Congress Is Once More up Before Itself

By HAROLD W. ROLAND

OF THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT STAFF

WHAT are we going to do with the House of Representatives? Or, as it might be phrased, what is the House of Representatives going to do with the House of Representatives?

The foregoing is intended neither as a joke nor a riddle, although there are some who claim, assert, and maintain that the best thing the House (and the Senate) could do would be to abolish itself. In fact, there are a number of such gentlemen who, having asserted such beliefs too vociferously, are now at Ellis Island, guests of the United States Government, about to be transported to that portion of the world where the people are permitted to struggle (struggle is used advisedly) without the help, or the handicap, according to the viewpoint, of such institutions as a House of Representatives and a Senate.

Nevertheless, the question of what the House of Representatives is going to do with the House of Representatives is a serious question and one to which an answer shortly must be found. Let it be stated that the question is not a new one. It is one that has recurred with the regularity of each decade of history of the American nation. It has to do solely with the growth of the United States. If the United States refused each decade to account for many more millions of persons within its borders than were present when the roll was called the preceding decade, there would be no such problem to deal with, the House of Representatives would be happy, and would continue to function along the same grooves in which precedent has decreed it shall function.

But the United States is like Topsy. It just grows, and grows, and grows, and now it has grown so great, and has so many millions of persons who claim it as their own, that the House of Representatives must again decide what it is to do with itself. And this time the problem is very, very real.

You probably don't know—quite likely you have never given the matter a moment's thought, and there's no reason why you should—that as present constituted, there are not enough seats on the House floor to seat all four hundred and thirty-five members of the House of Representatives. There are not enough by twenty, but the members of the House usually take care of that situation very nicely, except on the occasion of a visit of a distinguished personage such as the King of the Belgians or the Prince of Wales, in which case chairs to seat the full membership are brought in that none may be slighted.

The present seating capacity of the House chamber being some four hundred and fifteen, and the present membership of the House being four hundred and thirty-five, it would seem quite impossible arithmetically to care for a greatly-increased membership without building a new chamber, remodelling the old extensively, or cutting down the air space for each member considerably. However, if positive action is not taken during the session of the present Congress, looking toward the stabilizing numerically of the membership of the House, one of the three measures already outlined must go into effect.

The Bureau of Census within a few weeks will begin to count noses. It has been ten years since the official population of the United States was counted, and it is estimated that since the last registration the country has added at least sixteen million persons, and probably twenty-five to twenty-seven millions. In 1910 there were 91,972,266 persons within the borders of the United States of America, and it is held that this census will reveal between one hundred and seven million and one hundred and eighteen million men, women and children who live under the protection of the American flag; wherein rests the necessity of the House of Representatives making a decision of what to do with itself.

The problem is one that has come up every ten years since 1790, when the first federal census was undertaken. This time, however, it is recognized, at least by some members, that steps should be taken to prevent the House membership, already declared unwieldy and cumbersome, from becoming more unwieldy and more cumbersome. Indeed, it is held by a few far-seeing members that should the House membership be increased, the number necessitated by what the coming census will reveal, its functioning will slow so considerably as to make it difficult to legislate. And there are some who hold that even now the membership is too large to legislate properly.

On only one occasion since 1790 has the House mustered up sufficient courage to cut its numbers, and that was in 1830 when the membership was reduced from 242 to 232. In 1790 there were 106 Representatives and the average district had 37,069 persons. In 1910 the reapportionment gave the House a membership of 435 with an average population of 211,430. If the estimates are correct, thirty-three states in 1920 will show an increased population sufficient to warrant increased representation in the House of Representatives. The increase, it is held, will result in a membership of five hundred and four. The men of the House who are responsible for the bulk of the legislation that is carried through, the men on whom the responsibility is thrust, are without doubt in favor of a smaller membership.

The fifteen states that have shown no increase in population will fight desperately against having the per capita reduced.

That the added cost to the country in salaries, clerk hire, and all the other extras will run into many millions of dollars yearly is not likely to be considered by those who maintain their office by keeping the "home folks" in good humor.

Elihu Root, formerly Secretary of State, and once member of the United States Senate, is responsible for the statement that the larger a deliberative body the more acute is that struggle which is going on in every popular government and in every branch of every representative system between efficiency and individual liberty. It is held, too, by many members of the House that a large membership affords a far greater opportunity to make possible domination of machine politics, with a corresponding advancement of local interests and "pork barrel" legislation. Those who would cut down the membership hold that with a smaller membership the House would work in the interest of the nation, rather than in the interest of the particular district each man represents.

It is admitted by many in the House, in private conversation, that the House has become too big. But none is willing, or rather, few are willing, to take the chance of sacrificing themselves. And so, if the ratio of the last census, 211,430 persons to be accorded a Representative in the Lower House of Congress, is followed out in 1920, and if the lowest estimate of the increase in population of the country is used as a basis, sixty-nine members will be admitted to the House of Representatives from new districts in 1922. Here are the states, and the estimates:

New York	8	Pennsylvania	6	California	4
Washington	3	Alabama	2	Arkansas	2
Illinois	3	Georgia	2	Massachusetts	2
Michigan	2	Mississippi	2	New Jersey	3
N. Carolina	2	Ohio	3	Oklahoma	4
Texas	4	Oregon	1	Colorado	1
Connecticut	1	Florida	1	Indiana	1
Kansas	1	Louisiana	1	Maryland	1
Minnesota	1	New Mexico	1	North Dakota	1
S. Carolina	1	South Dakota	1	Tennessee	1
Virginia	1	West Virginia	1	Wisconsin	1

The Land That Never Went to Sleep

By J. W. CHAMBERLAIN

IT HAS been said that Norway never went to sleep. There is plenty of evidence of this in the manner in which the forests are being properly conserved at the same time that the lumber industry is being expanded. Another big thing which has made it possible for Norway to start out on a new and more prosperous career than ever before is the sensible manner in which factories are built there. If there is a good site for a factory away off in some desolate country corner—if the railroad is near, or water transportation facilities handy, the factory is built. Generally this is on a waterpower site. Sufficient wooden houses to shelter the employes go up around this factory and the result never fails to spell increased prosperity.

More work is offered the people of that vicinity and there is an increased market for foodstuffs. The employes live better and healthier and happier lives than they would if crowded into a city. Cities are few and far between in Norway. There are only four with a population of 30,000 or more. These are Stavanger, Trondhjem, Bergen and Christiania. More than seventy per cent of the people of Norway live outside of any town or city.

In a ten-acre clearing in the midst of a great fir forest on the banks of a big mountain stream workmen were putting the finishing touches to a large factory building. The first story was made from the natural rock, the next two were of great spruce beams. It seemed such an out-of-the-way place for a factory. Two rows of little cottages were going up, about a quarter of a mile distant.

"It does seem absurd to strangers that we build factories here in such out-of-the-way places," said the owner.

He had served years in the Michigan lumber camps and spoke excellent English, "but when you understand conditions, it is plain enough. We are going to make spools, match boxes and other small woodenware here. We make this from the refuse. We float the lumber down this stream. The same stream furnishes us with factory power. We saw out the lumber and raft it down the few miles to the fjord where schooners take it aboard, not only for our own ports, but for ports all over the world.

"The waste wood is utilized in many ways to a big profit. Why should we build our factory in a town or city far away from the source of supply of material? The people prefer to come here and work. Their little families are contented. They put up a school, they have their little gardens, cows, and hens and I don't believe there is a more contented people anywhere else in the world than in such little factory settlements. I never saw them in your country." Norway's fishing industries form a part of her wide-awake career, despite the fact that fishing has been allowed in this country from the beginning of its existence. The reason for this lies in the fact that Norway has so strictly modernized her fishing methods that she has forged way ahead of other fishing countries in the last decade.

The cod fisheries located off a large share of her twelve thousand miles of coast line are among the greatest in the world. Her salmon fisheries have recently been developed and her sardine output is the largest in the world.

The little sardine has done much for Norway. It was a Norwegian who invented the clever key-opening sardine can. There are at present more than two hundred brands of sardines tinned in Norway. And her sardine industries continue to grow. It was from Norway that we got the first smoked sardines. For years all we knew of sardines was the sort put up in oil. Now we get them put up in ketchup, mustard, spiced brine and many other ways, all devised in Norway.

Every year sees more factories going up along the rugged coast of that country. These are canning factories and everything edible from the sea is put up there; cod, salmon, sardines, herring, even mussels, "the poor man's oyster," are now being put up in handy tins, and this brought on the necessity of can-making factories.

Today there are many factories, and more being built, which turn out all sorts of tins, printed in all sorts of languages. These got to the canneries. In several places along the shore where farming sections are at hand, Norwegian captains of industry have made arrangements not only for putting up fish in tins, but also for putting up fruit and vegetables brought in from the surrounding country.

So up-to-the-minute is Norway in building up a newer and bigger and better career that she is utilizing everything and even remodeling the fishing business. Her steam trawls are the best in the world today and her sale of tinned fish alone amounted to more than $84,000,000 during the year ending June 30, 1914.

The fact that tourists are beginning to appreciate this country has helped her in her new career. It is true that she has no Alps, although she has some mammoth and lofty mountains. It is equally true that Switzerland has no fjords. One of the great charms about Norway is the fjords. The green mountains with their abrupt headland and steep shaggy sides, clothed in giant evergreens, come fairly tumbling down into the sea. They do not slope gently, but tower over the waters, giving the coast some of the most rugged and attractive landscape in the world.

And the sea, with equal boldness, dashes away inland between these mountains. There are winding ways, curving bays, and inland coves, all classed as "fjords," which are so largely responsible for the attractiveness of the coast. And Norway can boast more seacoast than almost any other country in the world of the same area. The outside measurements are only 1,700 miles, but follow in every bay and nook and cover, every fjord, and the distance becomes twelve thousand miles!

Quaint little Norwegian towns are built here and there along the rugged coast amid surroundings quite equal for rugged beauty to any in any other country. There's room enough along those twelve thousand miles of charming seacoast for all the tourists in the world. Every year sees more hotels going up on selected sites along the coast. Some are tucked away down at the apex of deep fjords where all is quiet and sheltered. Others are built high up on towering bluffs where breezes always blow and where the view is of itself a tonic good for the jaded tourist.

That seems to be one of the secrets of Norway's new career—contentment and love of country. And they are now placing all their confidence in the revival of the tourist trade. Already there are more than 900 modern creameries built in Norway and the number is increasing.

Norwegians claim that they have no aristocracy there. Outside the royal family the number of titled people is exceedingly small. "We are *all* of the aristocracy," an old schoolmaster said, proudly, "ours is the land of Ibsen, Bjornson, Ole Bull, Edvard Grieg, Jonas Lie, Fritz Thaulow, and Nansen. And there, too, is Colin Archer, the shipbuilder who taught naval architects all there is to know about waves lines."

Norway *is* a wild country; there's no getting away from it. Fifty-nine and two-tenths per cent of the entire area is barren mountain country; twenty-one per cent of the entire area is thickly timbered with forests of the best quality which of itself spells riches for years to come. Seven and a half per cent is taken up with lakes and swamps and only three per cent of all Norway is under cultivation!

Consequently, Norway, the wide-awake, has a new career ahead of her. She has plenty of land for every one, she has plenty of resources on land for industries and plenty of coast for extending her fisheries.