and girls coming on to give them value. [Applause.]

Mr. SCHAFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPSHAW. I feel that the gentleman should not ask me to yield during an address of this kind.

HUMANITY MY HERO

Without apology I declared on every stump in my first campaign, that, while I expected to take intelligent interest in all questions of public interest, I expected to show, at least, one segment of kinship for Henry Grady who declared “Humanity is my hero.” I have, therefore, specialized in every phase and form of legislation touching human relief, human betterment, and human preservation. I have laid myself out for soldier relief. I began my first speech on that subject with the words: “I stand for the man on crutches.” I have rejoiced to go through snow and sleet and rain to secure compensation, hospitalization, and vocational training for disabled veterans. On every vote I have done what I said I would do before I came—I have given “the man in overalls” the benefit of the doubt, and I have tried to do the same thing for the struggling farmer, although I have almost turned grayheaded and had nervous prostration in trying to reach a conclusion. [Laughter.] I have voted unblushingly for better salaries for overworked and underpaid Government employees—yea, and for overworked and underpaid Congressmen.

And certainly with this declarative bent in favor of humanity I had no trouble from the beginning in fighting in Con-

gress and out of Congress humanity's "Great Destroyer." I have worn this white badge to let people know before I even open my mouth that I feel about liquor like the young doctor did at the Georgia Medical College. Questioned as to the use of turpentine, he replied: "I've forgotten what our Professor said, but turpentine is such a good medicine I am in favor of using it internally, externally, and eternally." He got his diploma. [Laughter.]

And liquor is so bad—so morally bad, so economically bad, so indefensibly bad, so inexcusably bad, that I want the world to know that I am against liquor, internally, externally, and eternally. [Laughter.]

I noticed in that "damp" fun column in a certain Washington paper this morning, the suggestion that Mr. UPHAW, in his Lincoln Day address, should tell how this country can endure half wet and half dry. [Laughter.] First of all I answer that this country is not "half wet" and I prove it by the fact that at every election the people send a larger "dry" majority than ever. The classical fun editor also expressed the hope that this would be my farewell address. I guess there are many more wets over the country who hope the same thing. [Applause.] I wish, however, that George Rothwell Brown would take a course in Webster's Blueback Spelling Book and learn to spell my name—not "O'pshaw" but "U-p-s-h-a-w." [Laughter.]

And I remind him and all his wet crowd that we are going to settle this question like Lincoln settled slavery. He said this country "could not long endure half slave and half free," and in the spirit of him who fought resolutely for complete human freedom we propose to dry up those wet sections of the country that are defying our constitutional law and save the future generations from their debauching slavery to liquor. [Applause.]

LINCOLN A TOTAL ABSTAINER

It is undoubtedly then in happy consonance with this Lincoln's memorial day that we should consider this great moral theme that the Great Emancipator loved so well—for he not only wrote and signed his own pledge of total abstinence, but on January 24, 1853, he signed an indorsement of the following statement made by Rev. James Smith, D. D., of Springfield, Ill.:

The liquor traffic is a cancer in society eating out its vitals and threatening destruction, and all efforts to regulate it will not only prove abortive, but will aggravate the evil. There must be no more effort to regulate the cancer; it must be eradicated; not a root must be left, for until this is done all classes must continue in danger.

If Lincoln could only have known that Nicholas Murray Butler, with iridescent dreams of a "damp" White House in his head was going to disagree with him, how different might have been the feelings of that great soul of lonely grandeur! [Laughter.]

FIGHTING FOR THE SOUL OF THE NATION

No man can read the papers—that part of the press that has done so much to encourage the violation of our constitutional prohibition law without being impressed that America is engaged in the greatest internal battle that any nation has ever known. That battle is not economic, although the sanest and soundest economics are bound up in its solution; that battle is not industrial, although no great industry can properly function where its man power does not sustain a proper relationship to this great industrial question; that battle is not agricultural, although confessedly, I usually vote in Congress with the "farmer's bloc" (whatever that means) who believe that theirs is the base of all bases in the development of our national life; that battle is not political—I mean from a partisan standpoint—although the purest and cleanest and bravest politics—nonpartisan politics, must be dedicated to the winning of this great unfinished fight.

America's greatest battle, as I conceive it, is a fight for the soul of this Nation; a battle for the very ideals of this Republic, a battle to prove to the eyes of our children, who are dearer to us than the ruddy drops that gather in our hearts—our children, whose intelligent, sober loyalty must make of our Constitution more than "a scrap of paper" and our flag more than a beautifully decorated piece of bunting to be given to the breeze on the 12th of February, the 22d of February, and the Fourth of July; our children, who, as Jacob Riis said, are the "Tomorrow of the Republic"; yes, and if we really love our flag—its majesty at home and its reputation abroad—it is a battle to prove also to the nations that watch us from the galleries of the world across the seas that the United States of America as a great governing entity is grandly capable of enacting a great moral principle into law, and then demonstrating to the upward march of struggling humanity that the enactment of

that law was not a mistake, as the liquor men declare, and that the vindication of that law, the moral majesty of that law, the triumphant coronation of that law—God help America—shall not prove a farce! [Applause.]

My supreme appeal must be for our own children, who must be guarded by our Government if they are to be the future guardians of our national ideals; but while we are momentarily abroad with our contemplation let me remind you, my colleagues, that when I was in Europe three summers ago I found it impossible to carry my wife and little daughters to any café, however humble or however glittering, where we did not find more than half the women smoking and drinking with the men. And as I looked on that sickening, tragic picture I said in my soul: "Is this Europe? Are these the mothers of the present and the future of Europe?" No wonder Europe, sodden and staggering for a thousand years, reaches her attenuated, trembling hand for the stalwart supporting arm of Uncle Sam!

FOREIGNERS LAUGH AT OUR PROHIBITION

And my sober, loyal American soul was vexed within me to hear foreigners of the blasé sort make fun of our prohibition everywhere. "Beer and wine?" queried those enterprising, exasperating European waiters (speaking good English with the prospect of fat American tips) until I was sorely tempted to bring on diplomatic embarrassments. [Laughter.] Talmadge said he never swore an oath in his life but there were times when he "didn't feel very devotional." Upon my word, I did not swear, but I will confess I did not feel very devotional when those wily, tantalizing rascals continued to pester me with their personal and national affront. Finally, Carl Hutcheson, an Atlanta attorney who belonged to our party got hot under the collar and shouted back: "No; we are from Prohibition America!" "Ah," said that Vienna waiter naively, as he looked back over his shoulder: "You want whisky, then!" [Laughter.] And they seem to think over there that—

The Frenchman takes his native wine—
The German takes his beer—
The Briton takes his 'alf and 'alf
Because it brings good cheer!
The Irishman takes his whisky straight
Because it brings him dizziness—
The American has no choice at all—
He drinks the whole ——— business.

[Laughter and applause.]

BAD BRAND OF PATRIOTISM

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I am uneasy about the man who has just enough religion to walk straight while he is in his home town with the eyes of his wife and pastor upon him, but who finds that religion all evaporated when he gets to Baltimore, Philadelphia, or New York. A man whose religion will not carry him to New York and bring him back straight has not enough, I fear, to carry him from his home town to heaven. Religion that will pass current at the gates of pearl will make a zone of light and righteousness 25,000 miles around. Yes; and I am uneasy about that brand of patriotism that will sing America and the Star-Spangled Banner and salute the Stars and Stripes on the Fourth of July at home; that will pledge allegiance to that flag with his children as they "stand at attention" and repeat The American Creed on some gala occasion at the public school; the man who will again salute that flag when he sees it waving proudly at the mast of the vessel on which he sets sail across the seas; who will salute it yet again when he meets it on another vessel in mid-ocean; yea, who will almost make obeisance when he sees that flag waving over the American embassy or consulate in London or Paris, Geneva or Berlin; who, if some foreigner steps on his American big toe or pulls a strand of his American hair, will rush to that flag and wrap himself in its protecting folds so he can make a face at that foreigner and tell him to "go where it does not snow"; but who, when that thrilling dénouement is over, will step aside and wave a farewell kiss to that flag and say: "Goodbye, Old Flag, for a few gay weeks! I count you a good flag to protect my fortune, my mine, my bank, my factory, my family, but I spit on your stars, I trample your stripes when my debased appetite wants a drink of bootleg liquor. I abhor your puritanical ideals—for seven years you have interfered with my personal liberty—and while I am over here in Europe I expect to have a high-heel time and drink all the liquor I want! Down with the creed of Abraham Lincoln, who wrote and signed his own pledge of total abstinence—down with the creed of the American flag that has outlawed intoxicating liquor—goodbye, Old Glory, until I need you again!"

That is bad patriotism. That brand of patriotism could not be trusted to the nth degree in our country's greatest physical

or moral crisis. Such a man ought to be ashamed to look the Goddess of Liberty in the face as he steams up New York Bay coming back to rest again and grow richer still under the protesting aegis of our sober Constitution and our stainless flag. [Applause.]

Over against that bad and dangerous brand of patriotism I offer those ringing words of Judge Edwin Parker, the great Texas lawyer, who wrote me from New York four years ago when I made my first plea for sober officials:

I have been an honest antiprohibitionist; I have not been a teetotaler, but when my Government outlawed intoxicating liquor by due constitutional process I refused from that hour to touch liquor of any kind.

[Applause.]

America should stand with uncovered head before such a knightly spirit, for only in such a spirit can the homes and the youth of America be safe; only in such loyalty can the ideals of the land we love be preserved under the approving eye of the God and guard of enduring civilization.

ILLUMINATING OUR BRITISH COUSINS

It is relevant here to note that while I was in London I spoke on the same platform with Herbert Tracy, the keen-eyed editor of the Brotherhood Outlook. He said, "UPSHAW, I want you to write a story for my paper on prohibition in America." "From what angle, Tracy?" I asked. And then with a sort of quizzical, triumphant British grin, he said: "First of all, tell us whether you dries put it over on the American people when they were not looking."

Gentlemen of Congress, you should have heard me laugh from London to Washington! Parenthetically, I am sure these bright school boys and girls who honor us with their inspiring presence in the gallery, with their minds fresh with the enrichment of American history, are ready to agree that our British cousins should be about the last to ever imagine that the sons and daughters of the courageous "Colonials" and the ragged "Regimentals" who fought for the birth of this Nation at Concord and Lexington and Bunker Hill and Ticonderoga and Saratoga and Monmouth and Trenton and Valley Forge and Brandywine and Cowpens and Kings Mountain and Yorktown were ever "asleep at the switch" when anybody was tampering with the Constitution of our fathers. [Applause.]

But listen again, and if you have tears to shed prepare to shed them now—for that British editor made another request: "Tell us also," he said (oh, the plaintive pathos of it all!), "whether the American Congress took advantage of the absence of 2,000,000 American soldiers who were over here fighting for freedom and stabbed them in the back when they were not looking and took away from them the freedom for which they were fighting!" Yea, yea, Pauline, it was awful! Anyway, with such a challenge and such an invitation, I proceeded to try to illumine and illuminate our misguided British cousins. I reminded them, as I remind you, and as we need to remind our children who are growing up under the lying propaganda—I measure my words; the utterly false propaganda of the liquor crowd, the "wet" papers and "wet" speakers—that our prohibition law was not passed in a spasm of war-time hysteria, as the "wets" claim, with advantage taken of the absent defenders of the Republic, but that it was passed after generations of education and agitation by a Congress elected with the eighteenth amendment as the burning issue. I reminded them as I remind you now that 33 States had already gone "dry" by local enactment when we were forced to come to Washington to get constitutional protection from the "wet" States that were outraging the white virtue of territory that had voted to be free.

I reminded them as I remind you now that before I became a Member of Congress I sat in that gallery all day long with many prohibition friends and watched the battle rage over the Hobson amendment, and at the end of that imperfect day we saw that amendment under the eloquent leadership of the intrepid "Hero of the Merrimac" receive a majority of 8 votes, but not being a constitutional majority, the "dry" leaders stood up and announced to the press gallery the story that flashed on the front page of every daily paper in America next day: "We will go home and elect a Congress that will pass a Federal amendment outlawing the liquor traffic." And I remind you—get this again, you who say that the American people never had an opportunity to express themselves on national prohibition—with that as the burning issue—you referendum dreamers and prevaricators, get it again—the Sixty-fifth Congress was elected with an emphatic mandate from the American people to come to Washington and outlaw the liquor traffic forevermore. And you who say that we "took advantage of the absent defenders of the Nation," listen to this, and forever after hold your peace—that Congress was

elected many months before a single soldier was sent to France. [Applause.] And yet, and yet, men are going around loose [laughter], actually outside the walls of St. Elizabeths—some of them in the United States Senate, and some on the way there—saying that we took advantage of American soldiers and that "the American people never had a chance to express themselves on prohibition!" [Applause.]

Dear old Sam Jones used to say that he "could endure ignorance, but he just could not stand ig-no-rance," with his drawing emphasis on the last syllable. [Laughter.]

UNCONSTITUTIONAL "IG-NO-RANCE"

And that man is guilty of "ig-no-rance"—inexcusable, unconstitutional ig-no-rance, who continues to make such pitiful, unpatriotic, misleading claims concerning the passage of this constitutional law.

What then? The only thing occurred that could occur in the execution of a constitutional process. I remind our "damp" objectors and our embryonic young citizens who may be misled by them, that, after the eighteenth amendment had received a constitutional majority in both branches of Congress, it was carried, as the Constitution provides, to every legislature of every State in the American Union; and with the searching eyes of their constituents, to whom they were amenable, full upon them, 46 States—not the bare margin of 36 like the nineteenth amendment received, but 46—fifteen-sixteenths of the States of the Union, voted to ratify that constitutional compact—among them the States of Maryland and New York, ratifying the bone-dry amendment to the Constitution—the amendment which they now refuse to support through the constitutional obligation of a concurrent State law.

But back to the story. The eighteenth amendment was enacted, of course, by legislative indorsement, with 10 States to spare; but our "wet" friends were seized with a spasm of "constitutionitis," and with vigilant and belligerent zeal for the constitutionality of the Constitution they employed one of America's greatest lawyers—twice a member of the President's Cabinet—to argue the unconstitutionality of the Constitution; and when that court of last resort for every loyal red-blooded American had heard his brilliant sophistry, they handed down the high decision that every step in the process of passing our national prohibition law was according to the Constitution of our fathers! [Applause.]

Now I submit, my countrymen, that that is the way we pass our laws in the "Good Old U. S. A.," and if there is anybody in fair and frisky Frisco, or brilliant and blasé Boston, or wet and windy Chicago, or gay and godless Gotham, or sad and saddening St. Louis, or historic but "hootchy" Philadelphia, or beery and boozy Baltimore [laughter], with all their foreignized booze-loving elements that do not like the way we red-blooded, sober, God-fearing, constitutional Americans pass our laws in the United States of America, I respectfully and sadly remind them that the boats are still running to Russia. [Great applause.]

And I think three spacious suites should be reserved for the Republican editor of the Chicago Tribune and the Democratic editors of the Baltimore Evening Sun and the New York World who have openly taught nullification of a constitutional law—while a whole deck is reserved for that ponderously brilliant president of Columbia University, Nicholas Murray Butler [laughter], who declared that it is no more harm to drink alcohol per se than it is to eat roast beef and buckwheat cakes. I wonder if he ever knew anybody to eat roast beef and buckwheat cakes and shoot up the town and go home and beat up his wife and children as the result. No, no; I would not banish these poor misguided leaders forever, but just long enough in Russia and elsewhere abroad to make them fall in love anew with America—our people, our laws, and our national ideals.

Mr. BLANTON. You ought to excuse him because he did say something the other day that was worth while.

Mr. UPSHAW. Thank you. I am going to refer to that right now.

I am reminded that that "lofty intellectual," Nicholas Murray Butler, who was put forward for President by a part of the New York delegation some years ago and who demanded a wet plank in the Cleveland platform, is the same curious colossus who, with one wave of his consequential hand, has just swept Calvin Coolidge into the political discard concerning a third term, and who demands that the next Republican nominee shall stand on a "damp" platform and wave a beer bottle in one hand and a liquor bottle in the other—for he calls for a repeal of the eighteenth amendment. He is determined that the genial and dangerously popular Alfred E. Smith shall not wear the only damp diadem in apostate New York. And that brilliant Boanerges of Republican dryness, Senator BORAH, challenges Columbia's erring president to debate. I object. [Laughter.]

I claim "first go" at "Uncle Nicholas," for I challenged him first. [Applause.] And when I issued him an open challenge following some of his piratical attacks upon the prohibition amendment and its supporting statute, what do you suppose he said? This erstwhile and all the while loquacious advocate of presidential witness answered faintly from the inside of a beer keg: "Being the challenged party, I have the choice of weapons—and I choose silence." [Laughter.]

Now, I submit that that answer was not a very brave or consistent one for a man who has made as much noise on this question as the damp Doctor Butler. I remember that Doctor Butler gave as another reason for declining to debate with me the fact that somebody down in my district called me "Mr. O'pshaw."

Wrong number. He must have been reading the kaleidoscopic, microscopic performances of George Rothwell Brown in the Washington Post. But both of these acrobatic sons of intellectual gymnastics and many of their "wet" compatriots need to be reminded that this same "Mr. O'pshaw," who seems to have disturbed their serenity, has received for the fifth consecutive time the emphatic vote of confidence—even in the last election—of the great capital city of Georgia. And it is a higher honor to be the "dry" Congressman of such a city as Atlanta than it is to be the "wet" president of Columbia University. [Applause.]

YOU CAN NOT "REGULATE" LIQUOR

Doctor Butler, wet Republican, his wet Democratic governor, and all the wet authors of the "57 varieties" of modification bills that are periodically introduced by the industrious but despairing wet minority in Congress are all crying out against the Lincoln doctrine of "eradication" and demanding a legal return of the old-time doctrine and practice of "regulating" the liquor traffic.

Ah, my countrymen, if these sophisticated citified "wets" only knew—if they had come from the country, like Lincoln and most of us did, they would know that you can no more regulate a liquor shop than you can regulate a polecat. [Laughter.] There is something about the thing that you just can not regulate. You can pour a whole barrel of cologne on the pesky varmint, but it is a polecat still. [Laughter.] If somebody does not like that illustration, I remind you that the Lord of Creation made them, and I have never understood why unless it was to establish an analogy between a polecat and a barroom. [Laughter.] You just can not regulate a barroom and let it keep on selling liquor. [Applause.]

And you can open a liquor shop at 6 in the morning and close at 6 at night—you can open at 10 and close at 4—you can open at 12 and close at 1, and during the hour in which you keep it open and regulated you may guard it with a thousand efficient officers of the law, but if you sell one flask of the devilish "regulated" poison that robs a man of his reason—that makes his body stagger to its fall—that robs labor of the fruits of its honest toil—that strikes the crust from the lips of a starving child—that drives the roses from a happy woman's cheek—that hushes the song on the altar of her one-time happy heart—that shatters the vase that holds her all of peace and love and the dream and hope of Heaven—that makes cowards of politicians that support it—that makes a brute of the man who shoots up the town and goes home and kills his wife and children—and you know it has done all this ten thousand times—ten thousand times in America, then you know and I know and God knows that that liquor shop is not "regulated" for the safety of your home and mine! [Applause.]

There is only one way to regulate a liquor shop, and that is the way you regulate a rattlesnake—smash its devilish head with personal-wide, town-wide, state-wide, nation-wide, world-wide prohibition of the liquor traffic! [Applause.] This reign of sober, God-fearing righteousness is "that far-off divine event toward which the whole creation moves"—that will help to usher in the radiant fulfillment of the dream of those who pray "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is in Heaven."

SEVEN YEARS IS NOT ENOUGH

Bishop Manning, who has not been listed among the outstanding advocates of prohibition, has declared this very week that prohibition ought to be given a fair chance to win. We know well that when a man has been drunk a long time it takes a long time to sober up; and when a nation has been drunk in fact or in ideals for a full century—indeed, in its tastes and the inherited prejudices in its progenitors for a thousand years, it should not be expected to sober up in the short space of seven years. If the wets had been good sports and loyal constitutional Americans, they would have taken hold of this duly constituted law and helped to make it succeed. But they pre-

dicted failure and they, for the most part, have tried to prove their evil prophecy true. Attacked by enemies without and betrayed by enemies from within, this new law has done marvels in seven years.

My intense feeling on this subject is told in the following anniversary lines, written at the request of the N. E. A. Service, over against some "wet" verses of Congressman CELLER, of New York:

'TIL SEVENTY TIMES SEVEN

'Tis seven years since the legal reign of moral might began—
The greatest battle ever fought in the upward sweep of man!
Not "spasmodic sentiment," as the poor wets tell the earth,
But generations of plans and prayers gave prohibition birth.

And never for a single day since a stainless flag unfurled,
Have the wanton wets, with all their pets, cared for a sober world.
They've fought the law, they've picked a flaw with every passing hour,
And marshaled well the imps of hell with all their devilish power.

They've trampled truth; they've poisoned youth; they've stabbed the
Nation's heart.

And now they spout and rave and shout and do the coward's part.
Shall craven bands with "yellow" hands surrender now the flag
Because bootleggers vendor booze and drinkers want to jag?

Shall "scofflaws" flout the Nation's stripes and hip flasks rule the
stars?

By a leaping flood of heroes' blood in all our country's wars
We swear to stand with fearless hand 'til seventy years times seven,
'Til law and truth shall keep our youth and guard their path to heaven!

[Applause.]

(Read at the recent national conference of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union at the Mayflower in Washington.)

In striking consonance with this thought of our ability to enforce this law are the following virile and vigorous lines from Rev. James I. Seder, the highly efficient and popular associate superintendent of the West Virginia Anti-Saloon League. It was doubtless inspired by the powerfully effective work of Judge McClintic, of West Virginia, who is a "terror to evildoers":

"IT CAN'T BE ENFORCED"

James I. Seder, A. M., with acknowledgments to Edgar A. Guest

Doubting one said that it couldn't be done,
But the judge with a chuckle replied:
That "maybe it couldn't," but he would be one
Who wouldn't give up till he'd tried.
With a firmly set jaw and a grip on the law,
Stern his face; if he worried he hid it.
He looked like a king as he tackled the thing
That couldn't be done—and he did it.

Yes; some lawless ones scoffed: "Oh, you'll never do that—
No officer ever has done it";
But he made out the warrant, 'ere he took off his hat,
And the sheriff was off, he'd begun it;
With his hand on the law, firmly setting his jaw,
That place, of the lawless he'd rid it.
He stood like a king as he tackled the thing
That couldn't be done—well, he did it.

All the "scofflaws" will tell you it can not be done;
"The 'dry' law?—you can not enforce it."
They're slackers and cowards ev'ry one,
They hate it, hence do not indorse it.
But you just set firmly your jaw, true man of the law,
First make up your mind, then go to it;
Law's scepter you swing as you tackle the thing
That "can not be done"—and you'll do it.

RIGHT CAN NOT SURRENDER

When we are bidden not to be "extreme" and "radical" on the subject of prohibition enforcement and also the fundamental question of keeping inviolate this great constitutional law we answer without hesitation or equivocation that right can not surrender to wrong! Lincoln bravely said:

I must stand with anybody that stands right—stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong.

If it were a question of mere economics—abstract economics; if it were a question of the tariff and other related revenues—if it were a question of Army and Navy appropriations and regulations and what not, we might give and take, sit around a conference table, and enter into a platform and program of compromise; but on a great moral question that holds within its compass the issues of moral and spiritual debauchery for time and eternity we can not surrender one inch to the forces of constitutional disloyalty and national immorality.

But liquor is wrong. It is poison. It is insidious. It is cruel. It blights and debauches and damns. It is supported by forces immoral and corrupt. The same crowd, for the most part, that fought prohibition before it came is now fighting to destroy it. By a combination of methods that beggar description this unholy, unpatriotic fight is being carried on in utter defiance of the laws of God and man.

The "wets" declare, "Modify or we will nullify!" And then they keep right on illegally nullifying without waiting for legal modification. And they might as well not wait, for we friends of our bone-dry, sober Constitution refuse to lower our fortifications for the sake of fraternizing or compromising with the attacking army. To surrender an inch to that unholy demand would dishonor the God to whom we prayed for victory and lower and soil the flag that has been hailed victorious before the eyes of the watching world.

In the ringing words of that pioneer crusader, the late Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts, we answer the demand for surrender: "You would not ratify, and you shall not nullify!" [Applause.]

A PROGRAM OF UNWORTHY "WETNESS"

Against the honest "wet" who sincerely opposed prohibition before it came, but who now obeys the law and seeks only by clean constitutional methods to change or repeal it, I have no word of harshness, but rather, only sharp variation with his judgment and abounding commiseration for his hopeless plight. But for the insincere "wet" who puts his appetite above his country's laws and who stabs his party without conscience and his country's good name without remorse—may the good Lord deliver us from his baleful influence!

In this camp, regardless of lines of political cleavage, you find those who blatantly declare that they never want to see the old saloon return, and yet they berate the eighteenth amendment that put 177,000 saloons out of business. You can not find a mother's son of them who will stand on the floor of Congress or even on any representative platform in his wet home city and boldly fight for the old barroom days, and yet he underwrites the stream of abuse which "wet" papers and "wet" politicians pour upon the "political parsons" and "fanatical, sentimental women," as they are outrageously termed, who earnestly prayed and unselfishly worked to banish the saloon and who are now earnestly praying and unselfishly giving their money and their labors to keep saloons from coming back.

They attack the Woman's Christian Temperance Union as "impractical dreamers" and flay the Anti-Saloon League and its brilliant, knightly leader, Wayne B. Wheeler—as clean a man as ever walked and as brave a man as ever fought—the wets call all these dry leaders "intolerant fanatics" and "political meddlers," but they have no word of censure for the Association against the Prohibition Amendment and forty-odd other wet organizations that have come into being since the eighteenth amendment was passed for the express purpose of nullifying and destroying the prohibition law, and who brazenly boast that they have raised, and are yet raising millions of dollars with which to defeat every dry man and measure possible and elect every wet man who will pledge himself to carry out this program of unworthy "wetness."

Mr. Speaker, I fear I can not conclude in the hour allotted to me and "in the name of the Continental Congress" and of this fine Lincoln Day fellowship, I ask unanimous consent, for the last time perhaps I will ever ask it, that my time be extended for 20 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. I object.

Mr. UPSHAW. I hope the gentleman will reconsider.

Mr. SCHAFER. I withdraw the objection.

Mr. UPSHAW. The gentleman has a heart as big as his body, and I am much obliged.

RED BADGE, RED NOSE, AND RED FLAG

Here is concrete evidence of the monumental gall of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment. I found over in Delaware membership blanks urging enrollment before the election, with a footnote specifically stipulating "No financial obligation is incurred by my signature." Then, when the names were in, a special letter was sent saying "that while we are glad to have the assurance that you are with us, it must be remembered that by votes alone can we defeat the fanatical dries. Send us a dollar to join our voters' league," and so forth. A "dry" friend sent a dollar on a voyage of discovery, and here is what he got—this card, telling him he was paid up for a year; he must pay his dues every year to be in good standing; and this red badge to wear, with a red nose, I suppose, beneath a red flag. [Laughter.] That is no fairy tale about the red flag. Over in West Virginia I found men and, alas, women engaged in the task of securing signatures to a petition to repeal our prohibition law; and they were asked, foreigners and

Americans, to sign in red ink—the red language of red Russia—and they were thus saying:

We will give our red blood if necessary to repeal the Constitution that denies to us the red liquor we want to drink.

And yet these "wet" organizations have the unspeakable gall to ask the Anti-Saloon League and other "dry" organizations to go out of business and leave 42 "wet" organizations in charge of the field. We answer without hesitation or equivocation that we "drys" will go out of business just the day after the organized "wets" leave the field and not one day before! [Applause.]

The wets say they only want light wines and beer when they know that beer is made in breweries and sold in saloons, and that these saloons would be nothing less than the camouflage and the open door for the reenthronement of those three corrupting agencies of human degradation—the drink shop, the gambling hell, and the house of shame.

WET PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES INDICTED

Yea, more, I indict every "wet" national politician of both parties as guilty of monumental insincerity and cowardice utterly unworthy of party leadership. These wet leaders with their State heroics, their inane, indeterminate local referenda, and their bawling acrobatics about State rights—meaning liquor rights—would not dare propose a wet plank and a wet platform appeal for themselves or any other candidate in the next presidential campaign. They may rail at this indictment, but I dare any one of them to come out in the open and deny this unequivocal charge. The timely death of that candidate would come before his untimely birth. [Applause.]

PROHIBITION HAS NOT FAILED

Prohibition has not failed. While it has suffered some reverses here and there, it has won a thousand battles in a great war of increasing victories. Only yesterday I read the statement from Dr. Jasper C. Massee, the famous pastor of Tremont Temple, Boston, declaring that in a preaching tour of 10,000 miles in America he never saw a single drunk man on the train or street car. It has been defied in the big, wet cities, but the hinterland is increasingly dry. Leave out, if you will, the testimony of preachers, teachers, and women—builders of citizenship—who have personally seen countless thousands of homes redeemed from want, the crickets chirping again on the hearth, and the music of childish laughter making that humble home the antechamber of the skies. Henry Grady said he could not give one such home redeemed from drink with the light of heaven again in the face of the one-time desolate wife and mother, for all philosophy since Cicero thundered and all the swords and crowns that ever contended "since Cataline conspired and Caesar fought." [Applause.]

But this is not intended as an argument of statistics—else I could pile them to the dome of the Capitol to prove the incontestable blessings that have come to the American masses during these seven initial years of prohibition; but enter such captains of commerce and exponents of character and patriotism as Roger Babson, master of statistics and business and Christian philosophy; Richard Edmunds, great God-fearing editor of *The Manufacturers' Record*; Elbert Gary, sitting on his throne of steel, wrapped in his four-score years of resplendent wisdom and success; Owen D. Young, clear-headed member of the Dawes Commission and inspiring friend of humanity and the flag; John D. Rockefeller, whose name spells Santa Claus to more institutions of constructive benevolence than any other name perhaps in the whole world; Fred B. Smith, whose organizing genius on the side of right is a marvel of national blessing—yea; and Henry Ford—language fails—whose name is the synonym of business wizardry and abounding love of humanity—take them all—these mountain-peak builders of civilization that skirt the shores of the world's industrial scenery, and they all pack their sweeping witness into Henry Ford's laconic wisdom at the White House this week: "It is the difference between night and day. Prohibition is day. I hope it has come to stay." [Applause.]

Against such a crushing avalanche of incontestable business testimony the puerile opposition of the enemies of prohibition should promptly subside into a stammering and eternal hush.

GEORGIA ELECTS "BONE DRY" GOVERNOR

It is interesting to note that not only is Georgia's present able governor, Clifford Walker, personally and politically dry, but our governor elect was the author of our State prohibition bill when he was a member of the Georgia Senate in 1907. Knowing that Doctor Hardman had not used alcohol in his wide practice of medicine nor his great sanatorium at Commerce, Ga., for many years, I wired him for a statement concerning the matter and here is the response of Governor elect Hardman:

COMMERCE, GA., February 10, 1927.

Hon. W. D. UPSEAW,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Do not remember how many years since I have used alcohol in practice of medicine. Certainly 35 years or more. Early in practice, when we knew less about alcohol and its effect, I prescribed it some; but it was so disappointing, never benefiting patients; and after studying it from every angle, how it lowered the vitality of my patients, discontinued its use. There is no disease in which alcohol has any curative effect.

L. G. HARDMAN.

This ringing statement from the next Governor of Georgia—a physician of high character and great business success, supporting the recent testimony of Doctor Mayo, the famous surgeon of Rochester, Minn., ought to give heart to those who believe alcohol is unnecessary as a medicine.

SURE CURE FOR PROHIBITION ILLS

But remembering that the present spasm of prohibition opposition—an opposition that was expected when the law was enacted—is simply the result of the tenacious appetite begotten by the long reign of the legalized liquor traffic, and remembering also that every vicious violation of the law brings a new reason for eradicating the evils of the illegal traffic, root and branch, I offer a dead shot, sure cure for all the prohibition ills that we see and the many more that its enemies tell us about—let everybody on the floor and everybody in the galleries, especially the press gallery [laughter] get this; I told our resourceful and thoroughly honest prohibition director, Gen. Lincoln C. Andrews, that I am uttering in every speech I make over the country a sentence of five words that would put him, Wayne B. Wheeler, and the whole dry enforcement brigade out of business: Let everybody quit buying liquor! [Applause.]

That is simple enough, with that other basic injunction—let everybody quit drinking liquor! [Applause.]

And then our troubles will be over; no more appropriations, no more greed, no more graft, no more redness of eyes, no more mothers weeping over drinking sons and daughters, our children and our national ideals safe at home and our country's reputation safe abroad.

CONVINCE AMERICA—BEGIN AT THE TOP

The first great step toward complete victory is to convince the masses of America that the Government means business by officially drying up the Nation's Capital. Marvelous progress has been made. It seems about a million miles in space and a million years in time as we think of the difference between that horrible barroom with its tragic quota of official patronage that was banished from the basement of the Capitol and this fair day of decency and sobriety when a Congressman under the influence of liquor is "As rare as a day in June" or "A Chinaman with whiskers." Indeed, the improvement since prohibition came seven years ago is glorious to contemplate. I rejoice to proclaim on the platform everywhere that Congress is overwhelmingly "dry" in precept and in practice. In fact, I think I could count on the fingers of my two hands all whom I have ever seen under the influence of liquor since I came here eight years ago. One crowning act, however, awaits to be done—to profoundly impress the youth of our own country and the nations of the earth. Let the President and the Vice President, every Member of the Cabinet, and the popular Speaker of the House, all openly and unitedly announce that they will not attend any function—social, fraternal, commercial, or diplomatic—where intoxicants are served. This would give a moral thrill that would electrify the world. [Applause.] And further, let the President of this prohibition Nation, through the Secretary of State—as I proposed four years ago—inform all nations with which we have diplomatic relations that we have entered upon this great national moral program and that we respectfully request that no representative, consular or diplomatic, ask for diplomatic immunity concerning the shipment and serving of liquors that have been outlawed by the Constitution of the United States. [Applause.] This is sane, wholesome, and fundamentally American. Thirsty Americans who are foolish enough to want liquor very naturally complain when they see foreigners haul through the streets and serve at their functions the intoxicating liquors which are denied by law to our own American citizens. Diplomatic courtesy to our foreign guests does not require moral or constitutional surrender. [Applause.]

What a marvelous opportunity for our sober, God-fearing President to send America's great moral evangel to every nation on earth! I believe Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, would indorse this completion of America's emancipation from the liquor which he fought from his resolute boyhood to the day of his tragic translation.

And somehow I have the exhilarating suspicion that if Theodore Roosevelt were President, he would slap Uncle Sam on the shoulder and say, "By George, Uncle, since your Constitution says so, if we are going to have prohibition, let's begin in Washington and have it 100 per cent and then some."

WHY NOT A PROHIBITION BREAKFAST?

And while we are thinking of Washington, let us be frank clear through. On January 3, 1924, on the floor of this House I paid the following honest tribute to the President of my country:

Let me say frankly that I have faith in President Coolidge. [Applause.] I believe in his character and I believe in his courage. But I want him to give me a larger faith—and the people of America a larger faith—in his dynamic initiative by using the executive guillotine on the head of every drinking official; those who hope and pray for national sobriety are anxious to see him lead the holy crusade by smashing every jug and breaking every bottle in official Washington.

I stand by that utterance and put it into shining italics to-day. I believe the President of the United States personally practices the prohibition which he preaches in his messages to Congress; but I believe just as honestly and frankly that he and General Andrews and even Wayne Wheeler himself have never quite awakened to the enormity of the crime of the bootlegger and his supporting patron—enemies of the Constitution, enemies of the authority of the flag, enemies of God, and enemies of man. If the President had really realized the enormity of this thing, I am sure he would never have allowed any liquor Senator or Congressman to pay a political debt by having a "wet" man appointed to enforce a "dry" law. [Applause.] This incongruous thing has been at once the despair and shame of much of our effort at prohibition enforcement.

Let us ask again—where are the Cramton bill, the reorganization bill, and the Stalker bill, if you please, changing "or" to "and," making jail sentences mandatory for every violator of the prohibition law? Has the august body at the other end of the Capitol gone "wet"? Or is the dry majority helpless in the hands of a few "wet" buccaneers?

When the President wants tariff or any other form of revenue legislation—when he wants to speed up any sort of legislative program, he has a breakfast, and when he wants to protect American property or American life in foreign lands, he is vigilant enough and spunky enough to send a special message to Congress and marines to Nicaragua; but for four years remedial enforcement legislation has been languishing in one or the other branches of Congress, and yet there has never been a specific message or an emergency breakfast that I have ever heard of concerning this question. I believe in my soul that there ought to have been at least one dozen plates of waffles, one or two pitchers of maple sirup, and a few links of sausage dedicated to the greatest problem before the American people. [Applause.] This is neither narrow or partisan; it only illustrates my deep conviction that the whole American Nation needs a new and militant conscience concerning this national challenge that is being hurled daily at the American Government from the forces of lawlessness on every side.

I believe that "that little piece of Vermont granite that occupies the White House," as Raymond Robbins strikingly referred to President Coolidge, is a man of "marble integrity," but I want to see him get excited, if you please, in weeding out every wet, wayward official under his appointive power and pushing all forms of enforcement legislation. [Applause.]

When Gifford Pinchot declared in his inaugural address as Governor of Pennsylvania, "The mansion will be dry, the governor will continue to be dry, and no official will be appointed to office who does not promise to be dry," he set the only safe example for all executives of the Nation.

FINAL WORD TO MY FELLOW DEMOCRATS

I hope it will not be necessary to summon the Sergeant at Arms to make you dear Republicans "behave" while I bid an affectionate farewell and give a little free advice to my fellow Democrats—for I seem to remember (Glory be!) [laughter] that you have a perfectly lovely new-born "wet" and "dry" squabble in the G. O. P. ranks. [Laughter.]

Forget it not, my Democratic comrades, that the very stars in their courses are fighting for us in 1928—if we will only be wise—and keep sober as a party. The economic skies are heavy with clouds for the opposition; the long delay in farm-relief legislation spells nothing promising for the opposition; dissatisfaction with prohibition enforcement is an incapable liability to the opposition; the three successive defeats of the Republican Party when the Dingley, McKinley, and Payne-Aldrich tariffs went into effect show that the people who pay the bills are getting ready to visit the same condign pun-

ishment on the perpetrators of the Fordney-McCumber tariff if—if—if we Democrats will only furnish a platform, a candidate, and a program that will give them half a chance to support us. Everybody knows that a divided Democracy can no more win in 1928 than a divided Republican Party could win when Woodrow Wilson was elected. What then?

BASIS FOR DEMOCRATIC HARMONY

I propose as a basis of Democratic harmony the Constitution of the United States! If that is not sound Democracy, then pray tell me what is? [Applause.]

"Oh, but you mean the eighteenth amendment," some "damp" Democrat replies. Why, certainly—and all the other amendments. But as there is more dissension and discussion about the eighteenth amendment right now than all others put together, I propose in absolute loyalty to my party and to my country that the next Democratic convention declare without equivocation or prevarication that the party will stand 100 per cent in platform and candidate for the enforcement of the constitutionally enacted eighteenth amendment and its supporting statute.

The God-fearing, patriotic American people will not stand for any more pussy-footing on this great moral question. They will brook no more glittering generalities and elusive innuendoes. For once economics will be largely forgotten in the great Armageddon for humanity and our threatened national ideals.

No friend of Democratic harmony and victory will propose a cowardly plank or a cowardly candidate. As a loyal Democrat, believing that the Democratic Party holds the economic hope of the masses, I am anxious to the point of consecration and desperation for my party to win, but I ask, in the words of Patrick Henry, why cry "Peace, peace, when there is no peace!"

The dry constitutional Democrats want peace, but they will not sign the articles of agreement on the upturned head of a beer keg—unless that keg is empty. If our fellow Democrats who are honestly "wet" and who honestly want the party to win should complain good-naturedly or a bit impatiently that we "drys" are "hard-headed," I answer, "But we are hard-headed on the side of the Constitution, while you 'wets' are hard-headed on the side of nullifying and destroying the Constitution—that part of the Constitution which holds within its compass the moral emancipation of the American people." The past eight years are strewn with presidential wreckage because "wet" unconstitutional counsel prevailed. Mark my words, we will never surrender again. Better that the Democratic Party lose another election than to lose its soul forever! Come on, fellow Democrats, and let us stand together flat-footed on the constitutional water wagon and ride to a clean, glorious victory in 1928! [Applause.] In that remarkable Toledo speech of William G. McAdoo, the most dynamic, powerful utterance on the subject of constitutional prohibition and law enforcement since William J. Bryan died—indeed, never surpassed, if equaled, by Bryan himself—he rightly warned against the political dominance of wet States that have broken with State enforcement of this Federal constitutional law. McAdoo is right—increasingly right. The great wet cities that defy this law have no right to control or defeat the sober democracy of the Nation.

I am sure that my Republican colleagues, with whom I have always had good personal and patriotic fellowship in this House, will forgive this brief digression, this heart-to-heart conference with my fellow Democrats, especially when you know that you will be the gainer if they do not take the advice I have so freely and honestly given.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). The gentleman has five minutes of his original hour. The gentleman made a request for an additional 20 minutes. Objection was heard and the objection was withdrawn but the Speaker pro tempore in the chair at the time did not submit the question. The Chair therefore asks: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia to proceed for an additional 20 minutes?

Mr. UPSHAW. I think I shall hardly need that much time, but I will be grateful for this extension.

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

FINALLY AND FAREWELL

Mr. UPSHAW. Finally, my comrades, on both sides of the aisle, I shall rejoice to remember when I have taken leave of you that I have never consciously done one discourteous thing toward any Member of this House. You have given me a thousand reasons to be glad and thankful that a kind Providence led me into your fellowship.

While I have believed my specialty with an intensity that has been the passion of my life, I am glad that I know—I am glad that God knows I have been every whit honest and that I have practiced what I have preached. [Applause.]

I can never forget how, on the 3d day of March eight years ago when I lifted my eyes and saw the dome of the Capitol as my train was entering Washington, bringing me to become a Member of Congress, I suddenly remembered how I rode 4 miles in a wire spring and leaned on the arm of my Christian father, as I cast my first ballot at old Oregon Court Ground, in Cobb County, Ga., and wrapped that ballot in the prayer that God would make my entrance into citizenship a blessing to my country and an honor to my God. And as I looked on the beautiful dome of this Capitol—nothing else like it for symmetrical grandeur in all the world—I found myself communing again with my Christian father and my birth into active citizenship; and I am not ashamed to say that I bowed my head and lifted my heart again to God that He would help me to be God's man in the Capitol of my country. [Applause.]

Have I been true to that prayer and that ideal? I leave the answer to the God of my creation, the Christ of my redemption, and the friends who know me best and who love me best. I am just human enough, as I think of many of the rash and harsh criticisms that the "wet" papers have heaped upon me because of my so-called "radical views on prohibition"—I am human enough, I say, to put over against them that declaration of the Literary Digest which certainly plays no favorites with southern Democrats—but after reviewing my honest contention for sober officials, begun with a little 13-minute speech four years ago at Christmas time, the Literary Digest said:

To Congressman UPSHAW belongs the credit of awakening the conscience of America on the question of sober officials.

I think I would be willing—I speak the truth as I feel it—to go from this spot by His Grace to the bosom of my Maker if by thus going I might have assurance that the sacred task I then espoused would thus be made complete.

The other night, coming from my office, I found this empty bottle [laughter] near the elevator. Behold—it has a Glasgow and London trade-mark. It shows that lawbreakers in a friendly country thus smuggle in their defiance of our Constitution and of our flag. It shows by its final destination that its owners were willing to make money by debauching some Member of this House or some secretary of a Member. It is an ingenious affair. It has a nonrefillable stopper, so that the foolish man who bought it thought that he was getting genuine Scotch—but behold the bottom. Some devilish bootlegger had cut the glass, taken it out, removed the genuine liquor and filled it, doubtless, with a superpoison from the liquid haunts of hell, and then snugly sealed it back again. Mr. Speaker, it is empty. [Laughter and applause.]

As I hold this outlaw flask aloft language almost fails me.

How I hate the stuff that will make seller and buyer descend to such devilry as would make even some thieves blush with shame. I hate it with a hatred too deep for words. I hate it because "it leads to bewilder and dazzles to blind." I hate it because as the word of God declares, "It biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." I hate it because, as Henry Grady grandly declared, "It has dug more graves and sent more souls unsaved to judgment than all the pestilence that has wasted humanity since God sent the plagues into Egypt and all the wars that have ever been fought since Joshua stood beyond Jericho." I hate it because of the happy homes it has destroyed, of the promising lives it has wrecked, and the unspeakable sorrows it has brought to millions of wives and mothers and children in the world. I hate it because it has twice wrecked the Democratic Party—the party I was taught from youth to love—and is preparing and daring to wreck it again. I hate it because, after all it has done to despoil humanity, along its trail of slime and crime through the centuries, and after it has been outlawed by due governmental process, it comes here now to challenge this Government again in the very Halls of Congress—to trample the Constitution beneath our feet and defy the flag above your home and mine. [Applause.]

YANCEY'S GREAT DECISION

Without one vestige of sectional thought, gentlemen, but illustrating the spirit of those tragic times and the type of courage and character necessary to make great moral decisions, I remind you of that dramatic hour just before Alabama seceded, when William L. Yancey, the eloquent Alabamian, was to speak in New York. When he rose and advanced toward the front of the platform the great crowd stood up and became a howling mob. They cried "Put him out—the enemy of the Union—put him out!"

But Yancey stood with folded arms like an uncrowned king and faced that frenzied throng. Watching his opportunity, he suddenly threw his voice like a silver bell across the excited multitude, and the tumult ceased—the curse, half uttered, died upon the lip—and then, with a logic overpowering and a pathos that melted all hearts, Yancey plead for his misunderstood section and people. When he sat down the audience was wrapped in a flame of subdued and subduing fervor. Everybody wondered who would break the magic spell. Then a man stood up in the back of the audience and called out "Mr. Yancey!"

All eyes were upon him.
"You faced an audience that was hostile an hour ago" said the speaker, "but now you must recognize the fact that you are in the house of your friends. This would we know of you, Mr. Yancey—if Alabama does secede, what will be your individual course?"

Heart strings seemed about to snap as that breathless crowd waited for the southern orator's answer. But they heard it not. Yancey clasped his hands to his throbbing brow and paced the stage. He caught a vision—the vision of his name in blazing letters all over the Northern press next morning, saying "Yancey goes with the Union—a Cabinet place with Lincoln." He paused, looked at the crowd but did not answer. He caught another vision of a beautiful southern home like Grady saw in his dying message in Boston—an old-fashioned southern home with tall colonial columns and the white pigeons fluttering down through the golden air.

He paused again but did not answer. Then, pressing both hands to his fevered brow, he paced the stage again as he caught the vision of his last hour in Montgomery. His departing train was thronged with constituents, his life-long neighbors and friends.

They were ringing his hands while tears were in their eyes. He heard them say again: "Yancey, we trust our all with you!"

Yancey had decided. He suddenly paused, stretched out his trembling hand toward that great multitude swaying with emotion and said: "Alabama's past has been my past, Alabama's glory has been my glory, Alabama's sorrows are my sorrows, Alabama's present is my present, and by the help of Almighty God, Alabama's destiny shall be my destiny!"

Thus, with startling and electrifying moral heroism Yancey broke with what he conceived to be wrong in Government and cast his lot with that little republic for which Robert E. Lee fought and Stonewall Jackson fell!

Ah, my colleagues, we of the South and the North thank God together that, with "ambiguities in the Constitution wiped out in a baptism of blood," we are one country now, living, working—if need be, fighting together for a common flag and sacred national ideals. We face a moral crisis greater than Yancey faced—greater than the Nation ever before has known. The eyes of our children are on us. The eyes of the nations of the earth are upon us. The outlawed liquor traffic, without conscience or character, is defying all things sacred to our laws, our hearts, and our homes.

I call upon you to break with every phase and form of the liquor traffic; break with all that is unclean in public life and leadership and cast your all for your children and your country—"for God and home and every land." [Applause.]

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPSHAW. Yes.

Mr. YATES. I am the son of an Illinoisan who sat for years in the House of Representatives side by side with that distinguished son of Georgia, Alexander H. Stephens. As one son of Illinois who has watched your course in Congress, I want to say to you that you bear from this Chamber my admiration, and that so far as I know the admiration of all of our colleagues. We wish you well, sir, in your future. [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Thank you, Governor, your words are graceful and gracious.

I ask this with my closing words: In this Chamber and beyond this Chamber, I ask the leadership of America, which will you take, this bottle I hold before you or this Bible? This Bible says:

No drunkard shall enter the kingdom of heaven.

Abraham Lincoln said:

Do not try to regulate, but eradicate, the unspeakable cancer.

And he urged and practiced total abstinence.

This bottle says: "Down with the Bible, down with the teachings of Lincoln, down with the prohibition that is trying to save the homes and youth of America." Which will you take? In God's name there is only one answer, and if there be those in the gallery or anywhere in America who laugh over this serious, desperate, passionate appeal, I remind you that these

principles for which Abraham Lincoln stood, the eternal principles that this Bible teaches and that I humbly and loyally support, will dance above the graves of their detractors and shine in the firmament of the ages like the stars of God forever and ever. [Applause.]

Mrs. Ella Boole said the other night, at that wonderful meeting of the Women's Christian Temperance Union:

Prohibition must win, because the prayers are on our side, and there is no prayer on the side of liquor.

God knows I would not be on any side for which I could not pray. [Applause.]

In the sacred closing moments of this birthday contemplation we love to think of those beautiful, enriching words of Edward J. Davis on Lincoln:

Heroic in his heart and mind,
Unparalleled—in deeds so kind;
Forever in our hearts enshrined—
Immortal spirit—God-refined!

I say with my last word, I came here with my heart on my knees. With the holy impact of the teachings of a family altar upon me, I have prayed daily that I might be true to every principle of that righteousness that exalteth a nation.

My colleagues, I would rather live in your hearts and help you and your children upward than to live anywhere this side of heaven.

I can leave to you and to them no loftier personal and national concept than Lincoln's creed—for he believed with Richard Hooker, the great British pathfinder in religion and patriotism, that—

Of the law no less can be said than that its seat is the bosom of God—its voice the harmony of the world.

Let us then obey the injunction of the great God-fearing Emancipator, friend of the flag, friend of God, and friend of man, and "make reverence for law the political religion of the Nation," and then, and not until then, may we be sure that "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth." [Prolonged applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. SCHAFER. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I shall have to object to the request at the present time.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. HAUGEN. We are trying to get through the debate on the farm-relief legislation—

Mr. SCHAFER. If the gentleman wanted to get through with the debate on farm-relief legislation, why did not the gentleman object to the one hour of the preceding speaker being extended 20 minutes? I raise the point of no quorum.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be discourteous about the matter, and if it is a matter of importance for the gentleman to proceed now, I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen of the House, I will be brief, because I do not want to interfere with farm-relief legislation.

The speaker who has preceded me has told the House and the country that farm relief or other legislation was not important, and that the main and the vital question in which the people of America and the Congress should be interested is the one problem which is foremost in his mind, namely, the prohibition question. If this Congress is in accord with the gentleman of Georgia, it should necessarily suspend the consideration of all legislation and confine the rest of this short session to the consideration of the prohibition question.

I asked the gentleman to yield during his address in order to correct a wrong impression which some of his statements appeared to convey. From his argument one would reach the conclusion that the only question and the only issue upon which the sovereign voters of America expressed themselves at the ballot box was the prohibition question, because the gentleman cited, as usual, the fact that a majority of Members who agree with him on this question were returned to the Congress. Thank God that the democracy of America has not sunk so low as the gentleman would lead us to believe. When the day comes—and I know that it has not come and will not come when a majority of America's citizens will determine who will

represent them in the Halls of Congress on one question alone, be it prohibition or modification, then I fear for the safety of the Republic.

On November 2 last the voters of Wisconsin in a clear-cut referendum indicated their desire that the Volstead Act be modified by a vote of 349,443 in favor of and 177,602 against. My congressional district is included in the County of Milwaukee, which voted 81,000 for and 14,000 against.

It is unfair and unjust for the gentleman from Georgia and other prohibition advocates to convey the impression that American citizens who desire that the Volstead Act be modified do not respect the flag and institutions of America.

I yield to no one, not even to the gentleman from Georgia, in my desire that all laws be enforced while they are on the statute books. I yield to no one in my reverence for the flag, Constitution, and institutions of our Republic, either in times of war or in times of peace.

I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that, under the American Constitution, if you please, the sovereign citizens of this Nation have just as much moral and legal right to ask for the repeal or amendment of the Volstead Act or for the amendment of the eighteenth amendment or its repeal, as they have to ask for the amendment or repeal of any other constitutional provision or law on the statute books. They have just as much right to ask for or advocate such amendment or repeal as he and those who now champion the Volstead Act had before its enactment.

It is to be regretted that the gentleman from Georgia should make a prohibition memorial and political speech on Lincoln's Birthday and convey the impression that said speech was a Lincoln memorial address. The gentleman declined to yield and indicated that he would not yield because he was delivering a Lincoln memorial address.

I think Abraham Lincoln, George Washington, and the late Robert M. La Follette were three of the most distinguished citizens of this Nation, and I yield to no one, not even to the gentleman from Georgia, in my high regard for President Lincoln. A prohibition memorial address such as the gentleman has delivered here on Lincoln's Birthday under the guise of a Lincoln memorial address is an insult to the memory of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for half a minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to make the RECORD clear that my address was never announced as a memorial to Abraham Lincoln. I asked the privilege and was given the privilege of speaking on the national lessons from Lincoln's life and character. I have been true to my announcement.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman called it a memorial address when I started to interrupt him.

THE McNARY-HAUGEN BILL

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent in extending my remarks on the farm relief bill to include therein statistics prepared by Mr. O. F. Bledsoe on the insurance plan, and also to include therein an analysis of the McNary-Haugen bill with the Bledsoe amendments included by A. H. Stone of Mississippi.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I now refer to a plan that I proposed some days ago that has not been worked out by dreamers but by successful cotton growers who are familiar with the problem of production and are skilled to an unusual degree in the methods of cotton marketing. I regard insurance against seasonal decline in the prices of cotton as vitally necessary in the pending legislation.

The insurance to which I refer is in no sense a guarantee of profit nor an insurance against loss. The only thing which may be insured is the price at delivery. This price may or may not result in a profit to the producer; that is a matter outside the limits of the proposed insurance.

I again call attention to this insurance plan, which has been proposed by Mr. O. F. Bledsoe, jr., a successful cotton planter and one of the ablest cotton men in the country; under this plan members of cooperatives would receive approximately the spot market price for their cotton on the day of delivery less carrying charges, and if the average annual price of cotton

should be higher, they would receive the benefit of the higher price.

I am delighted that amendments to carry out the plan proposed by Mr. Bledsoe have been adopted by the Senate. I call attention to the fact that Mr. Bledsoe appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and his views on the proposed plan may be found in the hearings of the committee on the McNary bill as reported to the Senate. The proposed plan has been carefully investigated. It is regarded as sound. The result has been that those who advocate legislation for the relief of agriculture are prepared to adopt Mr. Bledsoe's plan covering cotton, and desire that the plan be extended so as to take in the other basic commodities. In other words, I am not advocating an amendment for the proposed legislation that has not been carefully considered. The insurance plan has been investigated, and the amendment has been proposed by the author of the pending bill in the Senate, indicating that the advocates of the pending legislation desire to cooperate in any amendments that will perfect it.

As a matter of fact, the hearings disclose that in the case of cotton insurance experts have declared that it presents a legitimate risk from the standpoint of commercial insurance. The insurance can not be obtained commercially because of the insurance laws of the various States.

The amendment providing for insurance leaves the details to the board, and it can be undertaken by the board in the case of cotton and in the case of other commodities where proper statistical data is furnished for the basis of premium agreements. Experiences in insurable risks will have to be ascertained in the various basic commodities. I have carefully investigated the matter in so far as cotton is concerned, for I am more familiar with this product than I am with other basic commodities. Investigations are based upon statistics of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, which is the most stable cotton market in America, for a period of 20 years.

Statistics for a period of 20 years, from September 1, 1905, to August 31, 1925, show that, with the exception of 5 years, the average price of cotton during the harvesting or delivery season, which is the period from September 1 to December 31, in which farmers usually sell their cotton, is lower than the average price of cotton for the 12 months beginning September 1 and ending August 31.

The five years in which there were exceptions, and in which the trend has not held good, are all susceptible to reasonable explanations, due to unusual conditions, most of which are certainly not likely to occur again.

Many of us have been studying this matter, and we are convinced that it would be for the substantial gain of the cotton grower if a plan of insurance against crop decline during any one year could be put into effect. Under the plan which Mr. Bledsoe proposes, and which I now advocate, the cooperative cotton associations would be guaranteed that their weighted average delivery spot price during the delivery period—that is, from September 1 to December 31—would not be less than their average selling price for the year—that is, from September 1 to August 31. The result would be that such associations would be able to pay their members approximately the full spot market price for their cotton at the time of delivery, less carrying charges, which consist of freight adjustment, one year's insurance, storage, and interest.

The examinations of the daily price records of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange for the period mentioned were made by Ernst & Ernst, public accountants. I embody herein the result of these examinations:

First. A letter from Messrs. Ernst & Ernst to Mr. O. F. Bledsoe, jr., dated September 1, 1926, covering examinations of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, and giving the average prices of middling spot cotton for the delivery and for the annual seasons for the 20 years, which show the average price during the farmers' delivery season from September 1 to December 31 to be 17.55 cents per pound, while the average price during the entire season from September 1 to August 31 is 18.03 cents per pound, or the average price for the year is 0.58 cent, or a little over one-half a cent per pound, more than the average price during the harvesting or farmers' selling period, as follows:

27 CEDAR STREET, September 1, 1926.

Mr. O. F. BLEDSOE, JR.,
President Staple Cotton Cooperative Association,
Greenswood, Miss.

DEAR SIR: We hereby certify that we have examined the daily price records of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange from September 1, 1905, to August 31, 1925, and find that the average prices reported for middling spot cotton for the periods from September 1 to December 31 and from September 1 to August 31 were as follows:

Sept. 1 to Dec. 31—	Average price	Sept. 1 to Aug. 31—	Average price
Cents		Cents	
1905	10.86	1905-6	10.92
1906	10.22	1906-7	11.22
1907	11.48	1907-8	11.14
1908	8.93	1908-9	10.08
1909	13.79	1909-10	14.51
1910	14.26	1910-11	14.39
1911	9.85	1911-12	10.87
1912	11.99	1912-13	12.26
1913	13.29	1913-14	13.23
1914	7.29	1914-15	8.29
1915	11.45	1915-16	12.15
1916	17.56	1916-17	19.78
1917	26.47	1917-18	29.40
1918	30.88	1918-19	30.01
1919	36.15	1919-20	38.38
1920	20.21	1920-21	14.75
1921	18.21	1921-22	18.71
1922	23.34	1922-23	26.15
1923	31.39	1923-24	30.51
1924	23.45	1924-25	23.89
20-year average	17.55	20-year average	18.03

Attention is directed to the fact that in the year 1914 the exchange was closed during August and September. Therefore price of 7.29 cents above actually covers three months. The prices of 13.23 cents for the year 1913-14 and 8.29 cents for the year 1914-15 actually cover only 11 months of each year.

ERNST & ERNST.

Second. The summary of the New Orleans spot prices of cotton, as follows:

New Orleans exchange spot middling cotton

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June
1906	11.55	10.67	10.84	11.27	11.31	10.99
1907	10.44	10.45	10.82	10.79	11.88	12.81
1908	11.83	11.59	10.91	10.19	10.91	11.57
1909	9.33	9.43	9.38	10.03	10.58	11.03
1910	15.22	14.87	14.73	14.63	14.88	14.84
1911	14.95	14.62	14.55	14.70	15.48	15.26
1912	9.52	10.31	10.64	11.62	11.71	12.06
1913	12.58	12.51	12.45	12.43	12.29	12.44
1914	12.92	12.90	12.94	13.09	13.36	13.78
1915	7.87	8.01	8.34	9.42	9.04	9.11
1916	12.03	11.45	11.72	11.88	12.61	12.79
1917	17.33	17.14	17.93	19.51	20.01	24.18
1918	31.06	30.90	32.75	32.94	28.92	30.71
1919	28.84	26.94	26.83	26.70	29.37	31.94
1920	40.27	39.38	40.69	41.41	40.31	40.49
1921	14.53	12.85	11.03	11.16	11.79	11.03
1922	16.51	16.36	16.74	16.79	19.30	21.68
1923	27.51	28.78	30.43	28.42	26.53	28.61
1924	33.94	31.90	28.73	30.41	30.69	29.47
1925	23.66	24.60	25.63	24.51	23.53	24.06
Average	18.09	17.78	17.90	18.09	18.23	18.94

Year	July	August	September	October	November	December
1905			10.25	10.15	11.28	11.87
1906	10.95	9.97	9.24	10.75	10.35	10.48
1907	12.88	12.13	12.47	11.18	10.83	11.53
1908	10.80	9.92	9.10	8.92	8.96	8.74
1909	12.13	12.46	12.66	13.43	14.40	14.95
1910	14.92	14.91	13.69	14.19	14.49	14.84
1911	14.28	11.91	11.28	9.60	9.33	9.17
1912	12.93	12.04	11.36	10.94	12.15	12.80
1913	12.34	12.02	13.12	13.73	13.31	12.98
1914	13.33	None.	8.38	7.01	7.42	7.18
1915	8.71	8.93	10.40	11.95	11.50	11.88
1916	13.03	14.25	15.26	17.24	19.44	18.34
1917	25.41	25.03	21.68	26.75	28.07	29.07
1918	29.57	30.22	33.22	31.18	29.75	29.43
1919	33.93	31.37	30.37	35.18	30.57	39.88
1920	39.41	34.02	37.47	20.95	17.65	14.63
1921	11.48	22.77	19.35	18.99	17.27	17.17
1922	22.01	21.54	20.74	22.04	25.38	25.47
1923	25.73	24.22	27.70	29.18	33.68	34.88
1924	29.23	26.65	22.76	23.47	23.95	23.66
1925	23.97	23.07				
Average	18.85	18.33	17.01	17.34	17.93	17.94

Grand average 20 years, 18.03; Sept. 1 to Jan. 1, 17.55.

Third. Actual Staple Cotton Cooperative Association deliveries and prices for the years 1922-23, 1923-24, 1924-25, as compared with the theoretical average, show a gain of 0.11 cent per pound of actual delivery average over the theoretical delivery average, as follows:

Staple Cotton Cooperative Association

Month	Percentage of deliveries	20-year average price	Average delivery price
August	0.29	18.33	5.3157
September	26.27	17.01	446.8527
October	42.72	17.34	740.7648
November	23.02	17.94	412.7486
December	5.74	18.00	102.9756
January	.71	18.00	12.8430
February	.73	17.78	12.9794
March	.23	17.90	4.1170
April	.18	18.00	3.2562
May	.02	18.23	.3646
June	.04	18.94	.7576
July	.05	18.85	.9425
Total	100.00	18.03	17.44

Theoretical delivery average, Sept. 1 to Jan. 1..... 17.55
 Actual based on association delivery average..... 17.44
 Gain..... .11

Fourth. Variations by annual seasons in middling spot quotations for the period of 20 years, as follows:

Variations in middling spot cotton quotations—New Orleans

Season	Loss	Gain
1905-6		0.06
1906-7		1.00
1907-8	0.34	(1)
1908-9		1.10
1909-10		.72
1910-11		.13
1911-12		1.02
1912-13		.27
1913-14	0.06	(2)
1914-15		1.00
1915-16		.70
1916-17		2.22
1917-18		2.93
1918-19	.87	(3)
1919-20		2.23
1920-21	5.46	(4)
1921-22		.51
1922-23		2.81
1923-24	.88	(5)
1924-25		.44
Total	7.61	37.69

1 Money panic.
 2 World War.

3 Armistice signed.
 4 Crop estimate.

I also embody a statement, dated January 26, 1927, prepared by Mr. Bledsoe, giving profit and loss of seasonal cotton-price insurance from 1905 to 1919 and from 1921 to 1924, inclusive, which shows that the growers would have received, under the plan proposed, an increased amount for the annual period over the four months' delivery period in the sum of \$1,011,325,750. The production during these years was 228,528,000 bales; and if the Government had underwritten insurance against decline in the annual price at a premium of \$1 per bale, the premiums would have amounted to \$228,528,000, while the losses would have been \$120,783,450, leaving a profit of \$107,744,550 to the Government. The said statement is as follows:

STAPLE COTTON COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,

Greenwood, Miss., January 26, 1927.

Profit and loss statement of seasonal cotton price insurance from 1905 to 1919 and 1921 to 1924, inclusive

Fiscal year	Bales produced	Value per pound, Sept. 1 to Dec. 31	Value per pound, Sept. 1 to Aug. 31	Increased amount received by growers, yearly period over 4 months	Losses due to decrease in value, yearly period over 4 months
1905-06	10,575,000	10.86	10.92	\$3,172,500	
1906-07	13,274,000	10.22	11.22	66,370,000	
1907-08	11,107,000	11.48	11.14		\$18,921,900
1908-09	13,242,000	8.93	10.03	72,831,000	
1909-10	10,005,000	13.79	14.51	36,018,000	
1910-11	11,608,000	14.26	14.39	7,545,850	
1911-12	15,693,000	9.85	10.87	80,034,300	
1912-13	13,703,000	11.99	12.26	18,499,050	
1913-14	14,156,000	13.29	13.23		4,246,800
1914-15	16,135,000	7.29	8.29	80,675,000	
1915-16	11,192,000	11.45	12.15	39,172,000	
1916-17	11,450,000	17.56	19.78	127,095,000	
1917-18	11,302,000	26.47	29.40	165,574,300	
1918-19	12,041,000	30.88	30.01		52,378,350

Profit and loss statement of seasonal cotton price insurance from 1905 to 1919 and 1921 to 1924, inclusive—Continued

Fiscal year	Bales produced	Value per pound, Sept. 1 to Dec. 31	Value per pound, Sept. 1 to Aug. 31	Increased amount received by growers, yearly period over 4 months	Losses due to decrease in value, yearly period over 4 months
1919-20	11,421,000	35.15	38.38	\$127,344,150	
1921-22	7,954,000	18.21	18.71	10,885,000	
1922-23	9,760,000	23.34	26.15	137,128,000	
1923-24	10,281,000	31.39	30.51		\$45,236,400
1924-25	13,628,000	23.45	23.89	29,981,600	
	228,528,000			1,011,325,750	120,783,450

Growers' income from premiums payable on 228,528,000 bales of cotton at \$1 per bale	\$228,528,000
Losses due to decrease in value, yearly period over 4 months	120,783,450
Profit to underwriters	107,744,550

Baleage: United States Department of Agriculture.
Prices: Average spot middling prices of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, New Orleans, La., certified to by Messrs. Ernst & Ernst, certified public accountants.

STAPLE COTTON COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
O. F. BLEDSOE, President.

As stated, during 15 of the 20 years mentioned, the seasonal trend of the prices was upward; that is, the average of the prices during the selling period was higher than the average of the prices during the marketing season of the farmers. The years in which there has been a downward trend in which there has been a loss—that is, in which the delivery period average has been higher than the year's average prices, were as follows:

During the season of 1907-8 there was a loss of 34 points, or \$1.70 a bale. This was the year of the great bank panic.

During the season of 1913-14 there was a loss of 6 points, or \$0.30 per bale, due to the World War, when for more than two months during the delivery period all exchanges were closed, and there were practically no sales of cotton.

During the season of 1918-19 there was a loss of 87 points, or \$4.35 per bale. This was the year of the armistice, and the loss was due to the fall in prices of cotton after the unusual demands of the war.

During the season of 1920-21 there was a loss of 546 points, or \$27.30 per bale. This was the year of deflation. Such a condition could hardly occur in the future; and, inasmuch as the proposition is to be limited for one year, contracts for insurance made during such abnormal conditions as existed during the year 1920-21 would need to be given special consideration and should be eliminated from the plan here proposed.

During the season 1923-24 there was a loss of 88 points, or \$4.80 per bale. This is the only year in the 20 years where the loss in price might possibly be ascribed to crop conditions. Because of the unusual crop conditions, the estimates of the crop during the delivery season as well as the estimates of the spinning activities in cotton proved to be quite short. There was an underestimate of supply and an overestimate of demand, with the result that a loss occurred during the whose season over the delivery season.

Except during these five seasons there has been an invariable gain for the selling over the delivery season.

Excluding the season of 1920-21, the average annual loss for the 19 years included in the calculations is 56.6 cents per bale. The monthly percentage of the Staple Cotton Growers Association deliveries multiplied by the 20 years average monthly price of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange shows that the actual delivery price is 17.44 cents against the theoretical 20-year average from September 1 to August 31 of 17.55 cents, a reduction of 11 points, which would reduce the average loss from 56.6 cents per bale to 46.3 cents per bale. The loss for the season 1920-21 is excluded for the reason that a contingent liability in deflation does not exist at the present. It would be unfair to include the loss due to inflation in 1920-21, as without deflation it is doubtful if there would have been any loss at all.

Assuming, however, for the sake of argument, that the loss for 1920-21 would have been the average of the other entire four years of loss, or \$2.68 per bale, we get a total loss cost for the entire 5 years out of the 20 of \$13.43 per bale, or \$0.67 per bale per annum. Adding 33½ per cent for profit and expenses, in order to determine a reasonable insurance rate, would give a rate of \$0.89½ per bale. It will be kept in mind that the aggregate loss cost for the four years, excluding the year 1920-21, amounts to \$10.75 per bale.

The statistics which have been compiled show that the Government can safely guarantee that the members of the cooperative cotton associations would not receive less for their cotton than the average selling price during the year in consideration of the payment of a premium by the member of approximately one-fifth of a cent per pound, or \$1 per bale. This would be approximately 46 cents per bale more than the actual loss during the period of 20 years, as already stated, and would be a sound business and insurance proposition.

The premiums paid by the associations would be used to reimburse the associations for losses that might occur and to provide a reserve for any future losses. The premium of \$1 per bale would provide for unusual losses and allow for considerable margin, which would be placed in a reserve to take care of unusual conditions.

The plan proposed is especially applicable to short-staple cotton. In fact, it would be more beneficial to short-staple than it would be for long-staple cotton, for the grower of long-staple cotton must take the risks in so far as the difference between the value of his cotton and short-staple cotton is concerned.

There is no private agency that can finance the proposed plan. The proposition is safe; as an insurance measure it is sound. The Government can aid agriculture, and in this case a sound plan for financial aid by the Government is proposed.

There are a number of amendments whereby the insurance plan can be made effective, and I am advised that the pending bill can be amended in two particulars, so as to make the insurance idea effective:

It can be done by providing for insurance on all basic commodities, and I have enlarged the plan originally proposed covering cotton so as to embrace all agricultural commodities, because those who represent other agricultural commodities asked that these commodities be embraced. I may say that the investigation covering wheat disclosed the same trend as to prices during the season. I am sure that the same thing is true as to other commodities that may be bought and sold on the exchange; in the very nature of the case this must be true, for otherwise there would be no buying and selling. Moreover, by accepting the plan for insurance against price decline the equalization fee would be justified. Cooperatives may then offer their members insurance and also the cost of carrying the commodity from the time of delivery to the date of sale. The plan would encourage cooperative marketing. It would still be voluntary. The equalization fee would only be collected in case of a surplus. The insurance would be available at all times, with or without an equalization fee, but with an equalization fee in the case of a surplus the insurance would be indispensable.

Two amendments will provide for the insurance on all commodities against seasonal decline in price, and I shall propose the following amendments, which have been adopted by the Senate:

On page 9, line 5, strike out down through line 5, on page 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) During the continuance of such operations in any basic agricultural commodity the board is authorized to enter into agreements, for the purpose of carrying out the policy declared in section 1, with any cooperative association engaged in handling the basic agricultural commodity, or with a corporation created by one or more of such cooperative associations, or with processors of the basic agricultural commodity.

"(e) Such agreements may provide for (1) removing or disposing of any surplus of the basic agricultural commodity, (2) withholding such surplus, (3) insuring such commodity against undue and excessive fluctuations in market conditions, and (4) financing the purchase, storage, or sale or other disposition of the commodity. The moneys in the stabilization fund of the basic agricultural commodity shall be available for carrying out such agreements. In the case of any agreement in respect of the removal or disposal of the surplus of a basic agricultural commodity, the agreement shall provide both for the payment from the stabilization fund for the commodity of the amount of losses, costs, and charges arising out of the purchase, storage, or sale or other disposition of the commodity or out of contracts therefor, and for the payment into the stabilization fund for the commodity of profits (after deducting all costs and charges provided for in the agreement) arising out of such purchase, storage, or sale or other disposition, or contracts therefor. In the case of agreements insuring such commodity against undue and excessive fluctuations in market conditions, the board may insure any cooperative marketing association against decline in the market price for the commodity at the time of sale by the association, from the market price for such commodity at the time of delivery to the association."

On page 10, line 7, after "associations," insert: ", or corporation created by one or more cooperative associations."

On page 18, strike out lines 14 and 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Any loan under subdivision (a) or (b) shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum.

"(d) The board may at any time enter into a contract with any cooperative marketing association engaged in marketing any basic agricultural commodity, insuring such association for periods of 12 months against decline in the market price for such commodity at the time of sale by the association from the market price for such commodity at the time of delivery to the association. For such insurance the association shall pay such premium, to be determined by the board, upon each unit of the basic agricultural commodity reported by the association for coverage under the insurance contract, as will cover the risks of the insurance."

On page 17, line 14, after "loans," insert "and insurance."

On page 15, line 16, after the comma, insert "premiums paid for insurance under section 12."

On page 15, strike out line 19 through the comma in line 23, and insert "(b) the board, in anticipation of the collection of the equalization fees and the payment of premiums for insurance under section 12, and in order promptly to make the payments required by any agreement under section 6 or by the insurance contracts under section 12 and to pay salaries and expenses of experts."

On page 16, line 13, strike out all after the word "only" down through the comma in line 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(1) the payments required to be made by any agreement under section 6 or by an insurance contract under section 12."

On page 19, line 4, after the parenthesis, strike out through the word "act" in line 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "including the payments required by any agreement under section 6 or by the insurance contracts under section 12."

THE BENEFITS

The benefits to be derived from the plan are:

First. Banks can safely advance to cooperative marketing associations the spot-market price on the day of delivery, less carrying charges.

Second. Cotton cooperative associations will be able to pay members the spot-market price for their cotton on the day of delivery, less carrying charges.

Third. Cotton cooperative associations and their members will be insured against losses in cotton, with the orderly marketing of the cotton of the members.

Fourth. Members of the cotton cooperative associations, in the event of their association obtaining higher prices than were paid to them for their cotton on the day of delivery, will receive the gain in price.

Fifth. The operating expenses of the cotton associations will be reduced considerably, because the members will be receiving the full market price on delivery, without subsequent partial payments.

Sixth. Inasmuch as the producer is not guaranteed a specific or artificial price, but is only guaranteed against a seasonal decline in price, based on supply conditions, the tendency to stimulate production in excessive quantities is not present under this plan.

Seventh. All of these features would combine to strengthen cooperative associations and would promote the orderly marketing of cotton. The result would be both price and production stabilization.

The Federal farm board as underwriters of the contract will be taking the position that the cotton trade of the world is right to the extent that they will at least get back the price they paid for cotton, without carrying charges, storage, insurance, and interest.

The foregoing facts and statistics show that a Government agency would be warranted in indemnifying the cotton cooperative associations and the lending banks against losses arising from a decline during the annual season of delivery.

The Government can best assist in the problem of the surplus by aiding the growers to keep the surplus within their control. Surplus control by the producers in cotton is essential. I may say that the surplus of cotton is really low-grade cotton. When this surplus is taken out of the hands of the producers, it is taken from the only real friends that cotton has. This is true of any other agricultural commodity. In the very nature of the case no legislation will be beneficial, in so far as cotton is concerned, unless the legislation provides for the proper financing of low grades of cotton. By low grades I do not mean inferior staple; I refer to the stain and color resulting from weather conditions. There is a market for low-grade cotton, and while the grower can harvest an average crop, it is impossible for him to harvest an unusual crop, with the labor at his command, before weather conditions are such as to make the grades inferior.

In order to enable cooperative marketing associations handling cotton to pay their members approximately the full spot market middling price for their cotton on the day of delivery, the Federal farm board, as created by the McNary-Haugen bill, could allocate a revolving fund to cotton. The revolving fund for cotton would be used to make good the loss for any one year. The rate I have suggested is twice as much as is necessary to amortize the loss, based on a 20-year experience. The fee of \$1 per bale as suggested would provide for the building up of a reserve fund. The revolving fund is needed to take care of conditions until the reserve is built up.

I believe that the insurance plan proposed will especially appeal to the Representatives of the cotton section of the country.

In this connection I desire to call attention to an analysis of the McNary-Haugen surplus control bill, if amended so as to include the Bledsoe plan of insurance, particularly with reference to its application to cotton, recently made by one of the most successful cotton planters of the South, who has made a profound study of the problems confronting cotton growers, and who has taken a leading part in all of the plans and meetings for the improvements of the condition of the farmers of the South, Hon. A. H. Stone, of Dunleith, Miss., and I ask all friends of agriculture, and particularly the Representatives from the cotton-growing regions of the country, to read carefully this fine analysis of the pending legislation, provided it is amended so as to embrace the insurance plan.

Mr. Stone's statement is as follows:

[S. 4808]

The McNary-Haugen surplus control bill as reported from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry January 24, 1927, and amended to include the Bledsoe plan of stabilization by price insurance, analyzed as to its general provisions, but with particular reference to its application to cotton.

PURPOSES

To promote the orderly marketing of basic agricultural commodities, to make possible the control and disposition of surpluses, to enable producers to stabilize markets against undue and excessive fluctuations, to reduce speculation and waste and to encourage the organization of cooperative marketing associations.

This declaration of policy in section 1 begins and ends with a recognition of the necessity of promoting orderly marketing by cooperative associations as a means of accomplishing the purposes contemplated in the bill.

SET-UP

The bill creates a Federal farm board to act as a central agency in Washington for promoting the purposes of the bill in the manner indicated later in this analysis. This board shall consist of the Secretary of Agriculture and of one member from each of the 12 Federal land-bank districts who shall be appointed by the President subject to Senate confirmation, as follows:

The bill provides for a nominating committee in each of the 12 land-bank districts to consist of five members, one member of each committee to be named by the Secretary of Agriculture and four members to be named by the bona fide farm organizations and cooperative marketing associations in each district at a convention called for such purpose. The committee is to continue as a permanent feature of the general set-up. Each nominating committee shall submit to the President the names of three individuals from which the President may select a member of the Federal farm board for such district. The terms of office for members shall be six years, the first appointments to be so designated as to allow the expiration of the terms of one-third of the members every two years. Members of the board shall be American citizens, shall engage actively in no other business, and shall receive salaries of \$10,000 per annum. The board shall keep advised as to agricultural conditions at home and abroad, with special reference to actual or potential crop surpluses, and shall advise with cooperative associations and other farm organizations with a view to assisting them to receive the maximum benefits of this act.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Section 7 of the bill directs the board to create for each designated basic commodity an advisory council. Each council shall consist of seven members selected by the board annually from lists submitted to it by such cooperative associations and other farm organizations as may be determined by the board to be representative of the producers of such commodities. Members of such advisory councils shall receive a per diem and expense but no salaries, and shall meet at least twice a year. Each commodity council shall have power to confer with the farm board on all matters related to its commodity. Special reference is made to the time and manner of operations in any commodity and to the amount and manner of collection of equalization fees.

MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS AND OTHER FARM ORGANIZATIONS

Throughout all of its recitals of powers and duties the bill recognizes in specifically repeated terms the essential part to be played by marketing associations and other farm organizations in any and every effort of the board to give effect to the remedial provisions of the act. The activities of the board are so closely hedged about and safeguarded and made so definitely dependent upon local, regional, and commodity sanction and initiative as to remove any reasonable ground whatever for apprehension of a centralization in Washington of undue power or control over any branch of American agriculture. Beyond the scope of its advisory functions, the board may be said to have no active authority other than that which it acquires by specific delegation from the producers themselves. Such powers as are granted to it under the bill are purely potential in character and remain dormant until called into activity by specific warrant from those who would invoke their aid.

OPERATIONS

The foregoing statement is amply justified by a consideration of the manner in which the board may operate as indicated generally in the bill and specifically set out in section 6. Before any action can be taken by the board other than that of studying conditions and advising with farm organizations the following things must definitely occur:

1. The board must find that there is or may be during the ensuing year either a surplus above the domestic requirements for wheat, corn, rice, or swine, or a surplus above the requirements for the orderly marketing of cotton. The term "surplus" as used throughout the bill clearly contemplates operations for the control and disposition of surpluses in any basic commodity, whether arising through rapidity of delivery during the harvest season or arising from an annual or accumulated overproduction in any such commodity.

2. The commodity advisory council of seven members described above must "favor the full cooperation of the board in the stabilization of the commodity" in question.

3. "A substantial number of cooperative associations or other organizations representing the producers of the commodity" must also favor the full cooperation of the board.

4. The board must publicly declare its findings and must fix and publish with such declaration the date upon which it proposes to begin the operations authorized by the act. This guarantees full publicity to any action of the board before it is undertaken.

5. Any decision by the board relating to the commencement or termination of the operations authorized in the manner above detailed shall also require the affirmative vote of a majority of the appointed members in office. This excludes the Secretary of Agriculture, a member ex officio, from any voice in such decision and requires the majority action of the members selected by and for the producers themselves.

6. But even the total of all the above requirements is not yet sufficient to authorize the board to act. The majority vote just indicated must also include such members of the board as represent Federal land bank districts which in the aggregate produced during the preceding crop year, according to the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, more than 50 per cent of the commodity under consideration at the time.

After all these provisions have been specifically complied with and the board has been thus formally empowered to proceed with its operations, what may it really do as contemplated under the terms of the bill? Of itself, it can do absolutely nothing. The extent of all the power conferred upon it by the bill and brought into existence by compliance with the procedure here set out is a mere grant of authority to the board to enter into agreements with others for the purpose of carrying out the policy declared in section 1 of the bill; that is, to promote orderly marketing, to stabilize markets against undue and excessive fluctuations, to control and dispose of surpluses, to reduce speculation and waste, and encourage the organization of cooperative marketing associations. And with what agencies may the board make such agreements? The bill limits this also and confines such agreements to cooperative marketing associations or to corporations created by such association or to the processes of the commodity in question. There is but one exception to this limitation. Where the board is of the opinion that there is no such association or corporation capable of carrying out such agreements, in such case only it may agree with other agencies. This exception would not apply in the case of any basic commodity enumerated in the bill. In other words, the bill limits the operations of the board to agreements with the producers of the commodity to assist such producers in such effort as may be agreed upon to promote the purposes of the act. The English of the proposition is that the bill allows the board to cooperate only with the producers and only after the producers themselves have specifically set in motion the machinery of such cooperation.

FINANCING OPERATIONS

FEES AND FUNDS

The operations which may be agreed upon between the board and the associations or other farm organizations are to be financed in two ways. There is a fee to be collected on each commodity, out of which there is to be established a so-called stabilization fund for such commodity. There is also a direct appropriation from the Federal Treasury of

\$250,000,000 to be used and administered by the board as a revolving fund, as directed in the bill. The board may make loans from this fund to cooperative associations engaged in such stabilizing operations as may be mutually agreed upon. Such loans shall be repaid to the revolving fund from the stabilization fund of the commodity concerned in the particular operation.

Every operation authorized by the bill and provided for by specific agreement of the board is made in furtherance of the general interest of a particular commodity, and may be put into effect only at the instance of the producers of such commodity. There are a few broad general purposes common to all agriculture which may justify the grant of a general appropriation, as in the case of the revolving fund in the present bill. But specific operations and transactions, necessarily at the outset of a more or less experimental nature, should be financed by the commodity for the special benefit of which such operations are undertaken. It would be manifestly unfair to call on wheat to finance an operation in cotton, and vice versa. In other words, each commodity should bear its own burden and pay its own way though all of them may use the Federal farm board as a common medium, a sort of agricultural clearing house, by means of which the results of the experiences and operations of each commodity may be made available to all the others. Therefore, it is logical and sound that each commodity should have its own stabilization fund built up, maintained, and replenished from the equalization fees contributed by such commodity.

The board is authorized to determine the amount of each commodity equalization fee and to prescribe the manner of its collection. But no fee shall be fixed until the board in the manner described above has commenced operations in the commodity. The fee may be collected either on the transportation, processing, or sale of the commodity. An exception is made in the case of cotton in order that there may be no collection of the fee at the gin. It must be collected on cotton, either at the time of sale or in transportation after sale.

OPERATING AGREEMENTS

The agreements which may be made between the board and the associations or other farm organizations may provide for—

1. Removing or disposing of a surplus in any basic commodity.
2. Withholding or carrying such surplus.
3. Insuring such commodity against undue and excessive fluctuations in market conditions.
4. Financing the purchase, storage, sale, or other disposition of the commodity.

These agreements may be entered into only after the board has begun operations in the particular commodity covered by the agreement. There is, however, one contract which may be made by the board at any time, without all the preliminaries antecedent to commencing its other operations. By amendment to section 12 the board is authorized to contract with any cooperative marketing association, to insure such association for one year against decline in the market price of its particular commodity between the time of its delivery and its sale. For such insurance contract the association shall pay to the board such premium as may be agreed upon as being sufficient to cover the risk of the transaction. This is one of the Bledsoe amendments and was worked out by Mr. O. F. Bledsoe, president of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association, of Mississippi. The proposal is based upon actual statistics of spot-cotton sales in New Orleans. The figures show that the proposition is sound beyond question for cotton. It is based upon the showing that the average price of middling cotton in New Orleans during the four months which constitute the delivery period, September to December, inclusive, is less than the average price of the same cotton during an annual selling period from September to August, inclusive. This was found to be true for 16 years out of the 20 covered by the investigation, 1905 to 1925. The four years showing a departure from the rule were years for the course of which there was an entirely reasonable explanation. This means that there is very little risk attached to such form of insurance in the case of cotton. In fact, this commodity has been declared by insurance experts to present a legitimate risk from the standpoint of commercial insurance. The only trouble commercially is presented by the insurance laws of the various States. This form of operation could be undertaken by the board in such commodities as presented proper statistical data as a basis of premium agreement. Experience would have to be relied on for the safe extension of the operation to the various commodities.

It should be kept clearly in mind that this is not in any sense or form an insurance of profit nor an insurance against loss. The only thing which may be insured is the price at delivery. This price may or may not mean a profit to the producer who makes the delivery. That is a matter entirely outside the terms of the insurance agreement.

Using cotton for purposes of illustration, as we already have the experience tables for this commodity, we may briefly consider the matter from the standpoint of the benefit of such price insurance to cooperative marketing, to promote which is declared to be one of the chief aims of the bill. The primary problem of market stabilization is that of securing control of a sufficient portion of the crop concerned. The cotton cooperatives could exert a very great influence on the situation as to

cotton if they could control the commodity. They handle only about 10 per cent of the crop. And the reason is well known. It is primarily a matter of prompt liquidation. The grower needs his money immediately upon the delivery of his crop. As the matter now stands, he can get his money only by sacrificing his cotton at such price as he may be able to obtain at the moment.

Thousands of cotton growers do this, and the disastrous results constitute one of the agricultural situations sought to be remedied by this bill. With the price-insurance contract from the Federal farm board the cooperative association could negotiate a loan from commercial banks up to 85 or 90 per cent of the value of its commodity. Couple this with the assurance that any advance in price would accrue to the benefit of the cooperative member and these associations would be in position to render such a service as is now wholly beyond their power to offer. The inevitable effect would be the promotion of those results which the bill seeks to accomplish. A more direct and definite means to an end can scarcely be conceived. It may be again stated that this form of contract may be made by the board at any time, because it involves the payment by the cooperative association of an insurance premium and is therefore not dependent upon an equalization fee or a stabilization fund.

The other amendment covers another Bledsoe proposition. This is insurance against price decline, coupled with reimbursement for fire insurance, storage, and interest. Under this agreement with the board the cooperatives could offer their members price insurance and also the cost of carrying the commodity from delivery to sale. The acceptance of this feature of the bill is justified upon the broad principle that the cost of removing the weight of a surplus from the market and of carrying it through the period of its orderly distribution should be borne by the entire commodity concerned rather than be imposed only upon that portion of it which is thus carried and distributed. This, of course, is grounded still further back upon the admitted fact that the portion of the commodity which is individually sold, instead of being marketed through an association, gets the benefit of a market from which has been lifted the weight of that portion of the commodity carried by the association. Any profit which might accrue through an advance in price between delivery and sale would accrue to the marketing association and be by it distributed to its members. No charge of discrimination in favor of the cooperatively sold portion of a commodity as against that portion sold by the individual can be fairly made under this plan. The individual seller operates in a market from which the cooperative cotton has been removed and competition thereby reduced; and the individual seller makes his own choice of methods and markets. He makes his own decision between selling individually and selling cooperatively.

This feature of the bill is of itself amply sufficient justification for the equalization fee for creating a stabilization fund from which to meet the cost of the stabilizing operation, which, in this instance, is carrying the commodity through the period of its orderly distribution for the benefit of the entire commodity concerned. For it should be borne in mind that this agreement—price insurance plus carrying-cost reimbursement—can be had only when the board is operating in the commodity and collecting an equalization fee.

The foregoing analysis covers the outstanding features of the bill and discloses the voluntary nature of its operations as well as making clear the safeguards with which such operations are surrounded.

The above analysis was made prior to the passage of the bill by the Senate. The bill was so amended in the Senate as to emphasize the part to be played by the producer in initiating the operations of the farm board in the following particulars:

In addition to requirements above enumerated as essential to authorize the board to begin operations in any commodity, the bill as amended provides that the board also "shall have become satisfied that a majority of the producers of such commodity favor such action." This additional requirement tends distinctly toward the democratization of the bill and refutes the charge that the bill would bind and deliver American agriculture into the hands of a relatively small number of cooperative marketing associations.

To enable the board to be advised in the premises, and as still further emphasizing the voice of producers who are not members of cooperative associations or other farm organizations, another Senate amendment provides that in any State in which less than 50 per cent of the producers of a given commodity are members of such organizations, the wishes of such producers shall be ascertained at a State convention held for such purpose. This also is a requirement antecedent to the beginning of commodity operations by the board.

The number of members of the district nominating committees is increased from five to seven, and two of these must now be elected by the heads of the agricultural departments of the States in the district at a meeting held for such purpose. It is also provided that these departmental heads shall have the right to submit to the board recommendations for membership on the commodity advisory councils, in addition to such membership recommendations made by cooperatives and other farm organizations, as in the original bill.

The definition of the term "processing" has been amended so that it means spinning, milling, or any manufacturing of cotton other than

ginning. Under this amendment there can be no collection of the equalization fee at the gin.

A. H. STONE.

In conclusion, I beg to say that I believe the proposed legislation will be a distinct contribution toward the solution of the great agricultural problem confronting the country.

ADDRESS OF COL. WADE H. COOPER, OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including a brief speech made by Wade H. Cooper, of Washington, on Abraham Lincoln.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, this evening in the Peabody Hotel in the city of Memphis, Tenn., there is being held a great celebration in commemoration of the birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln. The speaker of the evening is Col. Wade H. Cooper, president of the Continental Trust Co., of Washington, D. C. Colonel Cooper is a southern man, the son of a Confederate soldier. I have been furnished in advance with a copy of his speech to be delivered on this occasion. It is one of the finest tributes to Abraham Lincoln that I have ever been my pleasure to read.

I may say in this connection that the Continental Trust Co., of which Colonel Cooper is president, is one of the few financial institutions in this country that threw wide its doors and made loans to veterans of the World War on their adjusted compensation certificates regardless of race, color, or creed, and regardless of whether or not they were customers of the bank. As a veteran of the World War I desire to take advantage of this opportunity to express my appreciation of that service.

The speech referred to is as follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, to the informed it is very difficult to think of any country, great or small, without associating therewith the name of some great character produced by that country.

In France it is Mirabeau and his contemporaries of the French Revolution, Napoleon and his excursions into Moscow and into Egypt, where he reminded his soldiers that 40 centuries looked down upon them. In England it is the Duke of Wellington and his victory at Waterloo, or Lord Nelson and his victory at Trafalgar. In Germany it is Frederick the Great and Bismarck. In Scotland it is Wallace and Wycliffe and Bruce and Sidney. In Ireland it is Emmett and O'Connell and Grattan. In Italy it is Garibaldi. In Hungary it is Kossuth. In Austria it is Marie Teressa; and in Russia it is Katherine the Great.

In Cuba it is Marti. In Mexico it is Juarez. In the Dominican Republic it is Duarte. In Argentina it is San Martin. In Brazil it is Bonofacio. In Bolivia it is Sucre. In Chile it is O'Higgins. In Colombia it is Santander. In Guatamala it is Barrios. In Honduras it is Morazan. In Panama it is Herrera. In Uruguay it is Artigas; in Peru it is Unanue; and in Venezuela it is Bolivar.

In our own great American Republic it is George Washington, its founder, and Abraham Lincoln, its savior and preserver.

This evening we are to talk about Mr. Lincoln. Forgetting for the moment his early life and his heroic struggles, let us consider Mr. Lincoln's public service and his life as a great statesman. He appeared in public life at that period in our history when the leading public men of the North and of the South were engaged in a great oratorical combat over the question of human slavery and the extension of the same, finally terminating in the attempt of the Southern States to withdraw from the Union.

While Mr. Lincoln opposed the extension of slavery into the free States, he was never an abolitionist. I think it well for us to keep in mind the fact that the idea of the abolition of slavery originated in the South. For instance, General Washington, in a letter to General Lafayette in 1798, said:

"I agree with you cordially in your views in regard to negro slavery. I have long considered it a most serious evil, both socially and politically, and I should rejoice in any feasible scheme to rid our State of such a burden."

And again our own Thomas Jefferson, the apostle of human liberty in this country, said:

"Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that His justice can not sleep forever; that considering numbers, nature, and natural means only; a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation, is among possible events; that it may become probable by supernatural influence. The Almighty has no attribute which can take sides with us in such contest."

"Nothing is more certainly written in the Book of Fate than that these people are to be free."

It may be instructive as well as entertaining for you to know how Gen. Robert E. Lee felt on the eve of the great conflict. My endeavor this evening is educational and not oratorical and I am going to read

you a brief portion of a letter of General Lee's to his son, C. W. Custis Lee, dated January 23, 1861, Referring in this letter to the existing troubles, General Lee concluded his letter as follows:

"As an American citizen, I take great pride in my country, her prosperity and institutions, and would defend any State if her rights were invaded. But I can anticipate no greater calamity for the country than a dissolution of the Union. It would be an accumulation of all the evils we complain of, and I am willing to sacrifice everything but honor for its preservation. I hope, therefore, that all constitutional means will be exhausted before there is a resort to force. Secession is nothing but revolution. The framers of our Constitution never exhausted so much labor, wisdom, and forbearance in its formation, and surrounded it with so many guards and securities, if it was intended to be broken by every member of the Confederacy at will. It was intended for 'Perpetual union' so expressed in the preamble, and for the establishment of a government, not a compact, which can only be dissolved by revolution, or the consent of all the people in convention assembled. It is idle to talk of secession: Anarchy would have been established, and not a government, by Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, and the other patriots of the revolution * * *. Still, a union that can only be maintained by swords and bayonets, and in which strife and civil war are to take place of brotherly love and kindness, has no charm for me. I shall mourn for my country and for the welfare and progress of mankind. If the Union is dissolved, and the Government disrupted, I shall return to my native State and share the miseries of my people, and save in defense, will draw my sword on none."

The letter, which we have just read, from General Lee tells how he stood. He was opposed to secession and regarded it as nothing but revolution. But General Lee, when the conflict became inevitable, became the leader of the military forces of the South. I can see him in his Gethsemane as the war clouds gather.

I know that General Lee was to the South as Moses was to Israel. I doubt if any greater tribute could be paid to General Lee than that paid him by Hon. Benjamin H. Hill, of Georgia. It is brief and I quote it:

"When the future historian comes to survey the character of Lee, he will find it rising like a huge mountain above the undulating plane of humanity, and he will have to lift his eyes toward heaven to catch its summit. He possessed every virtue of the great commanders, without their vices. He was a foe without hate, a friend without treachery, a private citizen without wrong, a neighbor without reproach, a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guile. He was a Cæsar without his ambition, a Frederick without his tyranny, a Napoleon without his selfishness, and a Washington without his reward. He was obedient to authority as a servant, and loyal in authority as a true king. He was gentle as a woman in life; modest and pure as a virgin in thought; watchful as a Roman vestal in duty; submissive to law as Socrates, and grand in battle as Achilles."

The greatness of Gen. Robert E. Lee is now recognized by all people of all sections.

In order for us to have a proper appreciation of Mr. Lincoln it is necessary for us to have a proper understanding of his views and his acts and of the environment in which he lived and moved.

I have shown you that two of our greatest Americans—Washington and Jefferson, both southern men—favored the abolition of human slavery.

The Rev. Dr. John Newton, a noted Episcopal minister of London, England, about 75 or 100 years prior to the Civil War, published in book form some of his observations and experiences while engaged in the African slave trade.

Prior to his becoming a minister of the Gospel he had served in the capacity of an officer on an English vessel engaged in transporting and selling African slaves to the American Colonies and the West Indies. He tells of the evils growing out of the slave trade, some of which he says were too horrible for publication. He describes how the poor, ignorant male slaves were fastened in chains, bound hand and foot, and linked together in the lower part of the vessel, unable to move and without fresh air for weeks and weeks at a time. Sometimes they would die by the hundreds as the result of some kind of fever or some other sickness contracted while on board the vessel.

He recalls one occasion when 100 of the unfortunate slaves were thrown overboard into the sea to perish in order to save fresh drinking water for others. He recalls one occasion when the mate, an officer on a small vessel, became irritated at the cries of a baby in its mother's arms and finally in exasperation snatched the baby from its mother and threw it into the sea, leaving the poor mother to mourn and moan for her little child for days and weeks afterwards. And some of the impositions practiced upon the helpless female slaves were indeed unspeakable and unprintable. Such cruel practices as these were doubtless known to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

I am speaking to you as a southern man, of southern birth, the son of a Confederate soldier named for Gen. Wade Hampton, one of the leaders of the Confederacy. No braver men ever stepped to martial music than the men who followed Lee and Jackson and Johnson. The

bravery and courage of the Confederate soldier was only equaled by the bravery and courage of the men who followed Grant and Farragut and Sheridan and Thomas, who fought that our Republic might live.

It would seem that if our great American Republic is to endure that it would be a confederation composed of all the people regardless of section, a confederation of love and affection, a Union of loyalty and not disloyalty, a Republic of union and not disunion.

The oldest republic of which recorded history gives us any account is the Hebrew Commonwealth under the administration of Moses, one of the greatest, if not the greatest, lawgiver of all time. Then follows the ancient republics, including the Carthaginian Republic, the Lombard League, the Ionian League, the Athenian Republic, the Roman Republic, the Venetian Republic, the Florentine Republic, the Achaean League, the Boeotian Confederacy, and the Aetolian League.

The Venetian Republic lived for about 1,300 years, having endured longer than any other of the ancient republics. The Florentine Republic lived for about 450 years, or the shortest lived of any of the ancient republics.

Therefore, if our own Republic should live for 300 more years, it will then only have lived as long as the life of the shortest of the ancient republics, the Florentine Republic.

It seems to me a difficult thing to appreciate a gift without appreciating the giver; a difficult thing to appreciate being rescued without appreciating the rescuer; a difficult thing to appreciate our great Republic without an appreciation of Abraham Lincoln who rescued and saved it.

A brief review of the record, as it is written, will only serve to increase your admiration and appreciation of Mr. Lincoln.

I believe Mr. Lincoln is his own best interpreter. I believe his papers, his writings, and his speeches reveal himself to us better than anything else.

I have not been able to find anywhere at any time, or in any place, any authentic statement that Mr. Lincoln ever advocated the abolition of slavery. He was opposed to slavery; he thought it a great moral wrong, but in all his speeches throughout his whole career from the time he entered public life until the Civil War, he stood for the Union, the Constitution, and the enforcement of the law. He had great respect for the Constitution—abhorring human slavery, he stood for the Constitution which sustained and supported it, but declaring always his opposition to its extension or its invasion of any free soil. He made his position clearly known in an address in Cincinnati in 1859 when he declared:

"I say that we must not interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists, because the Constitution forbids it and the general welfare does not require it. We must not withhold an efficient fugitive slave law, because the Constitution requires us, as we understand it, not to withhold such a law; but we must prevent the outspreading of the institution because neither the Constitution nor the general welfare requires us to extend it. The people of these United States are the rightful masters of both Congress and courts, not to overthrow the Constitution but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution."

One of Mr. Lincoln's greatest speeches was delivered at the Cooper Institute, New York, February 27, 1860. He had measured swords with the brilliant Stephen A. Douglas, and his speeches in that debate brought him into great prominence, so much so that the eastern Republicans wanted to see and hear him. He accepted an invitation to speak in Cooper Institute. His audience expected to hear a story-telling speaker. He disappointed them, entering into an immediate discussion of the greatest issue then before the people of the country. By his earnestness and his sincerity he soon had his audience captivated. In the most kindly spirit he protested against the threat of the Southern States to dissolve and destroy the Union if they could not have their way in regard to slavery. I quote one short passage from that speech:

"Wrong as we think slavery is, we can yet afford to let it alone where it is, because that much is due to the necessity arising from its actual presence in the Nation; but can we, while our votes will prevent it, allow it to spread into the national Territories and to overrun us here in these free States? If our sense of duty forbids this, then let us stand by our duty fearlessly and effectively. Let us be diverted by none of those sophistical contrivances wherewith we are so industriously plied and belabored, contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong, vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man; such as a policy of 'don't care' about which all true men do care; such as Union appeals beseeching true Union men to yield to dis-Unionists, reversing the divine rule and calling not the sinners but the righteous to repentance."

Abraham Lincoln won the Republican nomination for President over William H. Seward in the Wigwam in Chicago, where the Republican National Convention was held on May 16 to 18, 1860. The platform upon which he was nominated and elected provided briefly:

"1. That slavery must not be extended into the Territories and that it was the duty of Congress to exclude it therefrom by positive legislation.

"2. That it was not right to interfere with slavery in territory in which it then existed.

"3. That it was right to protect all persons in the exercise of their constitutional rights." (This was meant as assurance to the South that their slaves would not be taken away from them.)

This was the position which Mr. Lincoln had taken all along; the platform, according to his letter of acceptance, was thoroughly satisfactory to him. After a most exciting campaign he was elected.

On March 4th following he was duly sworn in, his old-time rival, Stephen A. Douglas, holding his hat while Mr. Lincoln delivered his inaugural address. It is important that all Americans, and especially all southerners, should hear these few lines from his address.

After all the only real democracy is a democracy of education, a democracy of intelligent information. There is no such thing as a democracy of blind ignorance. I believe it was Goethe who said that one of the prime requisites of genius was a passion to know the truth. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

No wonder the men of the South followed Lee and the men of the North followed Grant.

I want you, if you will, to visualize Mr. Lincoln standing on the steps of the National Capitol at Washington at noon on March 4, 1861, and hear him as he uttered these words:

"Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the Southern States that by the accession of the Republican administration their property and their peace and personal security are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. Indeed, the most ample evidence to the contrary has all the while existed and been open to their inspection. It is found in nearly all the published speeches of him who now addresses you. I do but quote from one of those speeches when I declare that—

"I have no purpose directly or indirectly to interfere with the institution of slavery in the United States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so.

"Those who nominated and elected me did so with full knowledge that I had made this and many similar declarations and had never recanted them; and more than this, they placed in the platform for my acceptance, and as a law to themselves and to me, the clear and emphatic resolution which I now read:

"Resolved, That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed forces of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes."

"I now reiterate these sentiments, and in doing so I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible that the property, peace, and security of no section are to be in any wise endangered by the now incoming administration. I add, too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be given will be cheerfully given to all the States when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause, as cheerfully to one section as to another."

And hear his earnest and sincere appeal from this same address:

"My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If there be an object to hurry any of you in hot haste to a step which you would never take deliberately, that object will be frustrated by taking time; but no good object can be frustrated by it. Such of you as are now dissatisfied still have the old Constitution unimpaired and, on the sensitive point, the laws of your own framing under it; while the new administration will have no immediate power, if it would, to change either. If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied hold the right side in the dispute, there still is no good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him who has never yet forsaken this favored land are still competent to adjust in the best way all our difficulty.

"In your hands, my dissatisfied countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the Government, while I shall have the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect, and defend it.'

"I am loath to close. We are not enemies but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battle field and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angles of our nature."

What a baptism of blood could have been avoided had his pleadings and his appeals been heeded? But, South Carolina had passed her ordinance of secession and when the Federal Government sought to provision Major Anderson and his men in Fort Sumter at Charleston Harbor, the fort was fired upon. State after State followed the example set by South Carolina and the Civil war was on.

On May 9, 1862, Maj. Gen. David Hunter, of the Federal Army at Hilton Head, S. C., took it upon himself to issue and did issue a proclamation declaring the slaves in the States of South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida to be forever free, these States at the time comprising the military department of the South under charge of Major General Hunter.

President Lincoln, always honest, always fair, and always just, on the 19th day of May, or 10 days later, issued a proclamation, stating that he had no official knowledge of Major General Hunter's proclamation freeing the slaves in the States mentioned, but if true, it was without any authority whatever and utterly void. President Lincoln further declared in his proclamation:

"I further make known that whether it be competent for me as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, to declare the slaves of any State or States, free, and whether at any time, in any case, it shall have become a necessity indispensable to the maintenance of the Government to exercise such supposed power, are questions, which, under my responsibility, I reserve to myself and which I can not feel justified in leaving to the decisions of commanders in the field. These are totally different questions from those of police regulations in armies and camps. On the 6th day of March last (1862), by a special message, I recommended to Congress the adoption of a joint resolution to be substantially as follows:

"Resolved, That the United States ought to cooperate with any State which may adopt a gradual abolition of slavery, giving to such State pecuniary aid, to be used by such State, in its discretion, to compensate for the inconveniences, public and private, produced by such change of system."

"The resolution, in the language above quoted, was adopted by large majorities in both branches of Congress and now stands an authentic, definite, and solemn proposal of the Nation to the States and people most immediately interested in the subject matter. To the people of those States I now earnestly appeal—I do not argue—I beseech you to make the arguments for yourselves; you can not if you would be blind to the signs of the times. I beg of you a calm and enlarged consideration of them, ranging, if it may be, far above personal and partisan politics. This proposal makes common cause for a common object, casting no reproaches upon any. It acts not the Pharisee. The change it contemplates would come as gently as the dews of heaven, not rending or wrecking anything. Will you not embrace it? So much good has not been done by one effort in all past time as in the providence of God it is now your high privilege to do. May the vast future not have to lament that you have neglected it."

Nothing came of the above-adopted resolution, as none of the seceding States adopted measures providing for the abolishment of slavery, as the resolution suggested.

And later, on September 22, 1862, President Lincoln issued a proclamation, containing among other things the following:

"That on the 1st day of January, 1863, all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in open rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free, etc."

And then on December 1, 1862, after the issuance of the above proclamation, in a long message to the Congress of the United States President Lincoln earnestly urged the adoption of resolutions and articles amendatory to the Constitution of the United States providing for the issuance of United States bonds, to be delivered to any State in payment for the freedom of the slaves of that State, said State to abolish slavery "at any time or times before the 1st day of January, 1900."

President Lincoln made a long and earnest argument for the adoption of this amendment, stating how much blood and treasure it would save. He said:

"The plan is proposed as permanent constitutional law. It can not become such without the concurrence of, first, two-thirds of Congress, and afterwards three-fourths of the States. The requisite three-fourths of the States will necessarily include seven of the slave States. Their concurrence, if obtained, will give assurance of their severally adopting emancipation at no very distant day upon the new constitutional terms. This assurance would end the struggle now and save the Union forever."

None of President Lincoln's appeals, pleadings, or proposals were effective. Therefore, on January 1, 1863, in accordance with his previously announced purpose, he issued his famous emancipation proclamation, striking forever the chains of slavery from the black people of the South, declaring it to be a fit and necessary war measure for the suppression of the rebellion.

I give you the facts according to the official records at Washington. All the time we find Mr. Lincoln working, pleading, and praying for peace.

Mr. Lincoln had his troubles in the North as well as in the South. He complained that his views and his policies were sometimes badly misunderstood or misrepresented in the North as well as in the South. He especially complained that the Boston Courier misrepresented him. And his letter to Horace Greeley, editor of the New York Tribune, in reply to Mr. Greeley's letter criticizing him, shows that Mr. Lincoln

was not only a great statesman but a great philosopher as well. This letter will teach all of us a lesson in patience, forbearance, and kindness. Listen and hear how he handled Horace Greeley:

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, August 22, 1862.

HON. HORACE GREELEY.

DEAR SIR: I have just read yours of the 19th, addressed to myself through the New York Tribune. If there be in it any statements or assumptions of fact which I may know to be erroneous, I do not now and here controvert them. If there be in it any inference which I may believe to be falsely drawn, I do not now and here argue against them. If there be perceptible in it an impatient and dictatorial tone, I waive it in deference to an old friend whose heart I have always supposed to be right.

As to the policy I "seem to be pursuing," as you say, I have not meant to leave anyone in doubt. I would save the Union. I would save it the shortest way under the Constitution. The sooner the national authority can be restored the sooner the Union will be "the Union as it was." If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time save slavery, I do not agree with them. If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time destroy slavery, I do not agree with them. My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union and is not to save or destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that.

What I do about slavery and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union. I shall do less whenever I believe what I am doing hurts the cause, and I shall do more whenever I shall believe doing more will help the cause. I shall try to correct errors when shown to be errors, and I shall adopt new views so fast as they shall appear to be true views.

I have here stated my purpose according to my views of official duty; and I intend no modification of my oft-expressed personal wish that all men everywhere could be free.

Yours,

A. LINCOLN.

As I emerged from Westminster Abbey in London last summer, I stood with uncovered head before the statue of Abraham Lincoln. As I stood there I wondered what human being could be so ungenerous or unjust as to withhold from this great man the tribute of praise to which he was so justly entitled, and what human being could become so embittered as to strike him down in death.

Was there ever a man clothed in human form more honest, more sincere, more earnest in his desire to deal fairly with all parties and all sections and save the Union? There is no doubt in my mind but that every time he struck a blow at the South for the preservation of the Union his heart bled. Indeed, his heart might well be compared to a great ocean with rivers of compassion and mercy flowing into it. That Mr. Lincoln was the best friend the South ever had, as well as the best friend the Nation ever had, all fair-minded men and women must agree when they know the record as it was really written.

Since Mr. Lincoln's untimely death numerous thrones of various kings and monarchs have trembled, tottered, and tumbled, never to rise again, but the gates of hell have not yet prevailed against our Republic which he died to save. And when you go home to-night I want all of you, if you are as courageous and brave as the men who followed Lee and the men who followed Grant—I want you to get down on your knees and whisper down, deep down, into the cold dead ear of Mr. Lincoln's honored dust—and tell him how thankful you are that the Great Republic which he died to save still lives.

Mr. Lincoln's letter to Mrs. Bixby reveals the character of the man. There is nothing finer or nobler than the sentiment expressed in this letter. Hear it:

"MY DEAR MADAM: I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of the adjutant general of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from a loss so overwhelming. But I can not refrain from tendering you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

"Yours very sincerely and respectfully,

"A. LINCOLN."

And his speech at Gettysburg is a classic. It will be remembered as long as our Republic endures. I quote it:

"Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

"Now, we are engaged in a great Civil War, testing whether that Nation or any nation, so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

"But in a larger sense we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we can not hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

The martyred President McKinley says that Mr. Lincoln was much impressed with the words printed on a silken flag which was presented to him just prior to his departure from Springfield to Washington. This inscription was taken from the first chapter of Joshua:

"Have I not commanded thee? Be strong and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed; for the Lord thy God is with thee, whithersoever thou goest. There shall not any man be able to stand before thee all the days of thy life. As I was with Moses, so shall I be with thee."

Upon my desk in the city of Washington I have a portrait of Mr. Lincoln, given me by some of my office associates, and immediately thereunder are some of his rules of human conduct, as follows:

"I am not bound to win, but I am bound to be true. I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to live up to what light I have. I must stand by everybody that stands right; stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong."

The story of Mr. Lincoln's life has been often told, but like that of the Man of Galilee, it never grows old.

Mr. Lincoln himself has told the story of his life much better than I can tell it. In brief and simple form he has told it from infancy to the time he became a great national character; at first declining and then demurring but finally yielding in 1859. To the pleadings of one who had urged him to give him the story of his life, Mr. Lincoln said:

"I was born February 12, 1809, in Hardin County, Ky. My parents were both born in Virginia, of undistinguished families—second families, perhaps I should say. My mother, who died in my tenth year, was of a family of the name of Hanks. My paternal grandfather, Abraham Lincoln, emigrated from Rockingham County, Va., to Kentucky about 1781 or 1782, where a year or two later he was killed by the Indians, not in battle but in stealth, when he was laboring to open a farm in the forest.

"My father, Thomas Lincoln, at the death of his father, was but 6 years of age. By the early death of his father and the very narrow circumstances of his mother, he was, even in childhood, a wandering, laboring boy, and grew up literally without education. He never did more in the way of writing than bunglingly to write his own name. He removed from Kentucky to what is now Spencer County, Ind., in my eighth year. It was a wild region, with many bears and other animals in the woods. There were some schools, so called, but no qualification was ever required of the teacher beyond 'readin', writin', and cipherin' to the rule of three. If a straggler supposed to understand Latin happened to sojourn in the neighborhood he was looked upon as a wizard. Of course, when I came of age I did not know much. Still, however, I could read, write, and cipher to the rule of three. But that was all. The little advance I now have upon this store of education I have picked up from time to time under the pressure of necessity.

"I was raised to farm work—till I was 22. At 21 I came to Illinois, Macon County. Then I got to New Salem, where I remained a year as a sort of a clerk in a store. Then came the Black Hawk war; and I was elected a captain of a volunteer company, a success that gave me more pleasure than any I have had since. I went into the campaign, was elated, ran for the legislature the same year (1832), and was beaten—the only time I ever have been beaten by the people. The next, and three succeeding biennial elections, I was elected to the legislature. I was not a candidate afterward. During the legislative period I had studied law and removed to Springfield to practice it. In 1846 I was elected to the lower house of Congress. Was not a candidate for reelection. From 1849 to 1858, inclusive, practiced law more assiduously than ever before. Always a Whig in politics, and generally on the Whig electoral tickets, making active canvasses. I was losing interest in politics, when the repeal of the Missouri Compromise aroused me again.

"If any personal description of me is thought desirable, it may be said that I am in height 6 feet 4 inches, nearly; lean in flesh, weighing

on an average 180 pounds; dark complexion, with coarse black hair, and gray eyes. No other marks or brands recollected."

There is the plain, simple, modest story as told by Mr. Lincoln himself. I think it would be interesting to you to hear a description of Mr. Lincoln as given by Col. A. K. McClure, of Pennsylvania, in 1861. Colonel McClure had been an ardent supporter of Mr. Lincoln, but had never known him personally; he therefore went to Springfield, Ill., to meet the President elect. Here is Colonel McClure's own story:

"I went directly from the depot to Lincoln's house," says Colonel McClure, "and rang the bell, which was answered by Lincoln himself opening the door. I doubt whether I wholly concealed my disappointment at meeting him. Tall, gaunt, ungainly, ill clad, with a homeliness of manner that was unique in itself, I confess that my heart sank within me as I remembered that this was the man chosen by a great Nation to become its ruler in the gravest period of its history. I remember his dress as if it were but yesterday—snuff-colored and slouchy pantaloons; open black vest, held by a few brass buttons; straight or evening dress coat, with tightly fitting sleeves to exaggerate his long, bony arms, all supplemented by an awkwardness that was uncommon among men of intelligence. Such was the picture I met in the person of Abraham Lincoln. We sat down in his plainly furnished parlor and were uninterrupted during the nearly four hours I remained with him; and little by little, as his earnestness, sincerity, and candor were developed in conversation, I forgot all the grotesque qualities which so confounded me when I first greeted him. Before half an hour had passed I learned not only to respect, but, indeed, to reverence the man."

What a fine inspiration it would be for every American boy, especially every poor boy, to visit the humble cabin home in which Mr. Lincoln was born in Kentucky.

Of course, Mr. Lincoln had his romances with the ladies when a young man. His first love was Ann Rutledge, and Mr. Lincoln was deeply grieved at her death.

Then a Miss Mary Owens, of Kentucky, attracted him and he became infatuated with her. But nothing came of it, and Mr. Lincoln finally married Miss Mary Todd, a well-educated, dashing young lady of one of the best families of Kentucky.

I am very sorry I have not the time to step into the beautiful garden of rhetoric and pick a few choice flowers for you ladies in regard to these various romances, but I must hurry on.

Some people have been unjust enough to say that Mr. Lincoln plunged our country into war; others have stated that he was without sympathy for the slaves in the South, and freed them to attack the women of the South. The record shows that both of the above statements are without any sort of foundation, utterly false and untrue in every respect, and could only be made as the result of prejudice or misinformation. The record shows that Mr. Lincoln had a horror of human slavery and exhausted every effort in seeking to avert the calamity of war.

If there is any one spot on the American Continent where Mr. Lincoln deserves a lasting monument above all others, it is on that very spot down yonder in the city of New Orleans where, when a boy, he witnessed the sale on the auction block of human slaves and which aroused his whole nature against the institution of slavery.

Ladies and gentlemen, God in His Providence moves in a mysterious way. He always supplies the man for the hour. Sometimes they come in single and sometimes in double column formation.

If we are searching the pages of history for a great law giver, we see in the dim distance the figure of Moses; if for a great prophet, it is old Isaiah; if for the founder of a great race, it is old Abraham; if for a great soldier, we see Alexander the Great, weeping for other worlds to conquer, or Hannibal, the mighty Carthaginian, knocking at the very gates of imperial Rome; if for a great scientist, it is Isaac Newton with his law of gravitation; if for a great astronomer, it is Copernicus or Galileo; if for a great philosopher, it is Socrates, Aristotle, or old Diogenes.

If you are looking for a great poet, it is Dante or Homer; if for a great historian, it is Gibbon or Hume or Macaulay; if for a great traveler, it is Marco Polo; and if for a great discoverer, it is our own Christopher Columbus.

If you are searching for a great musician, you hear the beautiful strains of Beethoven or Mozart; if for a great artist, you see Raphael's Madonna or The Last Supper by Leonardo da Vinci or The Last Judgment by Michael Angelo; if it is a great statesman, you see the form of Bismarck or Disraeli or hear the voice of William E. Gladstone. If you are looking for the founder of a great nation, it is George Washington. But you may search all the pages of all the histories of all the countries on earth for all past time and you will find but one savior of a great Republic, and it is our own Abraham Lincoln.

I am about to close, and I want you to hear this quotation:

"Mind is the master power that molds and makes,
And man is mind, and evermore he takes
The tool of thought, and, shaping what he wills,
Brings forth a thousand joys, a thousand ills;
He thinks in secret, and it comes to pass;
Environment is but his looking-glass."

We should not judge our fathers and our grandfathers too harshly because they tolerated human slavery. They were the victims of environment; and in deed and in truth environment is but a looking-glass.

In conclusion, let me say our country has been ever generous in its production of great men. I have great admiration for George Washington, the Father of Our Country, and many other great Americans; but to my mind Abraham Lincoln, the preserver and savior of our great Republic, surpasses them all. The spirit of that rugged man of sorrowful life and tragic death is a heritage and an inspiration to all our people, and touches alike the mansion and the cabin.

The greatest declaration ever made for human liberty, human rights, and human justice was the immortal emancipation proclamation of Abraham Lincoln in January, 1863, driving slavery forever from the soil of our great country. There is no other declaration in all history, from the very earliest dawn of authenticity, that even approaches this declaration for human freedom by Abraham Lincoln, save the declarations contained in Magna Charta, when the people wrested their rights from King John at Runnymede.

If I could send a message to-day to every boy and girl in my beloved country to point to them the upward paths of life, there are many great Americans, living and dead, whose footsteps I could bid them trace; but I should not fail to fix in their mental vision the path of glory that leads from the immortal rail splitter's cabin to the Olympus of eternal fame.

As a patriotic American, a son of the South, proud of our great country and its vast achievements, I reverently salute the memory of Abraham Lincoln, and give to-day the tribute of the South as I know it to exist in the hearts of her great people.

The name of Abraham Lincoln belongs to no section, but to the whole Nation and to the entire world. In every land and every clime where people love human freedom, human rights, and human justice their hearts and souls will ever thrill at the mention of his immortal name.

M'NARY-HAUGEN FARM RELIEF BILL

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15474) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining for general debate on this bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has 2 hours and 22 minutes. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] has 1 hour and 31 minutes. The gentleman from Kansas has 57 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] has 16 minutes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa, if it is the intention to extend general debate beyond the 12 hours?

Mr. HAUGEN. Nothing has yet been definitely determined on that point.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I have 18 requests, and I have only 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. HAUGEN. I suggest that we go on this afternoon and take that question up this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The motion of Mr. HAUGEN was agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MAPES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I represent in Texas a producing district. The great majority of my constituents are farmers and stock raisers. I am naturally interested in anything that affects their business. I have been anxious ever since the war to vote for any measure that would promise any real relief for agriculture. I have carefully studied every bill that has been proposed during that time.

There is an all-powerful influence that keeps Congress from passing farm relief. What is it? Why do not we admit it? It is the interest of the consumer in the big cities. It is the conflicting interest of the city consumer, who wants at a low price everything he eats and uses against the interest of the man who raises the product. You who have been here for several years remember the remark that was made from this floor by that former distinguished gentleman from New York, our former colleague Hon. Bourke Cockran, who said that he was not going to camouflage on the subject; he said he was going to be frank with the Members of the House. He said he represented a city of 5,000,000 consuming constituents in New York, and he said he wanted for them everything they ate and wore at the very lowest price possible.

There is the influence that stops the passage of farm relief legislation. That is the conflicting interests that never will be solved on the floor of the House; it will always exist. It is the conflicting interests of the producer against that of the consumer.

I can remember when our friend from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] introduced his first bill on this subject on May 2, 1924. When he was fixing the basic commodities of that bill he forgot all about cotton. He did not put cotton in the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; but I have not much time.

Mr. HAUGEN. It was a matter left with the cotton producers to determine whether they wanted it included or not. They did not ask for it.

Mr. BLANTON. Why? Because cotton raisers knew it would not benefit them. As I say, it was not in his bill—one of the main products of this Nation that is produced by the farmers of the country. Not a Congressman from a cotton-raising State asked that cotton be placed in the bill. They knew that it would not help cotton.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Not now; I have only 10 minutes, and the gentleman can get his own time. And then I remember when our friend from Iowa introduced his next bill and got it reported on April 26, 1926. He put cotton in that bill, hoping to get votes from the cotton States, but in his reported bill, and to meet the objections of some and to get the votes of others, he provided that the equalization fee should not apply for two years after the passage of the bill, which would have made his bill inoperative on cotton until 1928, because his bill is wholly dependent on the collection of such a fee if it is to relieve cotton in any way. Hence if he had passed his bill last year, it would now be inoperative as to cotton and would in no way have relieved the present situation. And in his 1926 bill he also provided that on cotton the equalization fee, which is nothing in the world but a tax on the farmers' products, should not exceed \$2 a bale on cotton.

In that 1926 McNary-Haugen bill, which was introduced in the House by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], it provided for an appropriation of \$375,000,000, which should constitute a revolving fund. That is, it would be a revolving fund as long as it lasted. But some of us who investigate such pipe dreams beforehand knew that it would not last long. And if we had passed that bill just as Mr. HAUGEN hoped we would pass it when he introduced it, that \$375,000,000 of the people's money would long since have been wasted and Mr. HAUGEN would not be asking for a new replenishment.

In section 305 of his bill (H. R. 9033), Mr. HAUGEN provided that any farmer who failed to pay, or who attempted in any manner to evade paying, the equalization fee, he could be fined \$5,000 and imprisoned for one year.

Our friend from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] at first provided that there should be four appointed officers who should receive \$10,000 each per year. Those few positions did not interest enough active propagandists to gain any impetus for his bill. He could not get enough votes for it to get it started. So when he introduced his 1926 bill he provided for plenty of positions to go around. He created an advisory council of 44 members, to draw \$20 per day each as expenses when attending meetings. He thought that would be particularly attractive to the 44 men, as he thought some of them were not used to drawing \$20 per day, and he felt that such provision would get many votes for the bill. And then he provided for not 4 but 12 officers who were to draw \$10,000 per year each, and he knew that such prizes would make many men seeking such positions get busy in behalf of the bill in their respective States. And I can imagine that our old friend, Hon. Clarence Ousley, down in Texas, has had one of these twelve \$10,000-per-year positions in his mind during all the time he has been hunting up these memorials in behalf of the McNary-Haugen bill.

But why was it that Mr. HAUGEN agreed to limit the equalization fee on cotton to \$2 per bale? It was because some men good on statistics had figured up that to accomplish anything it would be necessary to collect anywhere from \$5 to \$10 per bale to do cotton any good, and some estimated even that it would require an equalization fee of at least \$15 per bale on cotton to provide a sure means of carrying over the surplus. And such a tax scared off our Representatives of cotton-growing States, and Mr. HAUGEN was about to lose their votes, so he reduced the fee and put in a limitation of \$2 per bale in the bill. But that 1926 Haugen bill provided that the board could raise this fee, and we all know that it would have raised it, and we all know that it would have been raised to \$10 or \$15 per bale, which might have ruined every cotton grower in the South, especially when under the terms of the 1926 bill

cotton could have been taxed to provide means of protecting corn or wheat or the other commodities.

Since by its own provisions, which made the equalization fee not applicable until 1928, had the 1926 Haugen bill been passed last year it would not have helped the present cotton situation at all, and would have been of no benefit whatever to the 1926 crop of cotton. And the \$375,000,000 of the people's money would have been wasted and gone, and the farmers would have been taxed to cover the loss.

It was a godsend to the farmers of the South that the 1926 McNary-Haugen bill was not enacted into law, and those who prevented its enactment performed a valuable service to the farmers.

The McNary-Haugen forces have amended the 1926 proposal in many particulars, and their new bill that is now before the Congress has eliminated from it some of its unsound, un-economic provisions. This 1927 McNary-Haugen measure is still economically unsound. But it is some better than the 1926 bill. Its appropriation for a revolving fund is \$125,000,000 less than the one proposed in the 1926 measure. So this is a saving of at least \$125,000,000. The present measure does not require the farmer himself to pay the equalization tax, and it provides no penalty upon the farmer for refusing to pay such tax. However, it shifts the fee, and requires the one buying the product to pay the fee, so, after all, it will come out of the farmer.

I believe that the farm-relief measure offered by our friend from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] promises much more for the farmers of this country than any other measure that is before this House. [Applause.] I am going to vote for Mr. ASWELL's motion to recommit and to substitute his bill. I believe that the Aswell measure is sound. I believe it can be worked into a proper farm-relief measure, and I am going to support it and I hope that it will prevail. The President would sign it promptly and we would be assured of some farm relief. And there must be some relief for agriculture. Otherwise the farm boys are all going to leave their farms and go to the cities. And then the cities will starve to death for want of food.

But suppose that we are not able to substitute the Aswell bill? Then what are you colleagues who believe as I do going to do about farm relief? I know what I am going to do. I have made up my mind. I am tired of seeing the interests of the farmers kicked back and forth in Congress. I am tired of seeing their rights ignored. I am tired of seeing the farmers turned down. I am tired of seeing all relief denied them. They must have some relief measure before we adjourn. And I am going to help pass such a measure before we leave here March 4.

The farm organizations all over my district and State have requested Texas Members to vote for this McNary-Haugen bill if we can not get anything else. They have asked me to support it. And while I know that it contains some unsound provisions and some really vicious provisions, yet since the farmers of my State have asked for it and can not get anything else, as a last resort I intend to vote for this new McNary-Haugen bill, if the Aswell substitute is voted down, and there is no chance to pass any other farm-relief measure. The time has come when the farmer is entitled to something, and I am not going to turn him down.

The Farm Bureau at Brownwood, Tex., has requested me to vote for this new McNary-Haugen bill. The Coleman Farm Bureau has made such request. The Abilene Farm Bureau, the Nolan County Farm Bureau, the one at Comanche, the one at San Saba, the one at Brady, and many others in my district have requested me to give it support. And I have just received a telegram from the one at Dallas. Whether it is good for them or not, and whether it will do for them or not what they expect, they have asked for it, and if that is all we can get, I am going to help to give them what they want. They are the ones I am hoping to relieve. They are asking for certain relief. When they ask for bread, I am not going to give them a stone. I am going to give them what they ask for.

I realize that until you get this McNary-Haugen bill out of the way the farmers of the country will never get any relief at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I regret I can not. I have only a few minutes. I received a long petition from some farmers, some of whom I knew well. One name signed to the indorsement of the Haugen bill was H. J. Guyer. I immediately sent him the RECORD containing the speech of our friend from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] made some time ago, and I sent him a copy of the Aswell bill and also a copy of the new Crisp bill, as well as a copy of the new Haugen bill. I told him I wished he would

take them home and study them and then give me his reaction. I have his letter here, and if there is no objection I shall put it into the RECORD. He says he signed the indorsement of the Haugen bill believing that it was something else. Here is the letter:

(Louis Garms, president, Bangs, Tex.; W. E. Lohn, vice president, Lohn, Tex.; H. J. Guyer, secretary-treasurer, Brownwood, Tex., route 1, box 113. Executive committee: A. Q. Jordan, chairman, Hico; J. E. J. Pepper, Valera; C. Q. Sevier, Goldthwaite; Paul Gerhardt, Rowena; W. J. Mogford, Menard; W. T. Loudermilk, De Leon; M. L. Bennett, Sweetwater; Fred Tettons, Lohn; J. M. Kennedy, Rising Star; W. R. Butt, Eola; R. A. Milsap, Kempner; W. J. Johnson, San Saba. F. E. and C. U. of T., Pecan Valley District Farmers' Union No. 26, composed of Brown, Comanche, Congho, Coleman, Eastland, Hamilton, Lampasas Mills, McCulloch, Menard, Mitchell, Nolan, Runnels, San Saba, Taylor, and Tom Green)

BROWNWOOD, TEX., February 8, 1927.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Member of Congress.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your kind favor of the 29th ultimo at hand, for which I thank you very much, especially for the three farm bills which are now before your honorable body, and which I have very carefully read and reread. I find the McNary-Haugen bill very different from what it has been represented to me as being.

A few days ago a representative of the farm bureau was circulating a petition asking us farmers to indorse this bill, stating that the equalization fee had been eliminated and a tax was levied per bale, as per our national income tax; that is, the tax was a graduated tax on production. As I am very much in favor of the graduated tax I signed his petition. But I see absolutely nothing in the bill of the elimination of the fee on cotton. I would thank you very much to mark my name off the petition which was sent you.

Of the three bills I prefer the Aswell bill. But it is not what we want.

I am offering the same objection to each of these bills, to wit, they seek to hold the surplus when they should seek to prevent the surplus being produced.

Our carry over this year will be around 8,000,000 bales, and it is absolutely immaterial who holds this cotton; it will be added to our supply for next year. Therefore it is not the amount of cotton held but the amount produced which will stabilize the price; then why not seek to stabilize production?

My dear Congressman, if you would like to see the surplus cotton disappear, pass a bill giving us a graduated tax on production—say a tax of 25 cents per bale for the first 50 bales, 50 cents for the next 50 bales, and graduate the tax up so that the man who raises 1,000, 2,000, 3,000, or 10,000 bales would pay from \$100 to \$500 per bale—then and not till then will you see the carry over disappear. The little farmer must be protected just the same as the little railroads are being protected. Thanking you for these bills,

I am yours very truly,

[SEAL.]

H. J. GUYER.

That letter shows you what is in the mind of some farmers after they had studied the Haugen bill—they reached the conclusion that the Aswell bill promised more for the farmers of the country, and even it did not suit. But we can amend in the future as the defects arise.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman already has that privilege.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADKINS].

Mr. ADKINS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I did not expect to participate in the debate on this bill. The bill has been before Congress for a long time. During this session I had occasion to go into the matter before the committee, and I addressed the House very fully during the last session. Realizing that a large number of men want to be heard, I decided that I would not ask for any time. However, as the debate has progressed we find a new feature developed in the opposition to the bill. After the futile arguments that have been brought forth by the chief opponents of this type of legislation were found to be without effect, the gentleman from KANSAS [Mr. TINCHE] the day before yesterday, after he pulled off the usual stunt of swearing himself in as a friend of the farmer, proceeded to inject ridicule as an argument in opposition to the measure. I do not know that it would be particularly my duty to meet that particular issue, except for the fact that he made me the butt of his ridicule, and the bellwether of the incompetent and ignorant who were supporting it because they did not know any better. He stated that I was innocent—which is commendable—but could not "comprehend."

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

Mr. ADKINS. I have only 10 minutes.

Mr. ASWELL. The gentleman surely does not call that ridicule.

Mr. ADKINS. As I observed the gentleman pulling off his little vaudeville stunt here to help defeat the Haugen bill, after hearing what he had to say about my mental limitations, it occurred to me that he certainly had a bad case of overdeveloped "comprehension." I have always thought that that attribute of the mind found a seat up here in the head, but as I observed the gentleman's anatomy, as he pranced back and forth, I could only conclude that as his "comprehension" overdeveloped, it overflowed and went down into another part of his anatomy. [Laughter.]

I think that overdevelopment has been at the expense of his discretion. The thought that impressed me was that if he had a little less development of "comprehension" and a little more development of discretion, he might have a little less belly and a little more brain. [Laughter.] And as he was impressing his ridicule upon the House another thought came to me, and that was that his case of overdeveloped "comprehension" stood him in very good stead long before the last session of Congress adjourned. You will remember the ancient king who did not have so much of the "comprehension" that distinguishes the gentleman from Kansas. He saw a "handwriting on the wall."

My limited "comprehension" helped me to "comprehend" along about the time the gentleman from Kansas saw the handwriting on the wall, and that it was a warning to him to flee from the "wrath to come." Then I thought of the gentleman from Kansas doing what I was doing, supporting the Haugen bill. Even the two distinguished Senators from Kansas, I notice, yesterday did, and I knew that he did have a little discretion left, too much to go out and put his Senators in the same class with me, or criticize his colleagues from Kansas as not having "comprehension," because he was the only man from Kansas not supporting the Haugen bill. I thought of our old friend, HAYS WHITE, who is religiously advocating a certain reform. Another thought came to me that if HAYS WHITE'S idea was the law of the land and a newly elected Congress had assembled at the beginning of this short session of Congress, we might have one more advocate from Kansas for the Haugen bill.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADKINS. I have not the time. I have got "comprehension" enough to "comprehend" another thing. Do you remember the crazy quilt he had out here, called a chart, I believe, and how vociferous he was in trying to present that to the House? His overdeveloped "comprehension" stood him in good stead when he brought it out to divert the mind of the public and the House from what he put in the RECORD last winter in reference to Canadian wheat, using this same chart. All the high-protein wheat in the country centers over in TINCHE'S district, a little of it slips over in Colorado in TIMBERLAKE'S district, and a little in the other districts in Kansas—but most of it in his district his talk would indicate. He was trying to divert the minds of the people from the old chart he brought out in reference to Canadian wheat. It just occurred to him under the Haugen bill that when the public found out that every miller in the country, if the board declared to collect the equalization fee at the mill, would have to collect an equalization fee during an operating period, whether that wheat came from Canada, TINCHE'S district, or wherever it came from. That thought just occurred to him. Look at that part of his speech in the RECORD last winter that he made, using this chart, and then read the Haugen bill; that is, the section providing for collection of equalization fee.

But he appreciated the fact that Sidney Anderson was here opposing the bill for the millers. Yes; Sidney Anderson put in the record of Committee on Agriculture a statement to the effect that he represented a milling organization that controlled 65 per cent of the milling interests of the country. He put into the same record the statement that the milling interests in the country bought 80 per cent of the wheat of the country, and it occurred to me, when I got from the Commerce Department the other day the statement, which no doubt you all got, why the millers were here opposing the enactment of this bill.

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

Mr. ADKINS. Has anybody a little time to yield me, so that I can finish this?

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. ADKINS. The reason occurred to me why the millers were opposing this bill and why the packers were not. The Department of Commerce shows that there are more than 116,000,000 bushels of wheat now owned by the mills which Sidney Anderson in part represents; about 4,500,000 barrels of flour, equal to about 20,000,000 bushels in public warehouses and mills December 31, 1926, depressing the price, as the proponents of this bill contend. They can afford to pay Sidney Anderson any price he may ask to come here and prohibit this board from taking off the market this surplus that they hope to reap the benefit from.

The gentleman from Kansas knows that the millers bear the same relationship to this board that the packers do. But there is this difference between them: The packers know that we can not take the live hog and store it. He has to be processed. The millers know that they can hold the wheat in storage without processing. They would rather have control of it than have the farmers control it. That is why Mr. Anderson is so valuable to the milling interests. I do not care what his price is. If he can defeat this bill, he is well worth it to the milling interests.

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

Mr. ADKINS. Will the gentleman from Iowa give me a couple of minutes, so that I can finish this?

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield the gentleman two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. ADKINS. I do not accept what appears to me the gentleman's "comprehension" of the farmer. I think his "comprehension" of the farmer is that the farmer is a fellow going around with a long chin beard and a slouch hat and a red bandana handkerchief around his neck and smoking a cob pipe. I can imagine his "comprehension" working when he saw Bill Settle wearing a pair of 75-cent spats. He ridiculed the men representing agriculture here, and praised the man representing the millers here, saying what a smart fellow Mr. Anderson was. I think he is smart. He is serving the millers well, because if the millers defeat this bill they can lay in their stocks of wheat sometimes too cheap for the farmer, and they are not interested in the price being profitable to the farmer and do not want to be interfered with by this organization we are trying to provide for, that will try to function, when wheat is too cheap, so the farmer can get a fair price. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is the birthday anniversary of Lincoln, known as the Great Emancipator. I trust that the successful termination of the fight in which the House is now engaged may at least hasten the emancipation of the American farmer. I do not come as a new convert to this cause. I am not a band-wagon booster. So I shall speak but briefly. But in view of the favorable action taken on yesterday by another body, and believing in the certain passage of the bill, I felicitate the farmer, congratulate the country, and thank the Lord for Lowden. Astute and practical politician as is Mr. Lowden, it is but fair that we confess that but for the strength of the Lowden lever it would be impossible to lift the block of New England granite which has so long borne down this bill. I say this because when, in the first session of this Congress, the farm relief bill was up for passage, not one vote for it came from the land of Coolidge.

Many measures may best be judged by the enemies they make, may be fortunate alike in friends and foes. To my mind this is true of the McNary-Haugen bill, which special interests and their spokesmen are now so viciously attacking.

Even on the floor there has been far too much of intemperate talk. When measures favored by special interests have been under consideration their representatives here have not been singled out for attack and had their motives impugned, as in this instance, when men honestly and unselfishly working for farm betterment have been subjected to abuse. Instead of these farmer spokesmen being treated at least as courteously and as considerately as have been the representatives of the tariff and the railroads, it has been openly charged that the former are interested in the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill only because of the fat jobs they expect to secure. Such talk is not only unfair to these men, but it is unfair to millions of farmers.

The opinion of the Washington Post, a publication supposed to be close to the President and which daily continues its tirade, is typical. This paper, professing great interest in the public welfare, is deeply concerned lest "absolute control of the peo-

ple's bread be placed in the hands of a bureau in Washington to manipulate as the bureau saw fit." Then there is seen the ghost of a "supergovernment not amenable to the President or Congress."

Unable to justify its position through reason or argument, the Post resorts to strong language, to ridicule, and invective. It is the "vicious" McNary-Haugen bill, supported by "weak-kneed" Members of Congress. It is "this brazen scheme to rob the majority of Americans for the benefit of the minority." It is the "McNary-Haugen urban hold-up farm grab bill," whose supporters are classified as "dumb." This morning we read—unable to fully vent its spleen in prose, the Post degenerates into doggerel, and says:

The farm-bill bloc discloses, by thunder,
The cohesive power of public plunder.

But why all this fear on the part of the Post lest the McNary-Haugen bill become a law? Surely this can not be possible if what the papers say is true, when it states that—the resentment of consumers against this proposed outrage is rapidly rising—

That—

the majority of farmers are opposed to the McNary-Haugen bill—

And finally that—

there is every reason to assume that if the McNary-Haugen bill should be presented to the President he would veto it.

Why, then, should the Post be so perturbed over an impossible proposition?

Another Washington paper, the Evening Star, is less pronounced in its views. However, a recent cartoon in the Star is interesting. It is based on a news item, "Another swimmer makes the Catalina Channel crossing." The "swimmer" about to make the start is the McNary-Haugen bill and into the swimmer's mouth are put the words, "Everybody seems to be getting away with it."

Now, the Catalina cartoon is not complete. It should have shown the island shore and some of the "swimmers" who had successfully crossed the channel. Prominent among these would be the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act, an indefensible special-interest measure through the working of which several billions of dollars are annually taken from the pockets of the people. No reference to the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill would be complete did we not mention the 40 per cent stock dividend by the United States Steel Corporation, whose earnings for 1926 were \$199,004,741. Nor should we fail to mention the \$60,000,000 bond issue of the highly protected Aluminum Co. of America and which issue proved most attractive to buyers. The interests which are now most vocal in their opposition to the McNary-Haugen bill found no fault when Mr. Fordney-McCumber Bill started out to swim.

Then there should be shown, on the farther shore, the Esch-Cummins bill, under the workings of which the farmers, and especially those of the Corn Belt country, are paying exorbitant freight rates while the railroads are enjoying rich returns, as shown by recent reports. Under this bill class 1 railroads showed a net operating income of \$1,151,604,395 for the first 11 months of 1926. A few days ago Mr. CRISP, of Georgia, stated that the estimated average earnings of the first-class railroads in the United States in 1926 amounted to 5.77 per cent, and he added:

They earn that by the Government, through the Interstate Commerce Commission, fixing freight rates.

In this connection it might be said that this figure fails to indicate the full prosperity enjoyed by the railroads, which, according to a recent statement, have been and continue to make extensive, even lavish, expenditures in the way of purchases of new equipment, improvement of roadbed, and additions and betterments to terminal facilities.

A maintenance table showing estimated expenditures from 1920 to 1927, inclusive, places such expenditures at \$875,000,000 for 1926 and \$900,000,000 for 1927, with a total of more than \$6,000,000,000 for the eight years. This, it might be added, is a reminder of that period when highly prosperous business firms were spending vast sums in advertising in order not to show greater excess profits. Just why such action should be necessary on the part of the railroads is not plain, as only \$6,618,203 has ever been paid in under section 15-A, known as the recapture clause of the Esch-Cummins bill. Commissioner Esch adds that a large portion of this has been paid under protest.

The gentleman from Georgia, in the speech referred to, also called attention to the fact that the Government made loans

of over \$400,000,000 to the railroads and paid out under the guarantee provisions of the Esch-Cummins law \$532,000,000.

When the bills referred to and others framed to benefit special groups or interests were under consideration, there was no expressed opposition from those who are now finding most fault when Congress attempts to do justice to the farmer.

Digressing a moment, I would mention the attack made against tax-free securities and which was centered on the Federal land-bank system. It will be recalled that it was represented that because of the tax-exempt provision billions of dollars were going into such investments while the demand for taxable bonds was being destroyed. As the attack led by the big interests proved futile, less was heard. The truth is that bond investments, including a billion dollars invested in foreign securities last year, have since broken all records. Yet the selfish financiers would, if possible, have forced the farmer, now struggling to carry the heaviest indebtedness he has ever borne—\$12,450,000,000 in farm mortgages alone—to pay a much higher rate of interest, as would have been the case had the tax-free feature been stricken out.

In short, it makes all the difference in the world as to whose ox is gored. In this case, though, nobody's ox will be gored. The proposed bill is for the common good. Sooner or later unless something is done the cities will see this. Their prosperity, which has been almost unprecedented, can not long continue unless something is done to change conditions in the country where bankruptcy and distress are now the rule.

I want especially to appeal for the support of my colleagues who come from the cities. You may feel that you are not directly concerned with what is going on in the country. In this view you are mistaken. You can not continue to prosper while the country is suffering heavy losses. Even now the end of the big city boom is in sight. Values greatly inflated must be readjusted. The first-of-the-year talk of continued city prosperity for 1927 sounds, if one but will listen closely, like the whistling of a scared man as he goes through a graveyard at night. If this newspaper talk be optimism, it is the optimism of a man who fell from the top of a 20-story building and on his way down said, as he passed each window, "I'm all right so far."

City builders, rather city promoters, have been shortsighted. They have failed to read the signs of the times, largely because they are selfish. A long time ago Lincoln expressed the thought that this Nation can not exist half slave and half free. It is equally true that it can not continue half "broke" and half prosperous.

Your big self-satisfied cities have so far given but scant thought to the country; but, if wise, they will change their ways. A part of the adversity which these same cities face is due to farm failures. They have been content to go right on killing the goose that lay the golden egg and soon must pay the penalty. A fair division of prosperity would have prevented much of the depression through which the country has passed and through which your cities must pass.

Three, four, or five years from now the captains of industries and their lesser lights in the centers of population will know more. In the meantime, there will be enough water squeezed out of corporations, building associations, and a thousand fictitious-value concerns to afford sufficient moisture for the most arid spot in our western country. The pendulum has swung far, first to one side, then to the other, but always when pendulums stop the location is near the center. This condition will be good for both city and country.

Then I would appeal to the 106 Members of this House who last May voted against the McNary-Haugen bill, but who only a few weeks ago supported the big Navy program. You believe in national defense. So do I. But I would remind you that in every great war the farm constitutes the last line of defense, if not, in fact, the first. Without food, food for our own fighters and food for the Allies, the World War would not have been won when and as it was.

During the last year we have not been hearing quite so much about the prosperity of the farmer. Even the presidential spokesman is having less to say on the subject, less of "an abounding prosperity," to quote the words of the President. More than a year has gone since the Chief Executive said:

There is every reason to suppose that a new era in agricultural prosperity lies just before us, which will probably be unprecedented.

With more than 3,000 bank failures during the Harding and Coolidge administrations, 192 of these in the State of Missouri, and with farm bankruptcies increased more than 600 per cent, even the purveyors of political propaganda are learning, with Lincoln, that it is impossible to fool all the people all the time.

True, there has been prosperity in the specially favored industries. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 1 contained

a New York dispatch over which was placed the caption, "Year just closed most prosperous in history of Nation." It was asserted that 1926—

leaves us with an estimated wealth of about \$400,000,000,000 as compared with an estimated wealth in 1912, or just before the war, of \$205,000,000,000.

More recently the Washington Post in an article in which President Coolidge is referred to as "one of the foremost business men of all time" it is said:

The United States was more prosperous in 1926 than in all preceding years in its history.

Those who know the Post and the facts will draw their own conclusions.

To-day all over the agricultural sections of America local newspapers are carrying columns of legal notices having to do with farm foreclosures, sheriff sales, and taxes overdue. Many farmers, bankrupt and discouraged, have taken their own lives.

While the total wealth of the United States is said to have increased almost \$200,000,000,000 since shortly before the war, farm values have decreased more than \$20,000,000,000 and farm indebtedness increased almost \$9,000,000,000 since the war. The value of farm crops in the United States in 1926 was more than a billion dollars short of that for 1925. Thus is the condition of the farmer becoming "no better fast."

Charles Nagel, of St. Louis, former Secretary of Commerce and Labor and head of the Business Men's Commission on Agriculture which was created jointly by the National Industrial Conference Board and the United States Chamber of Commerce to study the problems of agriculture in America, has just made a significant statement. He says:

Not only the farmer, but all classes of people find a grave common peril unless something practical is done to relieve conditions which harass American agriculture. Everyone we have heard admits that a grave situation confronts us because of the farmers' plight.

I might quote from many of my constituents. An extract from one letter is typical. The writer is a public-spirited citizen, president of a national bank, and a Republican who has been honored by his party. He says:

I am particularly interested in the preservation of rural communities in this State, and I have a deep feeling about the depression they are undergoing now because of the discrimination that apparently exists in our economic structure against agriculture. I feel that the prosperity of the last five years enjoyed in such marked degree by eastern interests and railroads should be shared by people devoted to agriculture. This is the big problem that must soon have a solution.

It is easy to understand the opposition to farm legislation, or at least the lack of interest in the subject on the part of those who are enjoying great prosperity.

Many have received letters from the National Chamber of Commerce, of which John W. O'Leary is president, advising us not to support the McNary-Haugen bill. Tuesday night Mr. O'Leary was one of the guests at the \$5,000,000,000 dinner given in Washington by Secretary of the Interior Work in honor of the President and Mrs. Coolidge.

The same Washington Post which finds so much fault with the proposed farm relief measure says of this dinner:

Had all those invited been able to attend the dinner, the combined wealth represented at the banquet table would have been \$5,000,000,000. As it was, a large share of the world's wealth was represented.

In running through a partial list of guests at the dinner given by Mr. Work to people who do not have to work, I fail to find the name of even one farmer. How many votes, think you, would the McNary-Haugen bill have received had a straw vote been taken at this dinner? Yet most of the men who sat about that table are more or less dependent upon the farmer. This is true of all, as is illustrated in the following from Edwin T. Meredith, one time Secretary of Agriculture:

While I was in a store in New York recently I saw a girl buying a tube of Colgate's dental cream. I asked her at what work she was engaged. "I'm a stenographer," she replied. "Where?" "Upstairs." "Are you interested in agriculture in Madison County, Iowa, or Texas?" "I never saw a farm, and wouldn't know one if I did." I went up to see the lawyer who employed her. "Are you interested in agriculture?" "No; we have no farmers' deposits. We have no farmers' loans." "With whom do you do business?" "Steel corporations largely." I went to a steel corporation. "Are you interested in agriculture?" "Not a particle. We never sold a farmer a piece of steel. We only manufacture structural steel." "To whom did you sell your last order?" "Bill Smith, of Rock Island, Ill." I saw Bill Smith and said to him, "Are you interested in agriculture?" "Well, I should say so. Why we sell the farmer trucks and tires. We sell him wire fences, we sell him roofing, we sell him a thousand things. And we

just bought some structural steel last week to build a new unit to our factory." All right; no tire order—no structural-steel order; no structural-steel order—no steel company; no steel company—no bank; a bank without deposits—no lawyer; a lawyer without a client—no stenographer; and no stenographer—no Colgate's.

I have referred to the opposition of the National Chamber of Commerce. Happily, this body does not control the local chambers of commerce in smaller cities and towns which are in close touch with local conditions and have the fullest sympathy for the farmer. For instance, I am in receipt of a telegram from the Boonville (Mo.) Chamber of Commerce, as follows:

Directors chamber of commerce, believing McNary-Haugen bill economically sound and calculated to relieve the situation under which citizens of Corn Belt States are laboring, have passed resolution unanimously urging you to support and aid the passage of said bill.

Some there may be who have the welfare of the farmer at heart, yet can not bring themselves to support the McNary-Haugen bill. They are anxious to do something, but this is not the way they would prefer. Frankly, it is not altogether my way, but it is one way and the only way at this time. I feel that we owe it to the farmers to give it a trial. If it does not work, we will have the satisfaction of knowing we have done all within our power. Then, if necessary, we will make another effort, perhaps in a different direction. To those who counsel a commission or institute to inquire into the ills of the farmer and report at some distant day I would reply that unless something is done agriculture, as we have known it in America, will be dead when that day comes. Whatever is to be done for the farmer must be done now.

I am reminded of a remark once made by Mrs. Marie T. Harvey, a Missouri woman who has made a phenomenal success of a one-room rural school. Asked why she did not at once advocate the abandonment of the one-room school and advocate consolidation everywhere, she replied, "I want to do something for the farm boys and girls now on earth." Those of us who are supporting the pending bill want to do something for the farmers now on earth.

Many explanations have been made as to this bill. Imagine an old-fashioned cupboard, such as some of us recall. On the upper shelves are cakes, cookies, and other goodies. Near the middle are the more substantial foods, while the lower shelves are bare. A boy, Manufacturer by name, stands on a stepladder known as the tariff and helps himself to the contents of the upper shelves. A little lad called Farmer stands on the floor and can reach but a small quantity of the food on the middle shelves. It is proposed through this bill to supply a stepladder for the farmer boy and so put him on an equality with the other youngster. Then the one will not overeat and the other will not go hungry. Failing in our effort to provide a second stepladder, one for farmer boy, we will take from the other boy his stepladder and the two lads will have equal opportunity, which is all the farmer asks.

Among the opponents of the McNary-Haugen bill are those who allege that it would place a tax on the farmer. Others, with equal emphasis, assert that it would unduly increase prices of food products.

Again there are those who hold that this bill is unconstitutional. In this contention many are, I am sure, entirely conscientious. But I would remind them that the Supreme Court can, if need be, pass upon the proposition when the time comes. Nor do I forget that in my legislative experiences I have frequently heard the question of unconstitutionality raised by those who sought to defeat worthy measures.

Finally, some say that it will not be worth while to pass the bill, as the President will fail to approve. As to this I do not know. But I do not hesitate to say that if there is a veto, the initials of the White House spokesman will be not C. C. but D. D. All the "dead ducks" will not be in the House. But when I think of the shadow of Lowden, lengthening across the land, "a giant staff in a giant's hand," I imagine I can hear the President say, feebly though it may be, "Pass the pen, please."

So I predict the enactment into law of this farm relief measure and sincerely trust that it may do well its work and put new hope in the hearts of the occupants of every farm home. [Applause.]

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

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. FORT. And I yield to the gentleman eight minutes additional.

Mr. ASWELL. I recognize him for 10 minutes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Is it not customary for those who have charge of the time to rotate?

The CHAIRMAN. The only one demanding recognition from the Chair was the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL].

Mr. KINCHELOE. If that has been the usual custom, I shall not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to be recognized?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Not now. I do not want to disturb the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I realize that I am one of the Representatives from one of the great agricultural States of the Union. North Carolina to-day is fifth in the value of its agricultural products. And the district that I have the honor to represent is the equal of any district in North Carolina from an agricultural standpoint. On this account, therefore, you can readily see that I for one would be for farm relief. But I can not, sir, vote for this bill, the McNary-Haugen bill, H. R. 15474. Notwithstanding that I have received one or more veiled threats, I shall not vote for the bill.

And probably it would be easier for me to vote for this bill, and thus follow the line of least resistance, and help by this means to put it up to the President of the United States to veto. But I believe that I have a duty here to perform and that I should not attempt to pass the responsibility to anyone else. I am opposed to this bill for many reasons, chief among them being the fact that, in my opinion at least, two provisions of the bill are unconstitutional, and the bill is unsound from an economic standpoint, and also it is unworkable.

I have wondered why it was, as this debate has proceeded, that the proponents and the supporters of the measure have not really spoken on the bill itself. There has been a smattering here and there. Why have they not told of the operation of it? Why have they not told of the machinery necessary to put the bill in operation? Except in a few isolated cases, nothing has been said. For this reason, before presenting my argument as to why the bill should not pass, I believe that it will be best to make an analysis and also to give the Members of the House the formation, the structure, or the machinery under its provisions by which it is supposed to set in operation the forces necessary to give the relief which is needed by agriculture at the present time.

You must bear in mind that under section 1, labeled the declaration of policy, it is declared to be the policy of Congress that there should be orderly marketing of the basic agricultural commodities, both in interstate and foreign commerce, by taking care of the surplus and also "to encourage the organization of producers of such commodities and the cooperative marketing associations." Of this last declaration of policy I shall speak later. The structure of the bill is cumbersome, for it provides that there shall be, first, a Federal farm board which is composed of 12 members and also the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall be a member ex officio.

The 12 members of the board shall come one from each of the 12 Federal land bank districts, and they are selected in this manner: In each of the 12 land bank districts a convention of the "bona fide organizations and cooperative associations" holds a conference at the office of the Federal land bank to elect four people who are known as a nominating committee. In addition to these four another person is appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture on the nominating committee. Shortly thereafter the nominating committee of five members meets and selects three names to be submitted to the President, who shall select one of the three as a member of the Federal farm board, and such member so appointed by the President shall be confirmed by the Senate.

In order, therefore, to find 12 competent persons to act on the Federal farm board, we find that the bill sets up machinery of having 12 conventions, composed of representatives of bona fide farm organizations and cooperative associations, 60 members of a nominating committee, the Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the United States, and the Senate of the United States.

The board so created is given both general and special powers. Under the general power provision of the bill "it may make such regulations as necessary to execute the functions as are vested in it by this bill." And, in addition thereto, "shall maintain its principal office in the District of Columbia and may maintain such other offices in the United States as it deems necessary." It also has the general power to "appoint and fix the salaries of a secretary and such experts," and, in addition to these, such officers and employees as may be necessary, these officers and employees, but not the experts, being subject to the provisions of the civil service law.

Before I proceed further I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that as many quarters or offices in the United States can be rented as the board wants to rent, and that there is no limitation upon the number of experts and the salaries of the experts to be selected by the board, except for the experts who are paid under the provision of subsection B, section 11. But evidently the experts provided for in this subdivision are not those which are provided for under subsection F of section 4. Also, there is no limitation upon the number of officers or employees that will come under the provisions of the civil service law. This being so, it is impossible for anyone studying the provisions of the bill to estimate the cost and expenses which the Government of the United States will have to take care of.

Why does not somebody who is in favor of this bill tell the House all about the number of employees and their expenses and salaries? Why does not somebody who claims to know something about this bill tell of the cost? Why did not the report give some of these facts and figures? But not a word, not a statement is given for the information of the House. It is true that the farmers shall be charged with the salaries of experts, but from my construction of the bill, the farm loan board can employ experts which the Federal Government will pay for and experts that the farmers shall pay for.

Before I discuss the bill further I wish to say that I am not going to speak on the amendments inserted in the bill and which were in the bill on its final passage in the Senate. I do not know what will happen to these amendments. Occasionally I have heard from members of the committee proponents of the bill that the amendments shall be included. All that I know in this argument is what is in H. R. 15474. Nor do I have any information of the secret plan that may be proposed later on.

Under the special power granted to the board they have the right to advise the cooperative associations and farm organizations, as well as the producers, of any adjustments that they may deem necessary for production and distribution in order that the benefits of the bill might be secured to the producers. Therefore it is clear that Congress is attempting under this provision to give power to the Federal farm board to say to every farmer in the country that unless you do as we say and comply with our orders and our advice no benefits, if there should be any under this law, are intended for you.

In addition to the Federal farm board, the nominating committee, the secretary to the board, the unlimited number of experts, officers, and employees, the bill provides that there shall be created at least five advisory councils to consist of seven members each. These are to be known as the cotton advisory council, the wheat advisory council, the corn advisory council, the rice advisory council, and the swine advisory council. These advisory councils meet twice a year at least, and oftener when necessary, and have the right to make recommendations to the board, or receive information from the board, or to aid the board in advising the producers, cooperative associations, and the farm organizations that it will be necessary to follow the advice of the board in matters of farm productions in order to secure the benefits of the bill. In order to select a board of 12 members and to keep that board fully advised, even though the Secretary of Agriculture be an ex officio member of the board, it is necessary to have under the bill 95 men who are paid \$20 a day and per diem expenses. This is a brief statement made with the intention of showing to the House, as I have said before, how cumbersome many provisions of the bill are.

The bill authorizes the appropriation of the sum of \$500,000 to cover the expenses incurred prior to July 1, 1928. But I doubt very much if there is a single member of the Committee on Agriculture who thought for one instant that \$500,000 would cover the salaries of the board, the salaries of the experts, officers, and employees of the board, and the per diem compensation and expenses of the members of the nominating committee and of the advisory council, as well as the necessary office expenses, the printing, binding, and the purchase of books and periodicals. How much all of this will cost no one knows, and no one can foresee.

It is well that I call the attention of the House to the fact that unless a farmer or producer is a member of a cooperative association or another farm organization which is recognized by the Federal farm board he has no right or representation in the selection of either the nominating committee or the advisory council. And as far as North Carolina is concerned, with only 8 per cent or less of the farmers belonging to the cotton cooperative associations, it will have very little representation or will have very little say in any of the matters either in selecting the committee or in the placing on of the equalization fee or tax. Or it will have very little say regarding the right of the board

or either one of the advisory councils in the matter of the adjustment of production.

Prior to the commencement of operations and when in the opinion of the board there is likely to be a surplus, the board estimates the amount of advances, losses, costs, and charges that are to be paid in regard to the operation of the law in such commodity, and it determines that it will be necessary for each producer of such commodity to pay a tax, known as an equalization fee, upon each bale of cotton, bushel of wheat or corn, or pound of rice or pork. But the board does receive advice and recommendation from the advisory council in regard to placing on the equalization fee.

This equalization fee under the provisions of the bill shall be paid upon either the transportation, processing, or sale of such commodity. The amount of this equalization fee is agreed upon by the advisory council and the board, and there is no way of determining under the provisions of the bill what that fee will be in the case of cotton, as well as the other commodities. There is no limitation upon the amount that the board may tax the farmer under the guise of aiding and helping. Who collects this tax, and how? The bill is silent. But may I not call to the attention of the House the fact that there will be, if this becomes a law, a horde of employees, because it will take a horde to collect a tax from either the producers, who come under the provisions of this bill, or from every small or large butcher, every packer, every transportation company, every gin, every mill, and so on ad infinitum. How many it will take we have no idea. What the salaries will be we have no idea. But this we know, that somebody will have to pay the salaries and expenses of this group of employees. Whether these come under the name of experts, which the board is allowed to employ and which is paid by the Government, is not known. Or whether, on the other hand, the salaries or traveling expenses of these tax or equalization fee collectors are paid by the farmers under the provisions which permit the board to pay the salaries and expenses of experts from the stabilization fund it is not known, nor does the report of the committee or the hearings before the committee give any light upon this subject.

This can be gained from the bill, that the farmer, manufacturer, butcher, packer, miller, or merchant shall be required to pay a tax, the amount of which is unknown at the present time and which no human being can estimate. That this equalization fee shall be enough to cover the losses, costs, and charges in respect of the operations in the basic agricultural commodity or its food productions, the salaries and expenses of experts, and the repayment to the revolving fund of any amounts advanced with 4 per cent interest.

In speaking further about the equalization fee under the provision of this bill, as I have stated before, this fee will be placed on all commodities named, as well as such others as the board may determine. I know that when a farmer in my district who purchases, kills, and dresses a hog for market, and carries it to the market, the butcher will say to him, "You know Congress put a tax on the sale of hogs. I am sorry that I have to deduct it from the amount I owe you, but Congress did it." Are you willing for the many dealers in these various commodities to make such a statement?

Who collects all this tax anyhow? All the bill provides is that there shall be a return made by the purchaser, but who is to check up on the purchaser? Why can not you give us some information about this? Again I say that there will be an unlimited number of these tax collectors, and in all probability they will be classified as experts and the farmers will have to pay. The Members of this House are entitled to know something about this bill. They are entitled to hear something else besides talk about the general conditions of agriculture. We all know that and we are sorry for that condition, but we have before us this bill for consideration, and we should know how it will operate if it becomes a law.

The equalization fees when put in one fund are known as the stabilization fund. It is expected that this amount will cover all losses, costs, charges, and expenses. The revolving fund provided for in the bill is a sum of \$250,000,000, which may be loaned for the purpose of taking care of the surplus, or to cooperative associations engaged in purchasing any of the commodities, or in purchasing or constructing facilities to be used in the storage or processing any commodity.

I can not speak for other productions; but if the bill had been in operation last year I wonder what the equalization fee, or tax, on cotton would have been. It is very hard to estimate this. I have tried it myself, and I have had experts at the Department of Agriculture assisting me. This I know: That the cost and charges on one bale of cotton for six months, exclusive of transportation charges, would have been around

\$6.15; for one year \$9.75, and for two years \$17.15. And right here I shall insert in the Record this table of costs and charges on cotton:

Cost of processing and storing cotton, per bale, for six months, one year, and two years, respectively, but not including transportation to warehouse

	One-half year	One year	Two years
Storage per month, 40 cents.....	\$2.40	\$4.80	\$9.60
Receiving.....	.10	.10	.10
Weighing.....	.10	.10	.10
Reweighing.....	.15	.15	.15
Grading and stapling.....	.40	.40	.40
Sampling.....	.05	.05	.05
Insurance average 60 cents per \$100—60 cents.....	.40	.60	1.20
Turning out.....	.10	.10	.10
Patching, 2 patches at 10 cents.....	.20	.20	.20
Compression.....	1.25	1.25	1.25
Interest on advance 4 per cent (\$100 value).....	1.00	2.00	4.00
	6.15	9.75	17.15

Cost of processing and storing, but not including transportation charges to warehouse, 4,000,000 bales:	
6 months.....	\$49,600,000
1 year.....	64,000,000
2 years.....	93,600,000
Advances:	
4,000,000 bales, value \$100 per bale.....	400,000,000
50 per cent advance.....	200,000,000

Mr. BANKHEAD. What charges are included in your statement?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Transportation is not included; that is, the freight paid to a common carrier or any other transportation company from whatever place to the warehouse is not included, but storage, receiving, weighing, reweighing, grading and stapling, sampling, insurance, turning out, patching, compression, and interest on the advance at 4 per cent.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does the gentleman mean there would be that much equalization fee on a bale of cotton?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes. There will be that much or more, because there is no freight included. There are no salaries for these experts that the farmers have to pay included, and there is none of these other things that the bill provides included. Are you men from the South, upon the basis of these figures—and they tell us it will be possibly three years they will have to hold this cotton off the market—willing to let the farmers be taxed \$20 or \$25 a bale?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman permit an interruption, because I want to understand whether or not the figures the gentleman gave are representative of the cost now of holding a bale of cotton or do they include the probable fee or fees that might be put on cotton by this board?

Mr. BULWINKLE. They have nothing to do with the fee put on by this board.

Mr. McDUFFIE. All of that is the cost of holding cotton?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is the cost of holding cotton, as estimated by the Department of Agriculture, and it is a conservative estimate.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The fee will be in addition to that?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes; and in addition, if you force them to joint cooperative organizations they will have to pay their annual dues to such organizations and the overhead expenses of the organizations.

They further say that it may be from two to three years that they will have to hold this cotton, and the board which must determine this in advance can not say, "We will take the cotton off the market for six months, or we will just take it off for 12 months," but they must estimate the fullest time and your farmers will be taxed accordingly.

I would like to see—no; I would not like to see it, because I know what would happen when some farmer would have to send his cotton to a country merchant and the merchant would say, "Yes; we are giving you to-day 15 cents a pound, but there is a board sitting up there in Washington and that board says you have to pay \$25 because you belong to these organizations." And this is done for the protection of the farmers.

You know what would happen as well as I do, and this applies not only to cotton but to wheat, which we also raise in North Carolina, to corn and to all these other products.

How much cotton it would have been necessary to take off the market in order to raise the price is a disputed question. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that there is a surplus of American cotton over and above the American consumption, over and above that which is bought by the American spinner as well as the foreign spinner, of 5,000,000 bales, and that it would have been necessary to take this, or the greater part of

it, off the market. And assuming that 4,000,000 bales had been declared surplus by the board and had been taken off the market last year, we do know that it would have required \$200,000,000 to place this cotton in warehouses.

That, in addition to the interest charges of 4 per cent on this amount, there would have been the rent or purchase of warehouses, the installation of the sprinklers and other systems for fire protection, if none had been provided for, the expense of city water, the insurance, the salaries of buyers, graders, clerical help, warehouse men, and laborers, and also the amount of freight paid for railroad or other transportation as well as other miscellaneous expenses. All these costs and charges would have been paid by the cotton farmer and would have been a very heavy tax on him. I am not willing, even though I thought the equalization-fee provision of this bill constitutional, to permit by my vote and my influence a tax to be placed upon the producers of my district. We all realize that the "power to tax is the power to destroy," and I am not willing, and I shall never vote to give a board the right and the power to place upon the farmers who raise cotton, wheat, swine, and corn in my district a tax, even though that tax were stipulated in the bill. But here we have the case of an uncertain amount of tax which at the present time can not be determined. I fear that if the bill were passed the farmer would find himself in a worse condition than he is in now. Congress or any other legislative body can never pass permanent legislation which attempts to override the economic law of supply and demand.

Again, I call to your attention that one of the outstanding provisions of this bill is an attempt to force the farmers of the United States to join various cooperative associations or farm organizations whether they want to or not. I believe in cooperative associations and will do all in my power to aid them, but I shall never vote for any measure which contains a provision to force farmers or producers of any commodity into any association or organization. Nor shall I, while I am in Congress, ever vote for a measure which directly or indirectly controls production. The supporters of this bill say that the control of production can be accomplished by placing a tax or equalization fee upon the commodities produced. And also by the advice, counsel, and direction of the board and advisory council.

It seems impossible to me that we of the South, who believe in local self-government, should be willing to turn over to the Federal Government the very land of the farmers themselves, for they say they intend by this measure to control production. Are you willing for that? I know you are not.

There is more in this than the temporary relief that can be afforded. There is a future question at stake, and that goes back to the philosophy of our Government, because they tell us that the only thing that can be done is to stop production, and by these means in the bill they hope to do that. If this should be done, then the Federal Government would have control of the farms.

How many farmers of the South or anywhere else know the full contents of this bill and know the full meaning of it? I have talked to them at home. And they have also come to me and asked me, "What are you going to do up there?" And I have said, "What do you think we can do?" And they have said, "Nothing, except to leave us alone." I have gone in my district to a good many farmers and have talked with them, and when you explain to them that there is an unlimited tax placed upon what they raise, they will tell you, "For God's sake, stay off of it because we are taxed enough."

I am for farm relief, yes; but I am not for this measure. I am for no such monstrosity as this, and I hope this bill will be defeated next week, because in the end its defeat will prove a blessing not only to the farmers of my district but to the farmers of the Nation. [Applause.]

I have not had the time to speak on the constitutionality of the bill. I have not had time to go into all the details as fully as I wished to do, but for these reasons and others not mentioned I shall vote against this measure and shall vote for the Aswell bill upon the motion to recommit.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] to be used whenever he desires.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, we have had so much discussion upon this question that if I had my way about it I would yield back the rest of my time and ask everybody else to do the same and let us vote on this bill. [Applause.]

I enjoyed very much the remarks of my friend from Illinois [Mr. ADKINS], who has just preceded me, about our good friend POLY TRINCHER, of Kansas. I heard the distinguished Kansan address the House the day before yesterday. At that time

he greatly entertained us, notwithstanding the fact that he spoke in opposition to this measure, which I have always favored. I realize that men upon this floor do not always agree. However, my friend from Kansas is always entertaining and, frankly, I am very fond of him. He retires from the House on the 4th of March. He leaves voluntarily, and I know that I voice the sentiments of every Member when I say that he goes from here with our very best wishes. [Applause.] It is rumored that a good appointment awaits him. We his friends upon this side hope he will get one that will be pleasing to him and one in which he can do the least harm to us. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, to-day as we take up for discussion this important measure the eyes of more than 30,000,000 men and women residing upon the farms of America are upon this Congress. These stalwart men and women, representing as they do nearly one-third of the combined population of the Nation, extending from the Atlantic on the east to the placid waters of the Pacific on the west, and from the Canadian boundary on the north to the Gulf on the south, are the bone and sinew of this Republic. As the earth makes its daily revolution, the sun does not shine upon a greater people or a people more deserving of aid and assistance at this very hour. [Applause.]

The need of farm relief is so well known that to discuss it is absolutely unnecessary. The need of legislation of this kind has been dwelt upon by every country newspaper in the land; it has found its way into the editorial columns of many of the great daily papers; it has been discussed by speakers everywhere; it has been the subject of lecturers and of magazine articles. In fact, to put it in a few words, there is not a man or woman anywhere who at all keeps abreast of the times who does not know that American agriculture is in great distress and sorely in need of relief. That question is settled; why prolong the discussion of it? There are a few in this House, and some out of it, who believe that that relief should come from the farmers themselves and not from the Government. If, however, every Member of this House were assembled upon this floor and the question were put to them as to whether or not some bill for farm relief should be passed, I firmly believe that 90 per cent of the Members would answer in the affirmative. Practically every Member acknowledges the need of such legislation; therefore there is no need for further discussion upon this point.

The only question, therefore, to discuss at this time, is which one of the measures that have been introduced and discussed before this body, should be enacted into law. The Committee on Agriculture, the last time it had the honor of coming before the House asking for farm relief, was very liberal, it came here with three bills. This time we have not been so generous, we have brought to you only one measure, the McNary-Haugen bill, and we ask you to enact it into law, or, at least to do your part by passing it through this body, and if you will do that, we have every reason to believe that it will be passed by the Senate and that the President will complete the job by signing it and enacting it into law. [Applause.]

It has been said, Mr. Chairman, that twice before this bill has been before the Congress; first in the Sixty-eighth Congress and again in the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress. I am reminded that a long, long time ago there was uttered a certain proverb and it now comes ringing down the ages without the slightest loss of our faith in it, and it is here to-day; and that is, when you have a great undertaking before you "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again." And upon this particular occasion I am reminded of another proverb which at this time fills the hearts of the proponents of this bill with hope and delight, and that is, "The third time is the charm." The proponents of the McNary-Haugen bill have great faith in it, and we firmly believe that when the final roll is called at its conclusion our distinguished Speaker will arise and announce "The bill has passed." [Applause.]

Mr. McDUFFIE. I am sorry to interrupt the gentleman, but will he yield for a question?

Mr. RUBEY. Yes; go ahead.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that this bill if passed and signed by the President, goes immediately into operation?

Mr. RUBEY. It will take time to put it into operation.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I did not mean under the terms of the bill; but does not the gentleman think that the constitutionality of the bill will be tested out in the courts of the country before it is permitted to be tried out?

Mr. RUBEY. Any farm relief bill that passes this House which has the determined opposition of so many of the big interests of this country will be tested out in the courts. You can not pass a farm relief bill that will not be carried into the courts. I am talking about the exchanges and all the big combines in the country opposed to farm legislation.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Does not the gentleman think that if the farmers are to get farm-relief legislation the Crisp bill or the Aswell bill would not be tested out before it was put into immediate operation?

Mr. RUBEY. No; I do not think so; any bill we may pass will be tested out in the courts. I think we ought to pass the McNary-Haugen bill, and I will tell the gentleman why before I get through. I will tell him why it is of greater importance than any other piece of legislation which seeks to bring farm relief.

I face to-day, Mr. Chairman, what I believe to be a body of great Americans. We are not all of one accord upon the legislation we are now called upon to enact. Our views are divergent as to what should go into this bill and what should be left out of it, but a very large majority of us are practically of one opinion, and that is that legislation should be enacted at once for the welfare and relief of American agriculture. [Applause.] Many measures of relief have been introduced. At least three of these measures have been discussed at some length upon the floor of this House.

First. The McNary-Haugen bill, which is before us now, and which comes with the favorable report of the Committee on Agriculture with the recommendation that it be considered and passed by this body.

Second. There is the Aswell bill, which has been prepared, introduced, and discussed by the Hon. JAMES B. ASWELL, long a faithful and efficient member of the Committee on Agriculture. Mr. ASWELL deserves much credit; he spent many months abroad this past summer studying agricultural conditions. I have extended to him every possible courtesy; I have read and studied his bill, listened to him before our committee and when he spoke on the floor of this House.

Third. There is the so-called Crisp bill, which was introduced by the Hon. CHARLES R. CRISP, of Georgia. Mr. CRISP is not a member of the Committee on Agriculture, but of another great committee. He did not write the bill, he so states, and he claims no pride in authorship. I have heard the question asked many times, "Why did CHARLEY CRISP introduce this bill?" I feel quite sure I can answer that question. Mr. CRISP is one of the most distinguished Members of this body, affable, agreeable, and really lovable, exactly the kind of a man who would be sought out by anyone looking for a real master to direct the course of a legislative bill. Some days before it actually occurred it was rumored about the House that there was to be introduced another agriculture bill, and that it would be introduced into the House by a prominent Member of the South—a Democrat—and into the Senate by a prominent western Republican. I have given to Mr. CRISP's bill very careful consideration. I have extended to him every courtesy; I studied his bill, listened attentively to him when he came before our committee and when he addressed the House. The shortcomings of this bill have already been discussed, and I shall not take the time other than to say that the Crisp bill is a temporary measure intended only to meet emergencies. This he himself states.

Mr. Chairman, if I had to choose between the two temporary measures, the Aswell or the Crisp bill, I am frank to say that I would choose the Aswell bill. It shoots straight from the shoulder; it would accomplish the purpose its author intends; but it too is a temporary measure. I am for the McNary-Haugen bill; I have been for it for a long time, and really believe, as I have already stated, that this third time will be the "charm." I would support the Aswell bill in preference to the Crisp bill for another reason, and that is, that it is presented to this House by a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

During the years I have been here frequently a man comes onto the floor of the House when the roll is being called on the passage of an important bill and asks of some Member this question: "What are we voting on?" Some one will tell him. The next question is, "How is the committee on the bill?" He is told that the committee is favorable. "All right, then I will vote for it." You have heard time and again this kind of a colloquy. In a large legislative body such as this, where hundreds, yes, thousands of bills are introduced each session, it is impossible for each Member to make a careful study of each bill introduced; he must therefore depend largely upon the judgment of the committee to which a bill has been referred. The committee has given this bill the most exhaustive consideration and study. No bill was ever before any committee in this House that has been given a fairer or more extended consideration than the McNary-Haugen bill by the Committee on Agriculture. By a majority vote it has reported this bill to the House and now asks that it be passed.

A few days ago there came to my office and to the office of every other Member of Congress a letter from the chamber of commerce of one of the large cities of the East, presenting resolutions which they had adopted. The writer of that letter

started out by saying that its "board in the broader interest of the country opposed the McNary-Haugen bill."

I took with a grain of salt the proposition that this chamber of commerce was opposing the McNary-Haugen bill in the broader interest of the country. I was reminded of the fact that just a day or two before, when the motion was made in the United States Senate to take up for consideration the McNary-Haugen bill, every Senator except two who voted against that motion came from the Northeast, nearly all of them from the New England States. I recall the further fact that every time we have had under consideration a farm-relief measure the Members of both the House and the Senate residing in the Northeastern States, which is the protected section of this great country, have voted solidly against it. That section of the country, with its large manufacturing industries, receives more benefits by legislation than any other section of the country. Yet they are unwilling for this great Government to come to the relief of distressed American agriculture.

Another argument presented—and that argument has been presented time and again by at least one of the daily newspapers here in Washington—that the passage of this measure would increase the prices of farm products and depress the conditions of the consumers of the country. Thus they admit that at least one of the objects aimed at by the McNary-Haugen bill will be accomplished, but at the same time they exaggerate the burdens that will come as a result of it to the consumers.

This same letter which came from the chamber of commerce of this large city decries any method whereby legislation be devised to handle the surplus of the country, and yet it is a well-known fact that in the campaign of 1924 there was one question upon which all political parties agreed and that was the question of handling the surplus farm products. They agreed that legislation should be passed which would prevent the surplus from beating down domestic prices and thus bring distress to the farmers of the country.

There is no question in my mind but that by taking the surplus off the market, holding and reselling it as needed, it can be effectively handled. We ship abroad at least 60 per cent of the cotton raised in America. That cotton, if we have an over-production, should be taken off the market, stored, and resold as needed. We can say to the people of Europe who must have our cotton, "Give us a fair and reasonable price for it, and you can have it; otherwise not."

If the McNary-Haugen bill becomes a law and goes into effect, what will it do for agriculture? This is a question which was asked me a few days ago by a prominent Member of this House, one who has always opposed the enactment of this legislation. He further stated that in the whole experience we had had in the discussion of this legislation no one of its advocates had ever come upon the floor and attempted to say what the legislation would do. The gentleman is incorrect in his statement, for this particular phase of the legislation has been discussed time and again. It is my purpose now, briefly, for my time is limited, to answer this gentleman's question.

From the very beginning of time agriculture is the only industry on earth whose workers have not had a single thing to say about the prices which they should receive for the products which they produce. The farmer toils from one year's end to the other. When the crop season comes he goes out into the field in the early morning, toils on through the heat and burden of the day until late at night. He undergoes all kinds of hardships. He contends with all sorts of weather; he meets the storms, the rain, the wind. He fights against floods that come and many times has to wait for the long, drawn-out drought to be broken. When, at last, the end of the season comes, if fortune has favored him, he carries his hard-earned products to market and humbly asks the buyer, "How much will you give me for them?"

It frequently becomes necessary for him to ship his cattle and his hogs many miles to market and there somebody else tells him what he can get for them, and it frequently happens that there is no competition in the bidding, in fact, it more often happens that he receives only one bid, and that a very reluctant one, and he must take that or nothing. He is hundreds of miles from his home, he can not afford to reship, therefore he takes whatever is offered to him. That is not only true of cattle and hogs but is true of everything raised on the farm.

If this bill passes, as I am confident that it will, all this will be changed. A Federal farm board created in this bill will become the farmer's agency through which he will be represented in having the prices determined for his products. This Federal farm board, composed of 12 members, one from each Federal land district in the United States, together with the Federal council cooperating with it, will determine the prices for each one of the staple products provided in this

bill, and when this bill is passed, and this Federal farm board is appointed and gets thoroughly organized, it will become the most powerful and the only agency the farmers of the country have ever had in obtaining for them fair, equitable, and just prices for their products. This is the vital point in this legislation and the fact that we have provided this agency in this bill is the reason that the opposition to it is so determined. We hear Members upon the floor of this House say "This is a price-fixing bill, and therefore I will not vote for it." Who fixes the prices for the farmer to-day? He does not do it himself, therefore who does it? The gamblers upon the exchanges, the manipulators, the grain dealers, the packers, and hundreds of others who manipulate the business in the great central markets of the country. All of these people, and many others are opposing bitterly the passage of this measure because they know that the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill will sound the death-knell of their nefarious business. [Applause.]

The Federal farm board, through its agencies, will go into the markets, buy agricultural products and purchase them at a price that will yield to the producer a reasonable profit, plus the cost of production.

There is no doubt that when this law goes into effect there will be advances in the principal markets of the country of the prices of the agricultural products named in this measure. Only a few days ago, when it was given out through the press that the McNary-Haugen bill would probably pass, cotton, wheat, and other products immediately advanced in price.

It will take time to put this law into effect. The matter of selecting the farm board, through the very efficient manner in which it will be selected under this act, may take months. Better to proceed with care and caution and get the very best men that can be secured than to make haste and get less efficient men. The success or the failure of this act will depend more upon the kind of men who will be selected for the Federal farm board than upon anything else; but I say now, without fear of successful contradiction, that when this board is selected and established and secures the cooperation of its agencies throughout the country, it will become in the course of a very few years the greatest and most potential organization that the farmers of America have ever had. Under the operation of this board the farmers of America will have, for the first time in all history, an able, efficient body of men who will represent them fairly and squarely, and I may say justly, in the determining of the prices which the producers shall receive for their products. I say justly and fairly to all, because I do not believe that any board selected, in its desire to aid agriculture, will go to the extreme and bring undue hardships on the great consuming public. The fundamental object of this bill is to bring farm relief to distressed agriculture and to give to the farmer a just and fair price for his products, and there can be no doubt but what this bill will do that. The friends of the measure think that it will, the opponents of the measure admit that it will, because in the editorials found in the large city newspapers, the home of the consumers, they object to this bill because they believe that it will make prices too high and be burdensome upon the consumer.

In the putting of this measure into operation the board should proceed, as I have already said, with care and caution, and the board which we hereby create, I am satisfied, will do that. They have in a manner supervision of the whole marketing system.

One of the troubles we have to-day is the fact that from the hour the product leaves the farm its price is increased and increased through every hand it passes until when finally it reaches the consumer it has been enhanced many times. Those things will be studied out by this board, and everything done that it is possible to do to bring about, as this bill provides, orderly marketing.

The passage of this bill and the putting of it into full and complete operation will bring relief to every farmer in America. We must not stop there in our comment; it will help every industry in the land. When the farmer is helped, when he gets a fair price for his product, when he is enabled to pay off his debts and obligations, when he, indeed, becomes fairly prosperous every merchant in his town will feel the favorable result of that. That merchant, as a result, will meet his obligations to the wholesale merchant and be placed in a position where he can handle increased stocks of goods. The whole business world will feel the stimulus of the increased purchasing power of the farmer. The farmer will be able to pay his obligations at the bank; bank failures in agricultural communities will become a thing of the past. The great railroads of the country, steaming from east to west and from north to south, will carry more freight, more passengers, and their business will be greatly enhanced.

Agriculture is the basic industry of America. Make its foundations solid and sure, give to it the means by which it can become successful, and you will help every industry on the continent. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL].

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, having been born and raised on a farm until 20 years of age, I have a recollection of what the farm was 35 years ago.

In that period there was always a surplus of grain on the farm. This surplus was carried by the farmer.

In those days after the harvest the haymow was filled with hay, the granaries were filled with corn and other cereals, and the straw stack remained on the outside.

The farmer went to town on Saturday, made his purchases for the necessities of life.

Then he gradually sold from the granary and haymow enough to pay his bills.

But invariably at the end of the year there was left a surplus. This surplus was in the clear and he carried it over until the next year, or to such time as the prices would show a reasonable profit.

In this way the farmer carried the surplus. This was the time of the reaper, the mower, and the self-binder. But since then the farming business has changed. To-day the farmer carries on his farming with improved utensils at a high automobile speed, raises better crops, increases production, plants more land, and the result is a larger supply of products.

But when the harvest time comes his indebtedness is so large that he finds it necessary to sell the entire crop in order to raise the money to pay the bills. What is the result? Market declines, he sells at low prices and plants at high prices, and the result, his profits are nil, and the farming occupation to-day is not a profitable proposition.

Gentlemen, if this Congress does nothing more than to relieve the mind of the farmer by passing legislation, it will have accomplished a great deal for the future welfare of the agricultural industry of this country. [Applause.]

It is the same old proposition: If you are going down the street and are met by 10 successive friends and each of them tells you that you are sick, in most cases you will become sick and send for a doctor.

The farmer to-day believes he is sick or broke; he believes he needs legislation at Washington, and everybody he meets tells him that he needs legislation at Washington.

If you disappoint him at this term of Congress you are going to set him back several notches in his future welfare.

I have sat here for these few days and listened to arguments on both sides of this question. I have tried to study this bill so as to have some definite idea of what it seeks to accomplish. I am not entirely convinced that it will do all that we hope it will accomplish, but I am sure of one thing, it is the best plan that has been offered, and if it is enacted into law the farmer will know that the Congress of the United States earnestly wants to do something for him. [Applause.]

The farmer thinks that you have done something for practically every other kind of business in this country; he believes that he has been sinned against and that no one has been his protector; he believes that the Congress of the United States has not been diligent in supporting some measure for his benefit.

Now, let us pass the Haugen bill; let us at least show him that the Members of Congress, east, west, north, and south, are determined to make a start toward helping him in his future progress. Let us take it for granted that the Haugen bill will not be a success; that it will work just the opposite to what has been proposed upon this floor and to what it was intended; that it will destroy the success of the farmer instead of assisting him. Let that be as it may, Congress can repeal the bill, but in the meantime we will have done one thing, we have done what the farm organizations of this country have asked us to do, we have made some effort to help the farmer. As far as I am concerned, I am going to support the Haugen bill. I am going to try to get every man that I can to vote with me for the Haugen bill, and I want to say to this Congress that as far as I know, there will be no Member from the State of Illinois outside of the city of Chicago but what will vote for this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CLAGUE].

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, there may not be much that I can say that will enlighten the Members of the House regarding farm legislation. The great majority of the thinking people now realize that the agricultural conditions are not satisfactory. For four years I served as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and I wish to say in behalf of that committee that there is not a more hard-

working committee in this House. For the past four years this committee has given much time and conscientious study to the question of farm relief legislation. My best consideration has been given to the study of the three farm relief bills which are now being considered. There is no doubt in my mind that if the Crisp bill were passed it would do some good. Mr. CRISP has given much study to the bill introduced by him, and I know that he would never have introduced it if he had not thought there was much merit in the same. My friend ASWELL, with whom I served four years on the Agriculture Committee, has before this body his bill. He has given much time and attention and much thought to the agricultural situation, and there is no doubt in my mind that if the Aswell bill would pass it would do some good, but only one of these bills can pass at this session, and the question before us is, Which bill will be of the greatest benefit and give the most relief to present farming conditions? After a careful study of each of these bills, it is my opinion that the McNary-Haugen bill, if passed, will be of much greater benefit to the farmers of our country than the passage of either of the other bills.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAGUE. I am sorry, but I can not yield at this time as I have only a few minutes.

I do want to see some practical farm-relief legislation passed at this session of Congress. Both of the great parties, Republican and Democrat, promised at their last conventions to help bring forth and place upon our statute books farm-relief legislation, and I am just a little surprised by the action of some of our Republican Members of Congress who have at all times fought every proposition to aid in the passage of any farm relief bill. You eastern Republicans have been before Congress many times asking for relief for the manufacturing interests in the shape of tariff legislation, and we have assisted you in securing a tariff on most articles manufactured in this country. I believe in a reasonable tariff. Our tariff laws have been of some benefit to our farmers, but it has been of a much greater assistance to manufacturing industries than to the farmers of the country. Within the last two years there has been an increase of 4 cents a pound in the butter tariff, increasing it from 8 to 12 cents. This is a benefit to our dairy farmers. We passed yesterday the cream and milk bill which prohibits the shipping into the United States from Canada of insanitary milk and cream. This bill will be of assistance to all of the dairy farmers of the United States.

As a whole, the farmers of the Central and Northwestern States have not prospered since 1920. At this time I wish to call your attention to some charts which are before you, which were prepared by the Department of Agriculture for our colleague, Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I wish that you would observe the lines on these various charts. One of these lines represents the prices of nonagricultural products which the farmer has to buy. The other represents the prices received by the farmer for the basic products which he has had to sell, such as wheat, hogs, cattle, corn, and cotton. These charts show that there has been a great loss to the farmers of this country since July, 1920. The chart relating to cattle shows that if the farmer had received for his cattle the ratio price that he has had to pay for things that he has had to buy, the farmers would have received over \$2,300,000,000 more than was received.

Look at the chart which relates to hogs. It shows you that if the farmers had received the same ratio price for hogs since July 1, 1920, that they paid for the articles which they had to buy, the farmers of the United States would have received over \$2,500,000,000 more than was paid to them. The chart relating to corn shows that corn farmers have lost over a billion dollars in the price that they would have received for this product, compared with the price which they have had to pay. The wheat farmers have lost over \$1,100,000,000. Chart No. 3, which I wish to call your particular attention to, shows the index price received by the farmers on upward of 30 basic agricultural products, as compared with the prices of some 300 nonagricultural commodities. This chart shows that the total losses to the farmers on these basic farm products since July 1, 1920, is more than \$13,000,000,000. In other words, if the farmers of the United States had received a ratio price for these basic farm products produced by them on a parity with the nonagricultural commodities which they had to buy, the farmers of the United States since July, 1920, would have received more than \$13,000,000,000 more than they did receive. Any person who has given study to the farm question must admit there is an agricultural problem; if this disparity between the prices of the things which the farmer has to buy and what he has to sell continues, farmers can not exist.

A few days ago my colleague from Minneapolis [Mr. NEWTON] made some statements regarding farm conditions. He is one

of the best fellows on earth, but when he stands before us and says that he believes that his views represent a great mass of farmers of Minnesota I take issue with him. There is not a farmer in his district.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CLAGUE. The gentleman may have a few small farms.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I have one township.

Mr. CLAGUE. Probably 3 acres to each farm.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Very good farms, too.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I know personally he has a good many constituents who were born on a farm.

Mr. CLAGUE. I will admit that.

The great grain exchange of the Northwest is located in Minneapolis, and I am proud of that wonderful city. This grain exchange is in my colleague's district, but until we secured general legislation relating to grain in Minnesota we did not always get the best results in selling our wheat in Minneapolis. There are located in his district some of the largest flour mills in the United States. In his talk before us the other day he called our attention to another matter. He gave us to understand that the indebtedness of the people of the Northwest was much less now than a few years ago. I only wish this were true. I have taken the pains in the last few days to look up this matter, and from such statistics as I am able to secure I find that the indebtedness, not only in the State of Minnesota but in the whole Northwest, has greatly increased since 1920. The mortgage indebtedness in the United States in the past 10 years, according to the best figures that I am able to secure, has increased from about \$4,000,000,000 to over \$10,000,000,000. When I asked my colleague from Minnesota the other day if there were any farm organizations in our State opposing this bill, he referred to the Twin City Milk Producers' Association and the Land O'Lakes Creameries Association, and the impression that I got from his statements was that these organizations were opposed to this bill. I wish to read you a telegram received by Congressman ANDRESEN:

ST. PAUL, MINN., February 7, 1927.

AUGUST ANDRESEN,

Congressman, Washington, D. C.

Public press reports Congressman NEWTON as saying that Land O'Lakes Creameries Association is opposed to the McNary-Haugen bill. Land O'Lakes has never taken any action opposing this legislation and never will. Dairy farmers of Minnesota overwhelmingly indorse this legislation. Personally, I unreservedly approve McNary-Haugen bill.

HENRY ARENS,

Vice President Land O'Lakes Creameries (Inc.).

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAGUE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman will recall that my statement was in answer to the gentleman's inquiry to show him any farm organization that had not come out in favor of the Haugen bill, and I mentioned the Land O'Lakes Creamery, and the gentleman can not show a telegram from that concern saying that it has come out in favor of the Haugen bill.

Mr. CLAGUE. The Land O'Lakes Creamery Co. is composed of about 500 creameries scattered throughout the State which send their butter direct to the Land O'Lakes organization at Minneapolis, and the butter is reshipped from that point. I have a number of telegrams from local creameries, members of the Land O'Lakes Association, favoring this bill. I have a telegram from the Twin City Milk Producers Association stating that it has taken no action regarding the bill.

I represent one of the great farming districts in the State of Minnesota. The farmers in my section carry on diversified farming. There has been much discussion of farm-relief legislation. I have not received one telegram or letter from any farmer in my district opposing this legislation; but on the contrary I have received hundreds of letters and telegrams from farmers, business men, and farm organizations favoring it. I have received letters from parties residing in Minneapolis opposing the bill, saying that it would hurt the farmers. I have not received a letter or telegram from any farmer in the State of Minnesota opposing farm-relief legislation, and of the 10 Members in the House from Minnesota nine favor this bill. [Applause.] I have in my possession petitions signed by several hundred business men, companies, and corporations in Minneapolis petitioning for the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill. [Applause.] The passage of this bill will not do all that is claimed for it by some of its advocates. It is not 100 per cent perfect; neither will it give 100 per cent relief to the farmers of our country upon its passage; but in my opinion it will give considerable assistance. The bill was prepared by men who have given much study to the farm question. The farm leaders of many of our leading farm organizations of the United States

have given years of study to this question. They have helped prepare this bill, and favor its passage. It is not perfect, but if passed, and given a fair trial, the defects of the bill will soon become known, and it can then be amended and be made a more perfect law. Its passage will be a partial fulfillment of the promises made in the late Republican and Democratic conventions.

No one can deny that legislation has not assisted labor, railroads, and our industries. Labor is fair toward this bill, and it gives me pleasure to state that labor leaders of the great labor organizations favor its passage. Many of these leaders have appeared before the Agriculture Committee and stated that, while the passage of farm-relief legislation might increase in some cases the cost of living, they were willing to bear their share of the increased cost, as they want the farmers of the United States to have a fair return for their labor and investments.

A higher price to the farmer for his products does not, as a rule, make much difference in the price to the consumer. Agricultural statistics during the years 1923, 1924, and 1925 show there was nearly 100 per cent fluctuation in the price of wheat paid to the farmers and only 5 per cent fluctuation in the price of bread. During the same years there was about 100 per cent fluctuation in the price paid to farmers for live hogs and the fluctuation in the cost to the consumer not over 30 per cent. Since 1923 there has been a fluctuation in the price of cotton of about 100 per cent, with little or no fluctuation in the price to the consumer of cotton goods. The same is true of all our basic farm products.

Legislation has been passed by Congress and laws are now on our statute books allowing railroads a fair return on their investments. Tariff legislation has protected our great industries, and through such legislation manufacturers are enabled to secure a reasonable return on their investment, and for us to sit idly by and say nothing can be done to help agriculture is folly. During the years 1925 and 1926 about 27 per cent of the people of the United States were engaged in agriculture. Under all rules of economics this 27 per cent of the people should have received about 27 per cent of the national income, but statistics show that they only received about 7½ per cent. Statistics further show—and it is undeniable—that the average income of the farmers of the United States during each of the past years has been less than \$700, while the average wage of all industrial workers, ordinary mechanics, teachers, and clerks, and other workers was nearly \$1,500 per year.

Many of the opponents who have spoken on this bill state that the farmers, when they come to understand it, will oppose the equalization fee. Like many others who favor this bill, I am interested in farming, and I know the ordinary farmer is intelligent, and I do not believe there is a farmer in the United States who would oppose paying a small equalization fee when he knows that it will bring him a higher price for his products. Many papers that are opposing this legislation have given the people to understand that upon the passage of this bill it will at once go into effect, and that the farmers will have to begin paying an equalization fee on the basic products mentioned in the bill. Such is not the case. No equalization fee will ever be placed upon wheat, or upon any other basic product, until the farmers, through their farm boards and organizations created by this bill, fix a fee thereon. In other words, when there is a surplus of wheat and the price is low the wheat growers will determine whether or not they wish to place an equalization fee upon wheat and take up the surplus for the purpose of increasing the price. The same is true as it relates to other farm products mentioned in the bill.

We do not want legislation that enables the farmer to borrow more money. They owe too much now. What our farmers want is a higher price for their products which they produce and have to sell in order that they may secure money to pay their present debts. I am going to vote for this farm-relief legislation for the reason that I honestly believe it will help general farming conditions. The passage of this bill will be a step in the right direction and I am in hopes that the Members of this House will assist in its early passage at this session of Congress that the bill may soon become a law.

Mr. FORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for one minute.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CLAGUE] could not yield further, I have asked for this time.

The statement that I made in answer to the question of the gentleman from Minnesota was based on a telegram that I personally received last spring from Mr. Brandt, who was then and still is the executive of the Land O'Lakes Creamery

(Inc.). This was to the effect that their organization had never come out in favor of the Haugen bill, the Tincher bill, or any other bill; and I repeat to-day that that organization has not come out in favor of any particular brand of farm relief legislation. My statement stands uncontradicted, as the RECORD shows. [Applause.]

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McSWEENEY].

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, gentlewomen and gentlemen of the committee, I am so enthusiastic about farm relief that I only wish I had some influence among the Members of the House to have them feel as I do on this great subject. I can not add much to it but I would like to speak a word in behalf of farm legislation.

First of all it seems to me we must have premises to depart from. The most ardent opponents of the bill; going back three years when the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VOIGT] was conducting the opposition—acknowledged two premises; first of all that there was a farm condition which was very bad economically, and second that legislative enactment would undoubtedly help the situation.

Let us come down to the present opponents, and I speak of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FORR], both of them able, strong opponents of this legislation, and both of these men have the same premises to depart from. First, they believe that we have the critical situation confronting agriculture; and second, that legislative enactment will help that situation. Both of these gentlemen have introduced bills which further prove to you that they believe legislation can do something for the farmer.

With these two premises let us discuss the bill. To my mind the question is whether governmental help will relieve the farmer from overproduction or not. I have been greatly interested in the Crisp bill and feel that one of his provisions is, in reality, a deterrent of overproduction. The equalization fee in the Haugen bill to my mind is a deterrent of overproduction. If I am misled I feel that I have done the farmer an injustice by voting for this measure. I really wish to do something constructive that will be beneficial for him in the years to come.

There are opponents who say that the good farmer, the efficient farmer, does not need help. I will probably agree with them. But may I make a comparison? I am a Democrat who believes that you can not suddenly change the tariff situation and, realizing this, I would not vote to remove the tariff wall that surrounds the businesses of my district. If I did, I would be as unjust to those manufacturing people as a man would be who would allow a canary bird that had been housed in warmth to be suddenly put out in the cold. So, believing in the tariff, I feel that you will understand me when I ask you to consult Henry Ford; I ask you to consult the Remington typewriter people. They will laugh if you speak of protection. They have built up an efficient business and go into the countries of the world where labor is negligible and undersell the producers of these countries. It is not for these highly efficient men that we have a tariff wall, but for the protection of the average business man who must compete in world markets. If that is true, why should we as legislators not try to help the efficient farmer and have him succeed even more, and at the same time let the man of average ability, the man who is struggling along, doing his best on the farm, have the same opportunity in the great field of food products of our country as the business man has in his field of production. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. KINCHELOE. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. McSWEENEY. And so I hope that you and I can realize that the efficient man will take care of himself, but we want to provide for that man who has not the best land and who is not nearest the market to weather the storm and to overcome the bad conditions in which he finds himself.

In conclusion, I would like to quote the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE]. He said if we pass this bill and allow some of our surplus of foodstuffs to be sent abroad and there sold at a price less than they are sold in America we will be furnishing the sinews of commercial warfare—food—to our competing laborers in Europe.

As I said before, I believe in a reasonable tariff, and under a tariff we must allow our surpluses to be dumped abroad. We have allowed the laborers in the field of agriculture in Europe to enjoy the use of American-produced farm machinery at a price less than our own farmers pay for the machinery in the city where it is built. We have allowed the foreign laborers in all lines of work to enjoy the products of America at a price cheaper than the American consumer enjoys them. We have

landed rails from the United States Steel Corporation in the harbor of Liverpool cheaper than they are obtained in the place of production. I merely say that the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] to my mind would lose weight, because we have already given those sinews of commercial warfare to our enemies abroad. It seems to me, from a humanitarian standpoint, that we can give sufficient food also, and at the same time give relief to the American farmer.

Mr. Chairman, in the years to come, when this bill is in operation, as I anticipate it will be, I hope that I shall be able to look back with pleasure and pride upon the fact that I had some small part in helping to pass it; and I hope, too, that the particular part of it which has been the bone of contention, the equalization fee, will prove to be the deterrent we wish it to be and will help the farmer to again enjoy the prosperity that he should have. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, since I received an assault upon my political body last Tuesday, delivered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], I have been receiving some reaction from Ohio, and I think the House will be interested to know what Ohio thinks on this question of the McNary-Haugen bill. From Mount Sterling I received this telegram:

The Mount Sterling Chamber of Commerce, composed of merchants and farmers of this community, is with you in your support of the McNary-Haugen bill. The Ohio Farm Bureau in its rejection of this bill does not reflect the sentiment of the farmers of this community.

Here is one I received from the grange in Champaign County:

The grange of Champaign County indorses the McNary-Haugen bill and asks that you support the same with your influence and vote.

Here is one from the grange of Warren County:

Believing that a majority of the farmers of this Nation are in favor of farm relief, be it therefore

Resolved, That we earnestly request the National Congress and the President to pass the McNary-Haugen bill now before the Congress.

Here is one from the farm bureau in Champaign County:

The Champaign County Farm Bureau at their annual meeting to-day, February 11, indorses and recommends the adoption of the McNary-Haugen farm relief bill. Success in the fight.

Loudon, Ohio, Chamber of Commerce:

I am glad to inform you that the chamber of commerce went on record as favoring the McNary-Haugen bill.—Scott D. Slaughter, Secretary.

There are a good many others, but I shall let it go at that. I have received two invitations to come into Mr. BEGG's district and discuss the McNary-Haugen bill. I believe I should do that, because I do not think Jim can explain it. I have listened to him on the floor, and I am satisfied that he can not explain it to his home folks. But I shall go there with a good deal of trembling and fear, because it is the district of a great man. I know that from what I saw in the papers there a few months ago during the campaign. When I was there I saw in glaring headlines in the paper an advertisement to this effect: "Three Big Men in Congress—LONGWORTH, TILSON, and BEGG." My genial colleague from Ohio evidently admits that, and I understand that he has it on his calling cards at home. [Laughter.]

I have but 10 minutes, and that is my share, of course, when everyone wants to talk about this question, and I shall take the time of the House on just one point.

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

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. Is the gentleman going to read the letter he has from Mr. Palmer, the head of the State Farm Bureau of Ohio?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I have not that letter with me, but I should be very glad to put it into the RECORD with my answer to it.

Mr. TINCHER. Very well.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I told him in my answer—

Mr. TINCHER. If the gentleman does that it will be satisfactory.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I do not yield further. I told him in my answer that I told the House why that resolution was passed in the chamber of commerce banquet because the Secretary of Agriculture and Professor Jordan were there addressing it. I told him that I was sorry to present that to the House, but I felt that it might have some effect on the

House and the vote in the House if it was not properly explained, and I told him in my letter this morning, "I find your resolution has had no effect in the House and that twice as many Congressmen from Ohio will vote for the legislation as did a year ago."

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman is telling what he told him in his letter. Is the gentleman going to put his letter in to show what he told the gentleman?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. All right.

Mr. TINCHER. All right, if it goes in. If it does not, I shall put it in.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, as to the point that I wish to bring out in the argument finally, the Washington Post stated the real difference of opinion about this bill. That paper in an editorial yesterday said:

We are opposed to the McNary-Haugen bill because it sets up a bureaucracy in Washington to boost the cost of living.

That is what the newspaper says, and that is really the opposition in this House. I call attention to the fact that it may not affect the cost of living, and I want to give some of my reasons for saying so. In the South you gentlemen have lost nearly half the value of your cotton this year, below the cost of production. You are selling cotton at nearly half the price that you were a year ago when we were debating this matter, and I wanted to find out whether that has been reflected in the price of cotton goods which sell in the stores of America.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. It has not been.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I sent my wife down to Woodward & Lothrop's big store in Washington and I asked her to go from counter to counter in that store and find out whether there had been any changes made in the price of cotton goods during the past six months. Now, she went to the shirt counter and asked the price of shirts and then she said, "Has there been any change in the price of shirts," and the clerk bristled up and said, "Certainly not. We sell these shirts as cheaply as we can and make very little profit," and that may be so, and he said there had been no change in the price of shirts. Then she went to the sheets and other places where cotton goods are sold, and in not one case has there been a penny's drop in the price of cotton goods in that store. That is fairly representative of the country. I have no reason to doubt it. Now, here is the point, gentlemen. I think there is not 10 cents worth of cotton in a dollar and a half shirt. Shall anybody dispute that? And it does not make any difference whether cotton costs 7, 8, or 15 cents, that shirt remains at \$1.50 when you pay for it, and, therefore, I think if this bill operating on cotton should raise the cotton price 5 cents you will see no change in the price on cotton goods.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I will.

Mr. KETCHAM. I wonder if the gentleman is willing to take from me the statement of Mr. Rabenold's, of the baker's association, figures which I have in this hearing upon the bread bill. He was asked in regard to what change in the price of flour was required to affect the price of bread 1 cent. Will the gentleman kindly read it. I have it marked.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio (reading)—

We find that, on an average, a fluctuation of \$2.50 per barrel in flour is necessary to justify a full unilateral increase of 1 cent in the selling price of bread.

That is \$2.50 a barrel, 5 bushels of wheat in a barrel, 50 cents a bushel.

Mr. KETCHAM. And right upon that very point in the same hearing did not he also say that the baking companies could absorb the entire increase in the cost of wheat up to 50 cents without being called upon to raise the price of a loaf of bread 1 cent?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I believe he did. Now I take up the matter of bread, if the gentlemen will give me their attention about bread.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. There are a good many in the House being appealed to by the bakers of the country asking them to vote against the measure because they are sure it will hurt their business. Now, what is to happen with the bakers? They take about two and a half cents worth of material, knead it into a loaf, and sell it. It retails here at 8 cents. Of course, if this bill goes through and raises the price of wheat it will add somewhat to the cost of that material, and it will make their material cost perhaps 3 cents instead of 2½ cents, and the

question is will that half cent be added to the 8 cents for a loaf of bread. I will say I have watched the price of wheat during the last five or six years and it has changed in price from 83 cents to \$1.85, and during the 83-cent period the price of bread was 8 cents and during the \$1.85 period it was 8 cents, and I know, too, gentlemen, of a bread-making establishment that made 48 per cent dividends when wheat cost \$1.85. You can add the tariff to the price of wheat to-day and not raise the price of wheat beyond \$1.85 per bushel, and therefore I say that you will not see a difference in the price of bread.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I will.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is not the honest fluctuation that the consumer has to fear, but it is the large bread companies of the United States, who take advantage of this measure to pass it on to the consumers.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I will say to the gentleman, in reply to that, that I have asked the bakers why they did not go above the 8-cent price, and their answer was that when bread goes above 8 cents the women of the country begin to bake, and they can not afford to have the women of the country go into the baking business.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. With the price of gas in New York City as it is, the women can not afford to bake.

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

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. FORT. The gentleman has been before our committee in support of his bread bill, in which he has contended that while the price is not changed, the size of the loaf is changed to meet the fluctuation in the cost of the raw material.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. All over this wide country there are States which have laws which require full-weight bread. Ohio has one and Indiana has one. They are selling bread in both to-day at 8 cents. I will take you to New York City and take you to the retail stores there, and you will find a 13-ounce loaf costs 8 cents; 3 ounces pinched off and taken away from the consumer because the chairman of the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives of the United States refuses to have that bread bill go before his committee. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAPES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 15474) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and distribution of the surplus of agricultural commodities, had come to no resolution thereon.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a resolution of the State Legislature of Montana expressing the desire of the people of my State that the President take steps to negotiate a treaty with the Dominion of Canada in furtherance of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway.

There is no single thing of such great importance to the agricultural and industrial interests of Montana in so far as our transportation problems are concerned as is the construction of this great deep waterway to the sea. It has been my privilege and pleasure to support this proposal consistently from its beginning, and I shall continue to press it in cooperation with those similarly interested constructively in this development as a means of bringing the utmost good to the Nation and our States.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of Montana:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of an act entitled "A resolution expressing the desire of the people of the State of Montana to His Excellency the President of the United States of America that he take steps to negotiate a treaty with the Dominion of Canada in furtherance of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway," enacted by the twentieth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by J. E. Erickson, governor of said State, on the 7th day of February, 1927.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 8th day of February, A. D. 1927.

[SEAL]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.
By CLIFFORD L. WALKER,
Deputy.

Senate Joint Resolution 2, introduced by Shelver, expressing the desire of the people of the State of Montana to his excellency the President of the United States of America that he take steps to negotiate a treaty with the Dominion of Canada in furtherance of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway

Whereas a joint board of engineers representing the United States and Canada have officially and unanimously declared ship-channel connection between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic by way of the St. Lawrence to be practical; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence Commission of the United States, appointed to determine the need of such a waterway, has unanimously declared, in its report to the President, made December 27, 1926, that—

“The construction of the shipway from the Great Lakes to the sea is imperative both for the relief and for the future development of a vast area in the interior of the continent” and that—

“It has been estimated that the values of a single year to the farmers alone would equal the capital cost of the waterway” and that—

“The economic importance of the improvement would be far greater than the savings made upon the actual tonnage transported, important though that would be,” and

Whereas the growth of the State of Montana, the development of her agricultural and mineral resources, her present prosperity, and her future welfare, all demand permanent relief from the existing high transportation costs to and from the markets of the world, and require that freedom to enter into world commerce now denied to her by reason of distance from the Atlantic Ocean—a situation resulting in a combined rail-and-ocean transportation cost, prohibitive to many of her potential industries, and oppressive to those industries which now exist, and

Whereas the St. Lawrence waterway would give to the State of Montana a sea base 1,400 miles nearer to her eastern border than at present, and by such removal would permanently lower her rail-and-ocean costs of transportation to and from world markets; would increase the demand for her agricultural products; would stimulate the development of her mineral wealth; would invite new enterprise, and, generally, would assure to her citizens an enlarged and abiding prosperity: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (The House of Representatives concurring), That we do most earnestly urge upon the President of the United States of America, the imperative national need of such waterway, and that we do further express to him the desire of the people of the State of Montana that immediate steps be taken for the negotiation of a treaty with the Dominion of Canada in furtherance of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway.

W. S. McCORMACK, *President of the Senate.*
G. T. DAVIS, *Speaker of the House.*

Approved, February 7, 1927.

J. E. EBICKSON, *Governor.*

Filed, February 7, 1927, at 2.21 o'clock p. m.

C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State.*

THE M'NARY-HAUGEN FARM RELIEF BILL

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to prefer a unanimous-consent request, to which I ask the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]:

Mr. Speaker, during the discussions of the rule for the consideration of the bill which is now the order of business there were certain gentlemen in the House who were opposed to three of the measures that have been discussed, and some additional time was then granted, an hour, I believe. Now, all the time has been occupied, up to the present, by gentlemen who are for one or the other of these three measures. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN], who is recognized as a student of economics, and a great one, is opposed, I learn, to all three measures. I think he should be entitled to have some time. I was wondering if it would be agreeable for the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] to permit this time to be extended by 45 minutes, that time to be used by the gentleman from New York when next we go into general debate.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will say to the gentleman that the time is equally divided, for and against. They have the same privilege as everybody else, for or against. That is in accordance with the rule provided by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Let me call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to this very peculiar situation. Of course, the time is equally divided between those for and against the Haugen bill, but the time that is being controlled

against the bill is being controlled by gentlemen who are for another proposition or propositions. The gentleman from New York is against all three bills.

Mr. HAUGEN. There may be one-third of the membership of the House who are against all of them. Personally I should be delighted to hear the gentleman from New York. I have great respect for him as an economist and as a Member of this House. But we are operating under a rule, and I see no reason for extending the privilege to one particular Member over others.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then I will put it in another way. I will ask unanimous consent that on Monday, after the reading of the Journal and the disposal of business on the Speaker's table, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN] may have 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that on Monday, after the reading of the Journal and the disposal of business on the Speaker's table, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN] may address the House for 45 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time of the general debate remains outside of this 45 minutes?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has 1 hour and 2 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] has 51 minutes, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] has 35 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] 23 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. What is the total?

Mr. CRISP. About three hours.

Mr. HASTINGS. A little over three hours?

The SPEAKER. Two hours and 51 minutes altogether.

Mr. KETCHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—and I shall not object—I find, so far as my own case is concerned, that I am somewhat in the same situation as the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN], except that I take the opposite view. I am in favor of the very best plan for farm relief that can be formulated, but I have not asked for time of any gentleman now in control of the time, although as a member of the Agricultural Committee I would be entitled to it. I therefore ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from New York I may have 20 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Then I object, because there will be 50 Members who will make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Do I understand that the gentleman from Iowa objects to the request I am making?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN] may have 45 minutes on Monday after the reading of the Journal and the disposal of business on the Speaker's table?

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would not object to Mr. KETCHAM, a member of the committee having time, but the gentleman from New York is not a member. If we extend it to one we should extend it also to every Member of the House who desires to be heard.

The SPEAKER. All the Chair desires to know is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Why not extend the time one hour and give these gentlemen that time?

Mr. HAUGEN. Then extend the time two hours and divide it equally.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I dare say the House wants to hear some more discussion of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I assume the proponents of the bill will be seeking another rule in a day or two, and we will see if we can then work out the time.

Mr. HAUGEN. I believe it can be worked out, and I hope it will be worked out in an orderly manner.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON]. There are a number of bills on the Private Calendar. Could the gentleman from Connecticut tell us when the House will consider these private bills or what he has in view?

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that, after the completion of this bill and two or three other minor bills that are pending, we may take up the Private Calendar in the regular order and consider it. If I find that no time can be found for doing it in this way I shall then ask the House to set apart an evening on which the Private Calendar may be considered. I hesitate, however, to ask the House, after working long hours,

to come back at night and consider bills on the Private Calendar and shall not do so unless it becomes necessary.

Mr. BULWINKLE. There are only three weeks remaining.

Mr. TILSON. I realize that, but after this bill is finished there is no other major matter that will take a long time. We shall have to wait for conference reports, and while so doing we can fill in with the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar. I think these bills should be considered.

THE EXPORT DEBENTURE PLAN

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing in the Appendix a substitute which I propose to offer at the proper time, namely, the export debenture plan.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a substitute he proposes to offer in connection with this bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following substitute which I propose to offer at the proper time, namely, the export debenture plan:

Mr. JONES offers the following amendment by way of substitute: Page 1, line —, strike out the first paragraph and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to place agricultural products and provisions upon a price equality with other commodities, to stabilize prices, to advance the market for agricultural commodities, and to promote the orderly marketing of such commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and to provide for the disposition of the surplus of agricultural products and provisions so as to place producers in the United States on a more equitable basis of competition with producers of similar products exported from other countries.

" DEFINITION AND SHORT TITLE

" SEC. 2. (a) When used in this act—

" 1. The term 'person' means individual, partnership, corporation, or cooperative association.

" 2. The term 'United States' includes not only continental United States but also possessions, except the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the islands of Guam and Tutuila.

" 3. The term 'debenture' means export equalization debenture as provided for in this act.

" TITLE II. DEBENTURES

" SECTION 1. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to issue to any person exporting products hereinafter enumerated export equalization debentures in such form and denominations as he may deem desirable.

" SEC. 2. Except as hereinafter provided, debentures be issued only upon exports of wheat, wheat food products, corn, oats, rice, tobacco, products of tobacco, cottonseed, cotton, cattle, swine, and food products of cattle and swine: *Provided*, That such commodities were produced wholly in the United States and have not previously been exported therefrom.

" SEC. 3. Applications for the issuance of debentures shall be made on such forms and shall be supported by such documents as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

" SEC. 4. All debentures shall be instrumentalities of the United States Government receivable by the Treasury of the United States at par without interest from any original holder or transferee in payment of import duties on commodities imported into the United States, and shall not be otherwise receivable by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That presentation of debentures in payment of import duties must be made at ports of entry or stations thereof not later than one year from the date issued.

" SEC. 5. Debentures shall be negotiable as between any persons, whether individuals, firms, corporations, or cooperative associations, and whether domiciled in the United States or elsewhere.

" SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall be construed to place upon any cooperative association of producers vested by their charters with authority to engage in the exportation of agricultural products hereby made debenturable any special limitation restricting its power to receive and/or to apply such debentures in payment of duties on commodities imported by them under authority of said charters.

" SEC. 7. In the event that the aggregate amount of debentures issued prior to April 1 of any fiscal year shall be equal to or in excess of 50 per cent of the total amount of import duties paid in debentures or otherwise during the last preceding fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall take such steps as he deems advisable to prevent the amount of debentures issued during the entire current fiscal year from exceeding 75 per cent of the amount of import duties levied during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That any excess debentures issued beyond 75 per cent of the amount of import duties levied during any

fiscal year shall be charged against the amount of debentures issuable during the succeeding fiscal year.

" SEC. 8. Any person owning or handling commodities upon which application is filed for debentures shall be liable to a penalty of three times the amount of debentures for which application is made under this section for any false statement made in the application. Such penalty shall be collected in a civil suit brought by the Secretary of the Treasury in the name of the United States.

" TITLE III. DEBENTURABLE LIST

" SECTION 1. That on and after the day following the passage of this act, except as otherwise specially provided for in this act, there shall be issued upon all articles when exported from the United States into any foreign country the debenturable rates which are prescribed by the debenturable list of this title.

" SCHEDULE I. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS

" (a) Cattle, weighing less than 1,050 pounds each, 1½ cents per pound; weighing 1,050 pounds each or more, 2 cents per pound; fresh beef and veal, 3 cents per pound; tallow, one-half of 1 cent per pound; oleo oil and oleo stearin, 1 cent per pound.

" (b) Swine, one-half of 1 cent per pound; fresh pork, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound; bacon, hams, and shoulders, and other pork, prepared or preserved, 2 cents per pound; lard, 1 cent per pound; lard compounds and lard substitutes, 4 cents per pound.

" (c) Corn or maize, including cracked corn, 15 cents per bushel of 56 pounds; corn grits, meal, and flour, and similar products, 30 cents per 100 pounds.

" (d) Oats, hulled or unhulled, 15 cents per bushel of 32 pounds; unhulled ground oats, 45 cents per 100 pounds; oatmeal, rolled oats, oat grits, and similar oat products, 80 cents per 100 pounds.

" (e) Paddy or rough rice, 1 cent per pound; brown rice (hulls removed), 1½ cents per pound; milled rice (bran removed), 2 cents per pound; broken rice, and rice meal, flour, polish, and bran, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

" (f) Wheat, 30 cents per bushel of 60 pounds; wheat flour, semolina, crushed or cracked wheat, and similar wheat products not specially provided for, 72 cents per hundred pounds.

" (g) Cottonseed, one-third of 1 cent per pound.

" (h) Cotton and cotton waste, 2 cents per pound.

" SCHEDULE II. TOBACCO AND MANUFACTURES OF

" (a) Tobacco, manufactured or unmanufactured, 55 cents per pound; scrap tobacco, 35 cents per pound.

" SEC. 2. If, under section 315 of the tariff act of 1922 or under any other act a change in rate of duty or classification is made in respect of any article which is included within the provisions of this act, the rate thus established shall become the debenturable rate for such article.

" TITLE IV. SPECIAL PROVISIONS

" SECTION 1. That there shall be issued upon all debenturable articles exported from the United States to the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and/or Tutuila debentures at the same rates as apply upon the same articles exported to foreign countries.

" SEC. 2. Minimum issues. No issue of debentures shall be made in amounts less than \$100. Claims amounting to less than \$100 shall be permitted to accumulate until the sum due reaches that amount.

" SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry into effect the various provisions of this act.

" PART II. PENALTIES

" SECTION 1. (a) That any person (1) who knowingly forges, counterfeits, alters, or falsely makes any receipt, debenture, or other paper or document necessary to establishing claim for debenture or uses, attempts to use, possesses, obtains, accepts, or receives any receipt, debenture, or other paper or document incidental to the administration of this act, knowing it to be forged, counterfeited, altered, or falsely made, or to be used unlawfully, or to have been procured by any false claim or statement, or to have been otherwise procured by fraud or unlawfully obtained; or (2) who, except under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, or other proper officer, knowingly engraves, sells, brings into the United States, or has in his control or possession any plate in the likeness of a plate designed for the printing of any receipt, debenture, or other paper or document incidental to the administration of this act, makes any print, photograph, or impression in the likeness of any receipt, debenture, or other paper or document incidental to the administration of this act, or has in his possession a distinctive paper which has been adopted by the Secretary of the Treasury for the printing of any receipt, debenture, or other paper or document incidental to the administration of this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$10,000.

" (b) All laws relating to embezzlement, conversion, improper handling, reception, use, or disposal of moneys of the United States shall apply to debentures while in the custody of any officer, employee, or agent of the United States.

"PART III. REPEALING PROVISIONS"

"SECTION 1. All laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. If any provision of this act is declared unconstitutional or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability thereof to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 3. The Congress of the United States reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal any of the provisions of this act."

M'NARY-HAUGEN FARM RELIEF BILL

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I want to submit a unanimous-consent request. I think we all recognize that those opposed to all three of these bills ought to be given some time for discussion, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that one hour additional of general debate may be had on this measure, the time to be controlled one half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN] and the other half by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM].

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker, may I say I would not want the unanimous-consent request to stand with that statement, because I am not opposed to the bill. I am going to vote for the best farm relief bill that can be perfected by the Committee of the Whole, providing it avoids the subsidy features of the McNary-Haugen bill of last May.

Mr. TILSON. If, then, the gentleman is in favor of all of the bills, would not that offset the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN]? [Laughter.]

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman does not object to having the time, does he?

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want my statement to stand with reference to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Oklahoma. Of course, I would appreciate the time, and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I really feel I would be entitled to it, but I wanted to make this qualification with respect to his request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be extended one hour, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN] and one-half by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM]. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is not this the situation? The gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN] being opposed to all three bills, and only one bill being before the House, the McNary-Haugen bill, any speech that the gentleman makes against all three bills is against the McNary-Haugen bill, the only bill before the House. Therefore if the gentleman is given this time and an equal amount of time is not given to somebody who is a proponent of that particular bill, the effect is to extend by 30 minutes the debate against the McNary-Haugen bill without an equal amount of debate for it. It seems to me it can have no other effect.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I had assumed, since the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] said he was going to support the best bill, that the gentleman was going to support the McNary-Haugen bill. The gentleman himself says he is, and I propose that the gentleman shall have one-half of this time.

Mr. LEAVITT. The gentleman is taking the position that if that bill is the one finally adopted in the committee, the gentleman will vote for it.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Then that divides the time equally between the opponents and the proponents of the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. LEAVITT. No; the gentleman is not a proponent of this particular bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman from Michigan, as I understand, proposes to show how the McNary-Haugen bill can be still further perfected.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman may want to amend it, but still, according to the gentleman's own statement, he is for the McNary-Haugen bill, which divides the time in a perfectly equal manner between the proponents and the opponents.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I understood it was not desired to have the bill amended in any way, shape, or form. That is what the wires I get indicate.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Perhaps the gentleman is right.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will propose as a part of his request to put one-half of the additional time in charge of the gentleman

from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], the leader of the proponents of the bill, I shall not object.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I have no objection to that if it will take care of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM], but the gentleman from Michigan needs to be taken care of or we may have objection from him.

Mr. LEAVITT. I have not been able to get time and I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. HOWARD. What about me? [Laughter.]

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think I will have to object to the request made by my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], because there are many Members of this House who would like to talk on this bill who have not been able to get even one minute, and I do not see why we should extend the time one hour and give this time to some one who is absolutely opposed to any legislation, when the politicians of this House, on both sides of the aisle, have promised to the farmers of this country some legislation. Let us try to legislate just as rapidly as possible. I object.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will withhold his objection a moment, the time is to be divided between a man who is opposed to the bill and one who is for it. I myself would like to have time on the bill, but I have not been able to get it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The time is to be divided between one who is opposed to the legislation in any form and one who is in favor of it in any form. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I think that is about the situation.

Mr. MURPHY. I object, Mr. Speaker.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 16863) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand this is agreeable to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR]?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. It is my understanding it is agreeable.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is the gentleman's understanding that the gentleman from Colorado agrees to this course?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DICKINSON of Iowa, SUMMERS of Washington, MURPHY, TAYLOR of Colorado, and COLLINS.

HOUSE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled House bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 11768. An act to regulate the importation of milk and cream into the United States for the purpose of promoting the dairy industry of the United States and protecting the public health.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE A. E. B. STEPHENS

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest sorrow that I announce the death after a long and painful illness of the Hon. AMBROSE E. B. STEPHENS, a Member of this House from the second district of Ohio. At a later time I trust arrangements will be made to commemorate the most excellent and lovable qualities of the deceased and dwell upon his public services. At the present time I desire to offer the following resolutions:

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. AMBROSE E. B. STEPHENS, a Representative from the State of Ohio.

Resolved, That a committee of 17 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following committee:

THOMAS S. BUTLER, Pennsylvania; CHARLES C. KEARNS, Ohio; CHARLES J. THOMPSON, Ohio; C. ELLIS MOORE, Ohio; FRANCIS F. PATTERSON, JR., New Jersey; ROY G. FITZGERALD, Ohio; JOHN C. SPEAKS, Ohio; JAMES M. MAGEE, Pennsylvania; W. W. CHALMERS, Ohio; W. T. FITZGERALD, Ohio; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; CARL VINSON, Georgia; HERBERT J. DRANE, Florida; CHARLES A. MOONEY, Ohio; ROBERT CROSSER, Ohio; JOHN MCSWENEY, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the other resolutions. The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, February 14, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Monday, February 14, 1926, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (10.30 a. m.)

Second deficiency bill.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY (10.30 a. m.)

To amend the Federal farm loan act (H. R. 15540).

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (7.30 a. m.)

The subcommittee making a survey of the District government will consider tax collection and the system of condemnation proceedings.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

964. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of proposed legislation affecting the appropriation under the War Department for the civil government, Panama Canal, and Canal Zone, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927 (H. Doc. No. 706); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

965. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, Library of Congress, for the fiscal years 1927 and 1928 in the sum of \$40,000 (H. Doc. No. 707); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

966. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, United States Senate, for the fiscal year 1928, in the sum of \$6,000 (H. Doc. No. 708); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

967. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, \$364.30 (H. Doc. No. 709); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SCOTT: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 3896. An act to amend section 11 of the merchant marine act, 1920, and to complete the construction loan fund authorized by that section; with amendment (Rept. No. 2053). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. Res. 379. A resolution declaring H. R. 5218 a public law; with amendment (Rept. No. 2054). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KIESS: Committee on Insular Affairs. H. R. 16996. A bill to confer United States citizenship upon certain inhabitants

of the Virgin Islands and to extend the naturalization laws thereto, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2065). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FISH: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 352. A joint resolution to provide for the expenses of the participation of the United States in the work of a preparatory commission to consider questions of reduction and limitation of armaments; with amendment (Rept. No. 2066). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GASQUE: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 16920. A bill granting permission for the laying of pipes for the transmission of steam along the alley between lots Nos. 5 and 32 in square No. 225; without amendment (Rept. No. 2067). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CARPENTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5622. A bill for the relief of Mary M. Jones; with amendment (Rept. No. 2055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARPENTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5662. A bill for the relief of John J. Corcoran; without amendment (Rept. No. 2056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7852. A bill for the relief of D. George Shorten; with amendment (Rept. No. 2057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARPENTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11727. A bill for the relief of the Press Publishing Co., Marianna, Ark.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 16311. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank, Savanna, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. S. 118. An act for the relief of all owners of cargo aboard the steamship *Gaelic Prince* at the time of her collision with the U. S. S. *Antigone*; with amendment (Rept. No. 2060). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARPENTER: Committee on Claims. S. 190. An act for the relief of Samuel S. Archer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2061). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. S. 2094. An act for the relief of C. P. Dryden; without amendment (Rept. No. 2062). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. S. 3665. An act for the relief of the owner of the ferryboat *New York*; with amendment (Rept. No. 2063). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. S. 4841. An act for the relief of Samuel J. Leaphart; without amendment (Rept. No. 2064). 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. MORROW: A bill (H. R. 17109) authorizing a per capita payment to the Mescalero Apache Indians of New Mexico from their tribal funds held in trust by the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 17110) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, and adjudicate and enter judgment in any claims which the Miami Indians in Indiana have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 17111) to authorize an appropriation to rehabilitate the Picatinny Arsenal in New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 17112) authorizing an appropriation of \$300,000 for the purchase of cottonseed, kafir seed, milo maize seed, and seed grain, to be supplied to farmers in the pest and flood stricken areas of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 17113) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17114) amending an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil-service expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 17115) to regulate the height and exterior design and construction of public and private buildings in the National Capital fronting on or located within 200 feet of a public building or public park; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANKIN: Resolution (H. Res. 417) directing the Federal Trade Commission to make an inquiry into cottonseed products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, requesting continued maintenance of the American Legion hospital at Camp Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, in support of the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EVANS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, requesting the negotiations with the Dominion of Canada in furtherance of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, requesting favorable action on S. 4627, providing for the development of the Umatilla Rapids power and irrigation project on the Columbia River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging a repeal of the Federal estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, urging passage of the McNary-Haugen bill for farm relief; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KVALE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging passage of disabled emergency officers' retirement bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORNING: A bill (H. R. 17116) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Craigan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 17117) granting an increase of pension to Alice T. Cantwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 17118) granting an increase of pension to Anna Sparks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17119) to correct the military record of Joseph W. Stroud; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17120) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 17121) granting a pension to Charles Henry Mosher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 17122) granting a pension to John P. Chain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 17123) granting an increase of pension to Lou D. Kyle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 17124) granting a pension to Dwight L. Trent; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17125) granting a pension to Minnie Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 17126) for the relief of the legal heirs of Mildred Eberlein, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 17127) granting a pension to Nancy Jane Lemon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLTON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 357) authorizing the making of surveys, plans, and estimates for the irrigation of certain land in the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming under terms of the Colorado River compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) directing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the operations

and activities of those persons, firms, or corporations who purchase cottonseed for the purpose of crushing cottonseed and refining and marketing the same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6565. By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: Petition of Mrs. Salome Cerrenner, of Hoboken, N. J., and other residents of the eleventh congressional district of New Jersey, urging increased pensions for the widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6566. By Mr. AYRES: Petition of citizens of Caldwell, Kans., in behalf of legislation for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6567. By Mr. BACON: Petition of 131 citizens in opposition to House bill 10311 and protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6568. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of New York Commandery of the Naval Order of the United States, regarding the maintenance of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6569. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of Mr. A. B. Ward and 22 other residents of Lawrenceburg, Ind., against the passage of any of the compulsory Sunday observance bills, known as House bills, 10311, 10123, 7179, and 7822; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6570. Also, petition of Mr. J. W. Brookbank and 14 other residents of Lawrenceburg, Ind., against the passage of any of the compulsory Sunday observance bills, known as House bills 10311, 10123, 7179, and 7822; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6571. Also, petition of Dr. John B. Talmage and 45 other residents of Lawrenceburg, Ind., against the passage of any of the compulsory Sunday observance bills, known as House bills 10311, 10123, 7179, and 7822; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6572. By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the board of aldermen of the city of New York, favoring passage of legislation helping veterans to get loans on soldiers' bonus certificates; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6573. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition signed by 100 residents of Toledo, Ohio, urging that immediate action be taken to increase the pensions of all Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6574. By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution of the American Sons and Daughters of Sweden, urging repeal of the national-origin clause of the immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6575. By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Petition of Mrs. Earl Gilmore and other residents of Warren, Ohio, urging increase of pension for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6576. Also, petition of W. H. Welsh and other residents of Youngstown, Ohio, urging increase of pension for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6577. Also, petition of Violet Moran and other residents of Vernon Township, Trumbull County, Ohio, favoring increase of pension for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6578. By Mr. CORNING: Petition from citizens of Watervliet, N. Y., requesting passage of bill providing for increased pensions for the Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6579. Also, resolution from the Troy German Hall Association, Troy, N. Y., requesting repeal of the Reed or "national origin" clause of the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6580. By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition signed by residents of Portland, Oreg., asking that the Civil War pension bill become a law at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6581. Also, petition signed by residents of Portland, Oreg., asking that the Civil War pension bill become a law at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6582. By Mr. DEMPSEY: Petition urging passage of Civil War pension bill for relief of veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6583. By Mr. DOWELL: Petition of citizens of Mitchellville, Iowa, urging enactment of legislation increasing pensions of veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6584. By Mr. DRANE: Petition signed by Mr. George Klein and others, of Tampa, Fla., urging the passage of pension legislation for the relief of veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans at the present session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6585. Also, petition signed by Roy Martinez and others, of Tampa, Fla., urging the House of Representatives not to pass the Sunday compulsory bill (H. R. 10311); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6586. Also, petition signed by Mr. A. J. Elcott and others, of Sarasota, Fla., urging the House of Representatives not to pass the Sunday compulsory bill (H. R. 10311); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6587. Also, petition signed by Mr. H. B. Mayor and others, of St. Petersburg, Fla., urging the House of Representatives not to pass the Sunday compulsory bill (H. R. 10311); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6588. Also, petition signed by L. C. Burnap and others, of Lake County, Fla., urging the passage of pension legislation for the relief of veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans at the present session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6589. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Petition of Department of Wisconsin of the American Legion, urging immediate passage of the Fitzgerald bill (H. R. 4548) for retirement of disabled emergency Army officers of the World War; to the Committee on Rules.

6590. Also, petition of Disabled American Veterans of the World War, composed of almost 100 per cent of enlisted men, per P. J. Trahand, chairman Illinois legislative committee, asking rule for consideration of House bill 4548, for the retirement of disabled emergency Army officers of the World War, advocated by the Legislature of Illinois in a joint memorial to Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

6591. Also, petition of 18 voters of Montgomery County, Ohio, praying for the passage of a bill to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6592. Also, petition of Disabled Veterans of the World War, State Department of California, urging the passage of House bill 4548, for the retirement of disabled emergency Army officers of the World War; to the Committee on Rules.

6593. Also, petition of the Elmonte Chamber of Commerce, urging that the House demand a rule which will permit immediate consideration of House bill 4548, for the retirement of disabled emergency Army officers of the World War; to the Committee on Rules.

6594. Also, petition of the Alhambra (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, urging that a rule be given permitting an immediate vote on House bill 4548, so that unfair discrimination against these few disabled veterans may be ended; to the Committee on Rules.

6595. Also, petition of the Rosemead Chamber of Commerce, urging the granting of a rule to permit immediate vote on House bill 4548, granting retirement privileges to disabled emergency Army officers of the World War; to the Committee on Rules.

6596. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, Cambridge, Mass., protesting against enactment of McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6597. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the Farm Life Publishing Co., indorsing House bill 13446, making certain changes in existing postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6598. Also, petition of the International Longshoremen's Association, urging enactment of Senate bill 3170; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6599. Also, petition of the Broom and Whisk Makers Union, urging enactment of the Cooper bill, to afford relief from the competition of prison labor; to the Committee on Labor.

6600. Also, petition of the Beaver, Meade & Englewood Railroad Co., urging enactment of the Pittman bill (S. 4390); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6601. Also, petition from Frank Dale, Guthrie, Okla., and from E. E. Blake, Oklahoma City, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 8708, to extend the time of payment of railroad indebtedness and to reduce the interest rate on such indebtedness from 6 per cent to not less than 4¼ per cent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6602. Also, resolution of the Missouri River Navigation Association, opposing House bill 8902, commonly known as the contractors bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6603. Also, petition of the executive committee of the Department of Oklahoma, American Legion, asserting belief in adequate military preparedness, indorsing the system of Reserve

Officers' Training Corps training in colleges and schools and the civilians military training camps in summer training camps and recommending appropriations to be made by Congress sufficient to bring the Army, Navy, and Air Service to proper strength for adequate preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6604. Also, petition of Breathitt Post, No. 107, American Legion, Jackson, Ky., urging enactment of House bill 16783, to erect a Veterans' Bureau hospital in Breathitt County, Ky., to be known as the honor county memorial hospital; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6605. By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: Petition of Durham Gilliland and 88 other citizens of New Albany, Ind., urging the Congress to immediately bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill giving relief to needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6606. By Mr. GRIFFIN: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Amsterdam, N. Y., protesting against the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence Canal, which would be constructed almost wholly through foreign territory, and urging consideration of the all-American waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6607. By Mr. HICKEY: Petition of Rev. E. E. Willsey and other residents of Marshall County, Ind., urging the passage of a bill increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6608. Also, petition of Mr. E. W. Parker and other citizens of Warsaw, Ind., urging the passage of a bill increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6609. Also, petition of Mr. Joseph Scholl and other citizens of La Porte, Ind., urging the passage of a bill increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6610. Also, petition of Mr. William Blender and other citizens of Goshen, Ind., urging the passage of a bill increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6611. By Mr. HOWARD: Petition submitted by Mrs. Sarah E. Bean and 55 others of Tekamah, Burt County, Nebr., pleading for increased pension for relief to suffering veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6612. Also, petition presented by Mrs. S. H. Wiegert and 74 others, of Plainview, Pierce County, Nebr., in behalf of better legislation for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6613. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition signed by four residents of New Marshfield, Ohio, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6614. Also, petition signed by 43 residents of Meigs County, Ohio, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6615. Also, petition signed by 136 residents of Jackson County, Ohio, petitioning the House of Representatives not to pass the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6616. By Mr. KEARNS: Petition of citizens of Georgetown, Ohio, requesting passage of Civil War pension bill carrying rates proposed by the National Tribune for relief of veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6617. By Mr. KELLY: Petition of Department of Pennsylvania, American Legion, urging erection of hospital in Philadelphia; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6618. Also, petition of citizens of Tarentum, Pa., urging increased pensions for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6619. By Mr. KINDRED: Resolutions by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Amsterdam, N. Y., protesting against the United States Government entering into any arrangement for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway, which would be constructed almost wholly in foreign territory, and which in the opinion of the Chamber of Commerce of Amsterdam, N. Y., would confer no benefits to the Middle West which could not be more fully and completely realized through the all-American route; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6620. Also, resolution of Jamaica Post No. 1059, indorsing House bill 16283, known as the firing squad bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6621. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of Stevens County Council of Agriculture, urging passage of the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6622. Also, petition of Chippewa County Council of Agriculture, urging passage of the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6623. By Mr. McKEOWN: Petition of Mr. J. J. Simpson, Walter Richard, J. W. Lowther, W. H. Hilton, J. E. Henry, J. A. Perry, and many others, of Pottawatomie County, Okla., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring the Civil War pension bill to a vote; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6624. Also, petition signed by N. M. Son, H. F. Gann, J. W. Hill, Tyrresa E. Conrad, and others, all of Milburn, Okla., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring the Civil War pension bill to a vote; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6625. Also, petition of J. M. Thompson, Maggie Thompson, Lila Stafford, Alice Helms, Jim Cox, Ruth P. Cotham, and others, all of Kellyville, Okla., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring the Civil War pension bill to a vote; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6626. By Mr. McMILLAN: Petition of Charles C. Wilson, of Columbia, S. C., representing American Institute of Architects, South Carolina chapter, asking purchase by United States of land around Lafayette Square to preserve environments of the White House; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

6627. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of Mr. J. T. Pinnell, Mrs. Viola Shoemaker, T. R. Marquardt, and 45 other citizens of Pineville and Seneca, Mo., protesting passage of House bill 10311, known as the Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6628. By Mr. MILLIGAN: Petition signed by citizens of Worth County, Mo., urging the consideration of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6629. By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: Petition signed by 88 voters of Barren County, Ky., urging immediate passage of the Elliott pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6630. By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: Petition of citizens of Arlington, Va., requesting Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6631. By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: Petition signed by Guy Long and others, in behalf of the Civil War pension increase bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6632. By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition signed by M. J. Rawson and others, of Madison, Wis., praying the passage of remedial legislation for veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6633. Also, petition signed by William M. Woodman and others, of Cazenovia, Wis., praying the passage of remedial legislation for veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6634. Also, petition signed by Mr. Fred Turner and others, of Richland Center, Wis., praying the passage of remedial legislation for veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6635. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Resolution by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, requesting Congress to pass Senate bill 3027 or its companion bill in the House, House bill 4548, or some other measure designed to give relief to disabled emergency officers as provided in said bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6636. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Veterans' Association of Federal Employees, navy yard, Brooklyn, N. Y., that the navy yard should be supplied with work enough to maintain its pre-war force of skilled artisans; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

6637. Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Amsterdam, N. Y., protesting against the United States Government entering into any arrangement for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6638. Also, petition of American Cotton Shippers Association, Memphis, Tenn., opposing the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill (H. R. 15474); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6639. Also, petition of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, opposing the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6640. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition from the citizens of Waterloo, Black Hawk County, Iowa, for the enactment of Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6641. By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Petition of Lou Eads and others, of Gibson County, Ind., that the bill increasing Civil War widows' pensions be enacted into law at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6642. By Mr. RUBY: Petition of the citizens of the sixteenth congressional district of Missouri, urging additional legislation for the relief of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6643. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Petition by sundry citizens of Smith County, Tex., in favor of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6644. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of certain citizens of Baker, Oreg., in favor of further increase in pension for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6645. By Mr. SWANK: Petition of the executive committee of the Department of Oklahoma, American Legion, indorsing adequate military preparedness and the present system of Reserve Officers' Training Corps, training in colleges and schools, and the citizens' military training camps; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6646. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition from the citizens of Leadville, Colo., urging legislation for further relief of the soldiers and widows of soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6647. Also, petition from the citizens of Montezuma County, Colo., urging legislation for further relief of soldiers and widows of soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6648. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of 51 citizens of Leipsic, Ohio, urging more liberal pension legislation for the veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6649. Also, petition of 110 citizens of Van Wert, Ohio, urging more liberal pension legislation for the veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6650. By Mr. TILLMAN: Petition of Mrs. Ett Eads and many other residents in the third district of Arkansas, praying for more liberal pensions for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6651. By Mr. TOLLEY: Petition of 10 citizens of Johnson City, N. Y., for liberalization of the Civil War pension laws; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6652. Also, petition of 47 citizens of Broome County, N. Y., to liberalize the Civil War pension laws; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6653. By Mr. WEFALD: Petition of Mr. R. A. Gletne and 42 residents of Moorhead, Minn., urging passage of a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6654. Also, petition of Mrs. Eliza C. Davis and 37 residents of Richville, Minn., urging passage of a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6655. By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: Petitions of John Maddy et al., of Stockton, Kans., and vicinity; S. G. Fish et al., of Wallace County, Kans.; Esther Schwietzer et al., of Osborne, Kans.; Mrs. Jennie Copeland et al., of Goodland, Kans.; and Joe P. Kinderkneets et al., of Ellis, Kans., for the relief of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6656. Also, petitions of J. D. Zumwalt et al., citizens of Downs, Kans.; Bernice Elkinton et al., of Prairie View, Kans.; Tom Chapman et al., of Ellis, Kans.; Mrs. Anna Williams et al., of Downs, Kans.; Mr. A. Beardsley et al., of Oberlin, Kans.; Mr. E. I. Randall et al., of Oberlin, Kans.; Mrs. Rebecca Pierce et al., of Hill City, Kans.; D. Pershing et al., of Ogallah, Kans.; Anna Myers et al., of Beloit, Kans.; and J. A. Poppen et al., of Ionia, Kans., for the relief of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6657. By Mr. WILLIAMSON: Petition of A. D. Reader, Mrs. M. Barrett, and J. A. Kelly and sundry other persons of Perkins County, S. Dak., asking for an increase of pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans without reference to time of marriage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6658. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of citizens of Hancock, Md., urging immediate action and support of Civil War pension bill granting relief to needy veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

MONDAY, February 14, 1927

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our heavenly Father, we rejoice in the privilege of calling Thee Father. We would understand Thy ways better and be guided by Thy principles in all the pathway of duty. Be very near unto us this day. Clear our vision in every prospect of responsibility, and so guide us that when the day is done we may be able to ask Thine acceptance. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.