

Mr. COLTON. This bill simply restores section 3 of the original highway act, which was inadvertently repealed by the act of June 24, 1930. Unless this bill passes it will hold up projects amounting to more than a million dollars. At the time the act of June 24, 1930, was passed it was intended to apply to the public domain and Indian lands as additional authorization only. It was not intended at all to repeal section 3 of the highway act.

It was not discovered at the time that the bill passed both Houses, and a great hardship will be worked in Western States if this bill is not allowed to become a law at this time.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I realize the gentleman's explanation, but at the same time it offers me no explanation for the situation that Members of this House are in who want a hearing on a bill to amend the Federal highway act and make a fair adjustment between the Government and States. The failure to get that hearing will work just as much of a hardship on many States as not to have this bill passed. The bill I refer to is recommended by the highway commissions throughout the country, and has already passed the Senate. Yet we can not get a hearing on that bill before a committee of the House designated as the Roads Committee, because of the autocratic action of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TREADWAY. Out of courtesy to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON] I shall not object.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal highway act approved November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. L. 212), as amended or supplemented, be further amended by inserting after section 3 a new section, to be numbered 3a, and to read as follows:

"Sec. 3a. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the State highway departments and with the Department of the Interior in the construction of public highways within Indian reservations, and to pay the amount assumed therefor from the funds allotted or apportioned under this act to the State wherein the reservation is located."

Sec. 2. All acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect on its passage.

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

REGULATION OF WAGES PAID ON GOVERNMENT BUILDING CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 16619, relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BOYLAN. I hope the gentleman will reserve his objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Very well, I reserve my objection, if the House wants to hear from the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOYLAN. I reserve it, so that the House might hear from the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BLANTON. It interferes with the contractual relations of the people here in Washington, and it ought not to pass.

Mr. BOYLAN. It does not, and the gentleman misunderstands the bill. He has not read the bill. It applies only to future contracts.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TUSAYAN NATIONAL FOREST, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 15986, to amend the act of May 23, 1930 (46 Stat. 378).

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the report does not comply with the rule, in that it does not show by a comparison in print what change is contemplated in the law to be amended.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. It simply adds to the language of the bill passed last spring. It does not strike out any language. It simply adds territory.

Mr. COLTON. This matter was not overlooked. We did not know how to comply any more fully with the Ramseyer

rule. There is no amendment to the existing statute. It simply adds to the law already in existence.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I shall not press my point of order, but I should think the way to do it would be to reprint the existing law in the regular print, and then the new sections could be added in italics. I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute S. 5557, a similar Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of May 23, 1930 (46 Stat. 378), entitled "An act to eliminate certain lands from the Tusayan National Forest, Ariz., as an addition to the Western Navajo Indian Reservation," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to include the following-described lands subject to all the conditions and provisions of said act: Sections 10 to 15, inclusive, sections 22 to 27, inclusive, sections 34 to 36 inclusive, township 27 north, range 6 east, all of township 27 north, range 7 east; sections 4 to 9, 16 to 21, 29 to 32, all inclusive, in township 27 north, range 8 east; sections 1 and 2, the east half of section 3, the east half of section 10, sections 11 and 12, township 26 north, range 7 east; sections 5 to 8, inclusive, township 26 north, range 8 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, Ariz.

Sec. 2. That for the purpose of arriving at the values and areas of lieu lands to which private landowners are entitled under the act of May 23, 1930, as hereby amended, the value of the improvements on all privately owned lands to be conveyed or relinquished to the United States for the benefit of the Indians shall be taken into consideration and full credit in the form of lands shall be allowed therefor: *Provided*, That the State of Arizona may relinquish such lands as it sees fit, acquired pursuant to the enabling act of June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. L. 557), which may be desired as lieu land, and the State shall have the right to select other unreserved and undisposed of nonmineral public lands within the State of Arizona equal in area to that relinquished, the lieu selections to be made by the State in the same manner as is provided for in said enabling act.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 15986) was laid on the table.

NANCY HART

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14205, to amend the act entitled "An act for the erection of a tablet or marker to be placed at some suitable point between Hartwell, Ga., and Alford's Bridge in the county of Hart, State of Georgia, on the national highway between the States of Georgia and South Carolina, to commemorate the memory of Nancy Hart."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This bill has had extended consideration by this House on various occasions. I recall when the original measure was under consideration that it was a bill to authorize an appropriation which was in part to be matched by the Daughters of the American Revolution down in Georgia. This bill proposes to amend that law so as to eliminate any local cooperation as to the erection of the monument. There was another important feature of the original bill, which is the existing law, which we are now asked to repeal, and that was the very eloquent and voluminous tribute paid to this lady of Georgia, of the Revolutionary period, Nancy Hart, giving the reason for the erection of the monument.

The report stated that—

During the American Revolution when a party of British Tories came to her home, which was located on what was then known as Fish Dam Ford or Broad River, single handed and alone she captured these Tories, killing one, wounding another, and the others surrendering, and that all of the living ones were thereafter hanged by Nancy Hart and a few of her neighbors.

I feel that it is a little unfair that the neighbors are not honored by at least a mention of their names on the monument. I am wondering, however, whether the purpose of eliminating this language is because of some more compelling reason for this monument or because historical research has developed the fact that she did not hang all or any part of them. However, the House has been very kind to me, and I shall not object.

Cong. Record, 71st Cong., 3d sess.,
Feb. 16, 1931, vol. 74, pt. 5: 5064