

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 10920) for the relief of William Chinsky; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10921) granting a pension to Frank McCoy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10922) granting a pension to Polly Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10923) granting an increase of pension to James B. King; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4612. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of John McCartney and other residents of Mayville, Mich., protesting against the passage of any of the so-called Sunday observance bills for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4613. Also, petition of George Newberry and other residents of Mayville, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 9753 or any other similar bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4614. Also, resolution of the Volunteer Welfare Association, of Marine City, Mich., supporting the purchase by Henry Ford of the Muscle Shoals project; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4615. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolution passed by the State executive committee of the American Legion, Department of New York, urging the passage of the American Legion fivefold optional plan of adjusted compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4616. By Mr. DYER: Resolution adopted at a regular meeting of Local No. 106 of the Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada, favoring the passage of the Hill bill (H. R. 9691); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4617. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Simmons College, of Boston, Mass., opposing pending legislation to impose duty on the importation of foreign books; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4618. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of H. B. Wimmer and 22 other citizens of Douglas County, Mo., protesting against the passage of the following pending legislation: House bills 4388 and 9753 and Senate bill 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4619. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the National Cloak & Suit Co., of New York City, N. Y., urging the reduction of taxes and opposing the bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4620. Also, petition of the Williams Printing Co., of New York City, N. Y., opposing the enactment of a bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4621. Also, petition of James Thompson, of Tulsa, Okla., urging the enactment of legislation for the relief of ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4622. By Mr. LINEBERGER: Petition of William A. Frye, of Long Beach, Calif., and several hundred others, urging that the Towner-Sterling bill be reported out of committee and enacted at an early date; to the Committee on Education.

4623. Also, petition from citizens of Los Angeles County and the Ministerial Union of Los Angeles, numbering 16 signed pages, requesting the President of the United States to extend whatever protection and help may be necessary to make Armenia a self-supporting and self-protecting nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4624. By Mr. MALONEY: Resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Lawrence, Mass., indorsing the legislation for ex-service men and urging its immediate passage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4625. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Federal Employees' Union No. 4, of New York City, urging the adoption of Senator Lodge's amendment to the second deficiency bill, relative to reimbursement of the members of the staffs of the Immigration Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4626. By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of the National Society United States Daughters of 1812, for the preservation of old Fort McHenry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4627. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of Melvin Torpen and 12 others, of Scranton, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4628. Also, petition of William F. Anhalt and 33 others, of Westby, Mont., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4629. Also, petitions of R. H. Randall and 11 others, of Fortuna, N. Dak., and C. B. Olson and 16 others of Marmon,

N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4630. Also, petition of F. H. Schroeder and 21 others, of Baldwin, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4631. Also, petition of J. F. Vavra and 65 others, of Stanton, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4632. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of R. M. Foster, of Racine, Beaver County, Pa., with reference to the bill providing for a bureau of civil aeronautics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4633. Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Beaver Falls, Pa., relating to the question of the elimination of tax-exempt securities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4634. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution adopted at a regular meeting of the South Boston Citizens' Association, urging the immediate passage of the fivefold plan of readjustment for World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 16, 1922.

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

Our great and gracious God, we come this morning appalled by Thy greatness but wooed by Thy graciousness. We are assured that whatever need may be pressing upon us, Thou art willing to supply our needs and out of the fullness of Thine heart to meet every necessity of life in all its plans and purposes. Grant that our land may become more and more eminent as the land whose God is the Lord. We ask everything in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, March 9, 1922, when, on request of Mr. JONES of Washington and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9981) making appropriations for the Executive and for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes, receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 19, and 36, insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21, 28, 29, 31, and 35, and agreed to the further conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Woon of Indiana, Mr. WASON, and Mr. HARRISON were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9606) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for payment of charges due on reclamation projects, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. KINKAID, Mr. SINNOTT, and Mr. HAYDEN were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KELLOGG. I present the memorial of Harold L. Wood and sundry other citizens of St. Louis County, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia. I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION TO CONGRESS.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

Believing (1) in the separation of church and state; (2) that Congress is prohibited by the first amendment to the Constitution from enacting any law enforcing the observance of any religious institution, or looking toward a union of church and state, or of religion and civil government;

(3) That any such legislation is opposed to the best interests of both church and state; and

(4) That the first step in this direction is a dangerous step and should be opposed by every lover of liberty;

We, the undersigned, adult residents of St. Louis County, State of Minnesota, earnestly petition your honorable body not to pass the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 1948), which aims to regulate Sunday observance by civil force under penalty for the District of Columbia.

Mr. MYERS presented the petitions of Janet Richards, Mrs. Court F. Wood, and sundry members of the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, all in the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia or the Territorial or insular possessions of the United States, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a resolution adopted by the Calumet (Mich.) Women's Club, favoring the prompt completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River project for ocean-going vessels, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions of the Frederick Douglass Equal Rights League, of Independence, and sundry colored teachers of the Kansas Industrial and Educational Institute, of Topeka, in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called Dyer antilynching bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Bigelow and Perry, Ark., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Fordney tariff bill on the ground that it would disturb business, delay the return of normalcy, and increase the cost of living, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Frank Fried Post, No. 18, American Legion, of Mena, Ark., favoring the passage of the so-called fivefold adjusted compensation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted by the board of aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass., favoring the passage of the so-called soldiers' bonus bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from employees of the Dennison Manufacturing Co., of Framingham, Mass., praying for the passage of the so-called soldiers' bonus bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Prospect Congregational Church, of Cambridge, the Congregational Church of Southampton, and the First Church, Old South, of Worcester, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the prompt ratification of the treaties prepared by the Conference on Limitation of Armament, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions and communications in the nature of petitions of the Kiwanis Club of Worcester; 180 members of the Trinity Church Men's Union, of Worcester; the Whitinsville Congregational Club, of Whitinsville; the congregations of the First Baptist Church of Framingham; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Middleboro; of the Williamsburg Congregational Church, of Williamsburg; of the First Congregational Church of Nantucket; and of the Old Cambridge Baptist Church, of Cambridge, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the prompt ratification of the treaties prepared by the Conference on Limitation of Armament, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions of the John Boyle O'Reilly Literary Club, of Springfield; the Wolf Tone Club, of Taunton; the Robert Emmett Literary Association, of Fall River; Division No. 11, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Holyoke; and Padriac H. Pearse Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, of Fall River, all in the State of Massachusetts, protesting against the ratification of the so-called four-power treaty, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PEPPER presented a resolution unanimously adopted by the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Teachers' Association, favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 31, proposing an amendment to the Federal Constitution authorizing uniform marriage and divorce laws, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution of the council of the city of Sharon, Pa., protesting against the construction of the proposed Lake Erie and Ohio ship canal, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition, numerously signed, of employees of the Narrow Fabric Co., of Reading, Pa., praying for the prompt passage of an adequate protective tariff law with ad valorem duties assessed on American valuations, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Board of Trade, remonstrating against the passage of House joint resolution 262, relative to the canalization of the St. Lawrence River, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LADD presented the petitions of R. I. Emerson and 16 others, of Drady and vicinity; Billie H. Evasdenk and 81 others, of Kief and vicinity; and George Rose and 28 others, of Ellendale and vicinity, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation reviving the Government Grain Corporation so as to stabilize prices of certain farm products, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the memorial of William R. Thompson and 14 others of Carpio and vicinity, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WILLIS presented a resolution adopted at the regular annual stockholders' meeting of the Minster Farmers' Exchange Co., of Minster, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation permitting the manufacture and sale of light wines and beers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of H. H. Squire and sundry other citizens of Sandusky, Ohio, praying for the prompt passage of an adequate tariff law based upon American valuations, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions and communications in the nature of petitions of the Kiwanis Clubs of Dover and Columbus, the congregations of the Friends Church of Leesburg, the Chapel of the Holy Spirit (Episcopal Church), of Columbus, and the First Presbyterian Church, of Forest, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the prompt ratification of the treaties prepared by the Conference on Limitation of Armament, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the pastor and members of the Patterson Memorial Presbyterian Church, of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the prompt ratification of the treaties prepared by the Conference on Limitation of Armament, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MCLEAN presented a resolution adopted by Somers Grange No. 105, Patrons of Husbandry, of Somers, Conn., protesting against threatened strikes in the coal and transportation industries as endangering the vital interests of the country at large, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of members of the New Haven (Conn.) Trade Council, praying for the passage of House bill 10034, the so-called Fitzgerald accident compensation bill; House bill 9691, for the creation of Federal local option districts; and acceptance of the proposal of Henry Ford relative to the Muscle Shoals project, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a resolution adopted at a community meeting of the America Union, of Dutchess County, N. Y., favoring the ratification of the treaties prepared by the Conference on Limitation of Armament, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of New Haven Council, No. 259, Catholic Women's Benevolent Legion, of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the so-called four-power treaty, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Up-Town Social Club, of Meriden, Conn., favoring the repeal of the so-called Volstead law and the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of members of the Greek-American Chamber of Commerce, of New London, Conn., praying for the recognition of King Constantine, of Greece, by the Government of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of members of the Rotary Club, of Meriden, Conn., remonstrating against the proposed removal of the submarine base at New London, Conn., which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of members of Charles B. Bowen Camp, No. 2, of Meriden; Lieut. N. W. Bishop Camp, No. 3, of Bridgeport; and Clarence G. Davenport Auxiliary, No. 1, of Waterbury, all of the United Spanish War Veterans, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of the so-called Knutson bill, providing pensions for widows of Spanish War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Arthur J. Petrie, commander of Post No. 39, American Legion, of Westville, Conn., praying for the passage of the so-called soldiers' bonus bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented communications in the nature of petitions of Frank C. Porter, of the divinity school of Yale University, of New Haven; members of the Eunice Dennie Burr Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Fairfield; and the

congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Greenwich, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the prompt ratification of the treaties prepared by the Conference on Limitation of Armament, which were ordered to lie on the table.

POST-OFFICE SITE AT MADISON, WIS.

Mr. FERNALD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9604) for the acquisition of a post-office site at Madison, Wis., reported it without amendment.

PUBLIC PARK LANDS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON.

Mr. POINDEXTER. From the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 9235) providing for a grant of land to the State of Washington for public park purposes, and I submit a report (No. 562) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill. I think it can be disposed of in a moment.

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 title and fee to all of the land comprising the military reservation situated on Fidalgo Island, in Skagit County, State of Washington, in township 34 north, range 1 east of the Willamette meridian, north of the entrance to Deception Pass, including the two islands in the pass, containing about 550 acres, and to the land comprising the military reservation situated on the northern end of Whidby Island, in Island County, State of Washington, in township 34 north, range 1 east of the Willamette meridian, south of the entrance to Deception Pass, containing about 630 acres, and to the land comprising the military reservation situated on Whidby Island (north point of) in township 34 north, ranges 1 and 2 east of the Willamette meridian, containing about 606 acres, and to the land comprising the military reservation situated east of Deception Pass in said township 34 north, range 2 east of the Willamette meridian, consisting of Hope Island and Skagit Island, containing about 200 acres, be, and the same are hereby granted, subject to the conditions and reversions hereinafter provided for, to the State of Washington for public park purposes, subject, however, to the right of the United States to at any and all times and in any manner assume control of, hold, use, and occupy without license, consent, or leave from said State any or all of said lands for any and all military, naval, or lighthouse purposes, free from any conveyances, charges, encumbrances, or liens made, created, permitted, or sanctioned thereon by said State: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be or become liable for any damages or compensation whatever to the said State of Washington for any future use by the Government of any or all of the above-described land for any of the above-mentioned purposes: *Provided further*, That if said lands shall not be used for the purposes herein above mentioned the same or such parts thereof not so used shall revert to the United States.

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. LADD:

A bill (S. 3290) to define commerce and to establish when an article or commodity is in interstate commerce and when subject to the laws of a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 3291) for the relief of Henry Cordes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 3292) granting a pension to Isaac Dobbins (with the accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3293) granting a pension to Arthur Gross (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 3294) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to condemn certain land; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRANCE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 179) authorizing the President to appoint a commission to visit the Republic of Liberia on a mission of friendship, amity, and mutual helpfulness; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

TARIFF POLICY FOR THE SOUTH.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have here an editorial from the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram on the subject of the proper tariff policy toward the South. I think it will be of great interest, and I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.]

IN THE INTEREST OF THE SOUTH.

Whether the estimate made by Col. Ike T. Pryor that \$1,000,000,000 a year will be added to the value of southern products if Congress accepts the schedules of the Southern Tariff Congress and incorporates them in the tariff bill is regarded as high or not, certainly every effort should be made to have fair recognition given to the products of the South in the bill.

Col. Pryor, who is chairman of the schedule committee of the Southern Tariff Congress, which meets in Fort Worth on March 15, outlines the schedules to be asked, as follows:

"We have indorsed the schedules filed by the western tariff bloc with the Senate Finance Committee, which call for a rate of 3½ cents per pound on beef, 2½ cents per pound on mutton, 4 cents on lambs, three-fourths cent on hogs, and 15 cents on unwashed wool.

"We have taken exception to the bloc rate on hides, which is 2 cents green and 6 cents dried. We regard 4 cents per pound on green hides the minimum rate that should be given. Other leading Texas products shown on the bloc schedules are vegetable oils, 4 cents per pound; eggs, 8 cents per dozen; and poultry, 6 cents per pound.

"Important southern items not included in the western tariff bloc and on which tariff duties have been requested by the tariff association are peanuts, pecans, sugar, graphite, manganese, and petroleum, and rates will be fixed Wednesday by the Southern Tariff Congress on these articles."

The greatest obstacle which stands in the way of obtaining proper recognition for southern products is the attitude of most of the Democratic Congressmen and Senators on this matter.

Instead of insisting that any tariff bill passed shall levy duties equitably, without discriminating between sections and industries on political lines but in accordance with the principle of not favoring one class or section at the expense of another, they are assuming an attitude of opposition to the entire tariff program and apparently are willing to have the Republicans pass a measure favoring special industries and sections at the expense of the South in order to make political capital of it later.

The present Congress is going to pass a tariff bill. That can be taken for granted. Democratic opposition can not prevent that. The position of the Southern Tariff Congress is simply that the products of this section of the country, most of which are of the farm and ranch, shall be given equitable protection in keeping with that given the products of other sections.

It is good Democratic doctrine that any tariff levied, no matter what its rates or its purposes, shall be equitably adjusted to the whole country and to all classes in the matter of schedules.

It is good Democratic doctrine that if tariff is levied, no matter what its rates or its purposes, shall be equitably adjusted to the whole country and to all classes in the matter of schedules.

It is good Democratic doctrine that if there is to be a tariff on manufactured articles there should also be a tariff on raw materials.

* * * * *

The Southern Tariff Congress represents a great body of producers in the South. We take it that the schedules which it will work out will be based upon a knowledge of conditions and in relation to schedules on the products of other sections and other industries. The delegates to the congress will be men thoroughly capable of working out such schedules and who have a full knowledge of the facts and conditions involved. For this reason we believe they should receive the cooperation of Congressmen and Senators from the South, especially from Texas.

The Southern Tariff Congress is not a political body. It is a business body, and it proposes to have a tariff law based upon principles of equity and justice and not upon mere partisan considerations. It is working for the economic interests of this entire section of the country and is seeking to prevent discrimination of a kind which will injure the producers of this section. It should receive the support of all intelligent citizens of this section irrespective of party affiliation.

SPECULATIVE TRADING IN COTTON.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask permission to place in the RECORD a statement with reference to the investigation of the American Cotton Exchange in New York showing that the great cotton exchanges are simply bucket shops and an injury to the farmers and that the southern cotton speculators are at the mercy of the New York brokers.

For many years the New York Cotton Exchange has been used principally to gamble in cotton futures instead of a place to buy and sell cotton in a legitimate way. The farmers of the South have lost millions annually on account of this exchange, which has been used to depress the price of cotton and rob the southern farmers. For my part, as I have often stated in the Senate, unless we can confine this exchange to the legitimate buying and selling of actual cotton and stop all gambling in cotton futures I favor abolishing the exchange. Nearly every year they sell cotton futures amounting to ten times the number of bales of cotton produced in the South. Congress should immediately pass legislation preventing the robbery of the southern farmers, who have suffered financially more than any producers in our country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAY COTTON MART IS "BUCKET SHOP"—BROKERS TESTIFY NEW YORK EXCHANGE OPENLY EXPLOITED SOUTHERN TRADERS.

[By the Associated Press.]

NEW YORK, March 15.

Charges that the American Cotton Exchange is a huge bucket shop, where actual trading is rare and where the southern speculator is at the mercy of the New York broker, were made by former members of the exchange at a "John Doe" investigation conducted by the district attorney's office before Chief City Magistrate McAdoo.

Witnesses testified to numerous instances of "cross-trading," fictitious orders, dummy accounts, "scalping," secret manipulation of unrecorded transactions, sensational advertising designed to woo the accounts of small speculators in the South, and undisguised bucketing of orders.

EXPELLED MEMBERS TESTIFY.

W. B. Wilson and J. H. Watson, members of the firm of Wilson & Co., which was expelled from the exchange last February 28 on charges that they had warned their clients against further dealings with the institution, were principal witnesses for the prosecution.

"When there was cotton for sale in the ring we made bona fide sales for our clients," Mr. Wilson testified. "But the southerner, who is an optimist about the cotton market, almost invariably bought. As

a result there seldom was any cotton for sale, and brokers simply "bucketed" the orders, taking a chance on covering themselves when cotton eventually was offered in the ring."

ORDERS BUCKETED OUTRIGHT.

The witness declared that he withdrew from the exchange after repeated complaints to officials that "it had become absolutely impossible to transact business without bucketing." At the time of his resignation in February, he declared, conditions were such that little trading was done on the floor of the exchange, most of the orders from customers being bucketed outright.

A score of the most prominent members of the exchange, some of them its directors, were named as constituting the "inner circle" of the trading ring.

J. H. Watson, partner in Wilson & Co., testified he first entered the floor of the exchange as a "scalper" for E. L. Dutton & Co., with instructions to "force the market" when actual trading was indulged in.

"Finally they caught me short of the market and then took the market for a walk, not bringing it back for several weeks," the witness declared. He then ceased "scalping" for Dutton and became a member of the exchange, "bucketing" orders on his own account.

ADmits BUCKETING ORDERS.

"Do you say you bucketed orders, then?" asked Magistrate McAdoo, who is sitting as a grand jury in the investigation.

"Call it what you want," the witness replied. "It is just plain bucketing."

"During the big rush last September, when every southerner was speculating in cotton and we were flooded with buying orders, brokers seldom went to the exchange to do their trading. They didn't have time. They simply marked prices on the sales contracts, sent them out for the signature of the broker with whom they had prearranged to complete the transaction of a fictitious sale, and entered it on their books. Everybody was bucketing."

Several gilt-embossed pamphlets, distributed through the South by New York brokers, were introduced as evidence.

PAMPHLETS AS LURE.

"These should be called to the attention of the postal authorities," Magistrate McAdoo told the prosecuting attorneys.

The pamphlets were entitled: "Southerners Not Slow—A Human Interest Story That Every Red-Blooded Southerner Should Know," "How to Trade in Cotton, Stocks, and Grains—by Randolph Rose," and "Methods of Successful Cotton Traders."

Mr. Rose was cited by each of the witnesses as a member of the biggest firm connected with the American Cotton Exchange and leader in bucketshop methods.

Efforts of counsel for the American Cotton Exchange were balked in their attempts to cross-examine witnesses by Magistrate McAdoo.

EXTENSION OF PAYMENTS ON RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9606) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for payment of charges due on reclamation projects and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McNARY, Mr. JONES of Washington, and Mr. SHEPPARD conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY TO HAITI.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, submitted by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. ROBINSON. As the junior Senator from Utah is not present at the moment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hale	Myers	Robinson
Ball	Harris	Nelson	Sheppard
Borah	Harrison	New	Shields
Brandeege	Heflin	Nicholson	Simmons
Bursum	Hitchcock	Norbeck	Smith
Cameron	Johnson	Norris	Spencer
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Oddie	Sterling
Caraway	Kellogg	Overman	Townsend
Colt	Kendrick	Page	Underwood
Culberson	Keyes	Pepper	Wadsworth
Cummins	King	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Ernst	Ladd	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Lodge	Poindexter	Warren
Fletcher	McCormick	Pomerene	Watson, Ga.
France	McKellar	Randsell	Weller
Glass	McKinley	Rawson	Williams
Gooding	McNary	Reed	Willis

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. TRAMMELL] on account of a sad affliction in his family, the death of his wife.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], who is detained on official business.

I was requested also to announce the absence of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], the Senator from Kansas

[Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], who are detained at a hearing before the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Chair has laid before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 249) submitted by Mr. KING on the 6th instant was read as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States has designated Brig. Gen. John H. Russell as high commissioner to Haiti, with the rank of ambassador extraordinary to the Government of that country, without having sent the nomination of said Brig. Gen. John H. Russell to the Senate for the advice and consent of the Senate with respect to his appointment to said office: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby requested to investigate the question as to the power of the President under the Constitution to appoint an ambassador extraordinary to Haiti, without the advice and consent of the Senate in that behalf, and report their findings and opinion to the Senate.

Mr. KING. I ask that the resolution may go over without prejudice until a later day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will go over.

CHICAGO, DETROIT & CANADA GRAND TRUNK JUNCTION RAILROAD CO.

Mr. TOWNSEND. From the Committee on Interstate Commerce I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 3268) to authorize the Chicago, Detroit & Canada Grand Trunk Junction Railroad Co., or its successors or assigns, to lease certain of its properties in the State of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with an amendment to insert at the end of the bill the following proviso:

Provided, That any such lease shall be made subject to the condition in said act that the grant to said railroad company shall cease and determine in the event such railroad shall be discontinued.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chicago, Detroit & Canada Grand Trunk Junction Railroad Co., or its successors or assigns, is hereby authorized and empowered to lease lot No. 1, or any portion thereof, and any buildings thereon, as described in the patent dated March 8, 1859, issued to such railroad company under the provisions of the act entitled "An act granting the right of way over and depot grounds on the military reserve at Fort Gratiot, in the State of Michigan, for railroad purposes," approved February 8, 1859, as amended: *Provided*, That any such lease shall be made subject to the condition in said act that the grant to said railroad company shall cease and determine in the event such railroad shall be discontinued.

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.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is disposed of. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] recently introduced a bill proposing to transfer the Forestry Bureau to the Department of the Interior. That bill has aroused much discussion. The Washington Post of Sunday, March 12, published a thoughtful editorial on the subject and I ask that it be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE'S PATRIMONY.

The inquiries made by the commission delegated to map out a reorganization of the executive departments are said to have disclosed many glaring inconsistencies and inexcusable sources of extravagance. The report of the commission is in the hands of President Harding, and when published it is expected to create a sensation because of its recommendations for sweeping changes.

A single example of inconsistent grouping of activities and the evils resulting therefrom is furnished by the commission in its discussion of the Forest Service in relation to the Department of the Interior. The Forest Service is in the Department of Agriculture, and the principal arguments in favor of its retention there are that it is allied with agriculture and is in touch with other bureaus of the Department of Agriculture, such as entomology, plant industry, etc. But the bureaus of the Interior Department are in even closer touch with those bureaus of the Department of Agriculture. The Reclamation Service sets aside land for model farms to be developed by the experts of the Department of Agriculture, and the Indian Office, General Land Office, Geological Survey, and other Interior bureaus are in constant contact with the Department of Agriculture.

Inconvenience of all sorts results from the attempt to administer public lands by two executive departments. The Forest Service fails and refuses to cooperate with bureaus in the Interior Department, with serious damages to stockmen, lumbermen, miners, farmers, and others who have a right to expect a square deal from the Government. The lack of a central authority in Washington makes it impossible

to coordinate the activities of the bureaus that are created for the public welfare.

The Department of the Interior was created for the purpose of administering and developing the patrimony of the people of the United States. Broadly speaking, the chief duty of the Interior Department is to look after the public lands. It has jurisdiction over homesteads, mineral lands, nonmineral lands, Indian reservations, irrigation projects, surveys, national parks, Alaskan lands, etc. The evident intent of the creators of the Interior Department was to place under one jurisdiction all authority over the public lands. But the Forest Service was gradually expanded in the Department of Agriculture and transformed from a research into an administrative bureau, with the result that constant friction has prevailed.

The Forest Service dictates the course of roads within the national forests, and prevents the construction of highways which are required in the public welfare. It halts a farmer's cow in search of a drink of water at a spring lying a few feet within a forest area. It denies to a pioneering farmer the right to acquire a few feet of timber adjoining his homestead. It sells off the timber on a mining claim, denying the timber to the miner, who must send sometimes thousands of miles for a few sticks of timber which might have been cut from his own claim. It disposes of timber to foreign countries at a time when domestic needs are unsupplied. It does not create additional forest to replace that which is cut, but clings to lands which are not forested at all, and refuses to permit them to be opened for homes.

The chaotic conditions resulting from divided authority over the public lands should be ended forthwith. The reorganization commission has recommended that the forests be administered by the Department of the Interior, just as other lands are administered, whether mineral, desert, oil-bearing, agricultural, or Indian lands. The commission takes the position, which seems to be logical and unassailable, that one authority should be exercised over public lands, without regard to the particular nature of the lands. Only by this method can there be coordination in the various services. When the question arises whether a particular piece of land is forest, agricultural, mineral, or what not, a central authority should decide. The question of surveys is most important in connection with the public lands, and it is most damaging to the public interest that the Geological Survey and the Forest Service survey should follow conflicting systems.

It is high time that political and personal aims should give way to public interest in the reorganization of the bureaus pertaining to the public lands of the United States. Alaska is locked up, a useless treasure house, while thousands of enterprising Americans are deprived of the opportunity to build themselves homes in that great region. A few million acres remain which could be transformed into homes in the continental United States, if the lands suitable for agriculture could be wrested from the dead grip of the Forest Service, which neither utilizes the lands nor permits others to utilize them. Roads should be built to accommodate growing populations throughout the western areas; mines should be opened which are now closed because of imaginary forest uses or because timber is denied to the miners; forests should be started in areas which the Forest Service claims to be unsuitable for forests; water supplies now unavailable should be made available to the people; forests in watersheds and catchment areas should be protected; and the so-called national forests should be overhauled, for the purpose of excluding from them the lands that are not forested and never will be forested.

Congress will have the reorganization commission's report in due time, with the Presidents recommendations thereon. It is to be hoped that the people will be given an opportunity to make their land heritage available for proper use.

WORLD WAR FOREIGN DEBT COMMISSION.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. From the Committee on the Judiciary I ask leave to submit a report (No. 563) in response to the resolution of the Senate numbered 244, requesting the opinion of the Judiciary Committee touching the question of the eligibility of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] and Representative BURTON as members of the Foreign Debt Funding Commission. The report is brief, and I ask that it may be read at the Secretary's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read the report.

The Assistant Secretary read the report as follows:

ELIGIBILITY OF HON. REED SMOOT AND HON. THEODORE E. BURTON TO MEMBERSHIP ON THE FOREIGN DEBT REFUNDING COMMISSION.

Mr. WALSH of Montana, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report to accompany S. Res. 244:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to which was submitted by the Senate (S. Res. No. 244) the question of the eligibility of Hon. REED SMOOT and Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON to membership on the commission created under the act of Congress approved February 9, 1922, in view of the fact that at the time of the passage of the act the former was, as he still is, a Member of the Senate and the latter was, as he still is, a Member of the House of Representatives, respectfully reports that having referred the question so submitted to a subcommittee, consisting of Senators CUMMINS, BRANDEGEE, STERLING, OVERMAN, and WALSH of Montana, it reported that, having investigated the question, the conclusion was reached that the gentlemen named are ineligible, Senators BRANDEGEE, OVERMAN, and WALSH concurring in the report and Senators CUMMINS and STERLING dissenting; that upon the incoming of the said report your committee canvassed the question and now reports that in its opinion the gentlemen mentioned are not, nor is either of them, eligible to membership on the said commission for which they have been nominated by the President of the United States.

In its labors the committee had the assistance of a discussion of the question presented by Senator WALSH, a copy of which is hereto appended, supporting the view that the gentlemen named are not eligible, and in support of the contrary view discussions by Senators CUMMINS and NELSON and an opinion by the Attorney General, which, it is understood, will be made a part of a report to be submitted by the minority of the committee.

In the opinion of the Attorney General reference is made to an earlier opinion of his department, copy of which, with some comments thereon by Senator WALSH, is attached hereto.

Respectfully submitted.

T. J. WALSH.
FRANK B. BRANDEGEE.
G. W. NORRIS.
LEE S. OVERMAN.
HENRY F. ASHURST.

WM. E. BORAH.
C. A. CULBERSON.
JAS. A. REED.
JNO. K. SHIELDS.

Mr. CUMMINS. On behalf of a minority of the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit the report which I send to the desk and ask that it may be read:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the report.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

OPINION OF THE MINORITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY UPON SENATE RESOLUTION 244.

Mr. CUMMINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following minority report (to accompany S. Res. 244):

The undersigned members of the Committee on the Judiciary, which committee has had under consideration S. Res. 244, are unable to concur in the report of the committee, it being their opinion that the Hon. REED SMOOT and the Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON are eligible for membership on the commission created by the act of Congress approved February 9, 1922, entitled "An act to create a commission authorized to refund or convert obligations of foreign Governments held by the United States of America, and for other purposes."

They submit herewith their views upon the subject matter of the resolution.

KNUTE NELSON.
ALBERT B. CUMMINS.
WM. P. DILLINGHAM.
LEBARON B. COLT.
THOMAS STERLING.
RICHARD P. ERNST.
SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, on behalf of the same minority, I ask leave to print, accompanying the report just made, the views which have been already submitted to the committee from the subcommittee, as modified or changed in phraseology to suit the present occasion, and also the views of the chairman of the committee, Mr. NELSON, as well as the report or opinion of the Attorney General rendered upon request of the President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I was going to ask unanimous consent for the printing as a public document of the report of the majority just submitted, with the accompanying documents, and with it the report of the minority, with the documents now referred to by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the suggestion is entirely satisfactory to me, but the printing can not be done for a day or two, inasmuch as it is necessary to change the argument in its phraseology so that it will constitute a report to the Senate instead of a report to the full committee by the subcommittee.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That, of course, may be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FOUR-POWER TREATY.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business in open session, for the purpose of considering the four-power treaty.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty submitted by the President of the United States between the United States, the British Empire, France, and Japan, relating to their insular possessions and insular dominions in the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to lay before the Senate, in connection with the treaties now under consideration, some facts which have not heretofore been discussed, and which, while they bear upon the disarmament treaty directly, have also a very important bearing on the treaty under consideration. I propose to place before the Senate some figures with reference to the relative strength of the navies provided for in the naval treaty; and I believe I can say as a preliminary that the whole status has been misrepresented to the Senate and to the American people. The facts I am about to present are the work of naval experts of a high order, and are buttressed by documentary proof which demands, in my opinion, the attention of this body. If they are not given attention before the four-power treaty is acted upon, we will have so far committed ourselves that probably nothing we can do will extricate us from a dilemma which is fraught, in my judgment, with the very gravest danger.

Let me say now in advance that I was in favor of calling this conference for the purpose of reducing armaments. I am in favor now of every reasonable means which can be adopted to prevent the expenditure of large sums of money in a race for naval superiority. I want to see the useless expense stopped. I believe that it can be stopped without endangering the United States.

Those in control of the conference saw fit to go outside of the purposes for which it was called and to take up the question of a quadruple alliance. It had no necessary connection whatever with the question of disarmament. It was at first denied that any thought of an alliance or treaty—by whatsoever name you may know it—was being entertained; but after the conference had assembled some influences of which we are not advised were brought to bear, and they were sufficiently potential to

divert the conference from its original purposes and to bring before it for consideration matters never dreamed of by the Senate when it passed the resolution asking that steps should be taken looking toward disarmament.

Having involved us in negotiations which had nothing to do in a legitimate way with disarmament, our friends were able to secure a treaty which every man with common sense knows in his heart is a quadruple alliance. As a part of that plan they have produced a scheme of disarmament coupled with a scheme for yielding to Japan and Great Britain the dominance of islands and potential naval bases which leave us in a position bordering upon helplessness; and I challenge the Members of our body who were members of this conference to produce to the Senate the confidential reports made to them regarding the relative strength of the navies of Great Britain, Japan, and the United States as those navies will stand when these treaties become effective.

The argument that the present treaty is nothing but a pledge to meet and confer, with no binding qualities and with no obligations which any nation is bound to observe, in itself is a manifest absurdity. If we are bound to do nothing, either in honor, by implication, or by express words, then we are signing a paper which is a mere nullity. We are doing something which might just as well not be done. If all that we agree to do, either morally or legally, by direction or by indirection, is to sit down and talk matters over, whereupon no nation is bound to try to reach an agreement and then to carry that agreement into effect, we are doing the most absurd thing ever performed by sensible men. Such an agreement is a mere cipher. It is nothing whatever. It gives no security, for it makes no promises. It gives no strength, for there is no binding force to it. It accomplishes nothing, because it agrees to do nothing.

That construction is an afterthought, and I charge it; for when this treaty was first proposed members of this commission uniformly talked of it in a different language. Some of them have asserted that it was the equivalent of article 10 of the League of Nations covenant. Some of them, in different language, which I shall quote, have expressly asserted it to be a treaty of great power and great force.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. REED. I think I ought to yield first to the Senator from Georgia, who rose a moment ago.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not want to pursue any inquiry if the Senator is going to pursue the matter of which he is speaking; but it seemed to me of such very extraordinary importance that I think the Senator ought to continue and we ought to know if members of the American delegation expressed the view of which the Senator now speaks.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, I rose to remind the Senator from Missouri that the first speech prepared, written, and read in this Chamber by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] expressly stated repeatedly that this was an association of nations. Then the Senator's colleague [Mr. SPENCER] yesterday afternoon read a speech, in which he said it was an alliance to confer, and nothing more; and by the time the discussion reached the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] the dilution had gone to the point that it could not do us any harm. That is the gradation.

Mr. REED. Of course, if it can not do any harm it can not do any good, because it either is true that it can do no harm because we agree to do nothing or else the statement is wholly inaccurate. If we agree to do something, then we agree to do all that may be the result of the consultation of these nations. If we agree to do nothing, of course it will do no harm except to lull nations to sleep and leave us to place our confidence in an agreement which will bring us no results, and at the same time to concede, through these four treaties, matters of the gravest importance.

If this treaty means nothing, the other treaties mean much.

First, we agree to yield to England and Japan something like 26,000 islands in the Pacific Ocean, some of which are mere rocks but a vast number of which can be used for airplane bases and airplane landings. Many of them can be used for naval bases and for fortifications. We yield them forever, and England and Japan take possession forever and a day. That they get out of these treaties.

Second, we agree that we will not fortify Guam or Wake, or further fortify the Philippines. As a result the Philippines will be helpless and can be taken in three days' time, according to the testimony of every naval officer with whom I have been able to confer. Guam, according to the best evidence, can be taken in 24 hours' time. Therefore if this four-power pact binds us to nothing and binds them to nothing, the other treaties

yield to them substantial advantages and place us in a position where we can be attacked in our possessions. We can expect no security to ourselves from the four-power pact, because it is a cipher.

In other words, to state it in plain language and using a homely illustration, we are situated exactly as we would be if a body of citizens were at enmity and at war with a body of other citizens and they were to sign an agreement that they would settle their differences in a certain way, and yet, having understood that that agreement amounted to nothing and that no settlement was binding, then one side were to disarm itself upon the strength of an agreement which was a nullity.

Not a single vessel of the United States can go to the Philippines to protect them and fight a battle in their defense and return to the coast of the United States or to the Hawaiian Islands unless there is, either in the Philippines or at Guam, a coaling base, a naval station; but the Philippines to-day can be attacked and taken, as I have said, in 3 days' time, and Guam can be taken in 24 hours' time.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. REED. In a moment. So we are placing ourselves in a position where we can not defend our possessions. At the same time you tell us that you are giving us a treaty that means nothing, that binds us to nothing, and binds them to nothing. That is the situation you are presenting to the people of the United States to-day.

I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I merely wish to ask the Senator with reference to a previous observation he made, that we are yielding some 25,000 or more islands. I want to know what he understood to be our interest in those islands.

Mr. REED. I do not care to go into that, because it is a digression, but I will answer the question. I understand that when those islands were surrendered by Germany they were surrendered to Germany's enemies, and we were one of Germany's enemies. I understand that if Japan and France and Great Britain got together and agreed to divide those islands among themselves, and did it without consulting us, it was an act of betrayal so base that it can not be characterized in parliamentary language.

What right did they have to meet and divide those islands? What kind of treatment of the United States was that, when we had stood by them through the late war, when we had stood by them until they had exacted the very terms of surrender they wanted? Is that the sort of Punic faith that is to be observed in this treaty? Quibbles about law, quibbles about whether we are tenants in common or tenants at will, quibbles about whether we got our rights under the Versailles treaty, which we did not sign, or whether we got them at war—what do those quibbles amount to when you are presumed to be dealing with your associates in a great and tragic struggle, and when the good faith, the very soul, of a nation is pledged? If they quibbled then, they will quibble in the future. If they sought refuge behind subterfuges then, they will seek such refuge in the future. We stand here confirming an act of perfidy and betrayal by the instruments we have already signed. We are asked to trust to the good faith of nations which, to use a common expression, "double-crossed" us before we went into the war, "double-crossed" us while we were in the war, secretly and perfidiously.

Their diplomats now come here with smiles on their countenances, our agents ratify that act, and we sit here ratifying it.

These things were done in secret, behind locked doors. They were kept from the President of the United States. They were kept from the people of the respective nations. They were concealed from the people of this country; yet we are asked to rely upon an agreement which Senators say means nothing, and to yield to them these advantages.

Let me just for one moment ask Senators to look at the map hanging on the wall of this Chamber. They can locate there with the eye the Hawaiian Islands, the square group to the left. A little farther on are Wake and Guam, then the Philippines shown to the extreme left, without a fortification which can withstand a real attack, with land which can be occupied so that the fortifications can be attacked from the rear, with Japan close at hand, and Japan with every point of land fortified.

Then observe the yellow squares to the left, which represent Japan and her holdings. She has fortified every important point along her coasts. She can fight her ships in her own seas, under the guns of her own forts, and if we undertake to go there to attack her we shall be out of coal before we can get

back to the United States. Every Japanese seaman knows that, every Japanese statesman knows it, the Japanese laborers know it, but apparently our representatives disregarded it.

Go a little farther south. I have not time to point it out, but the red on the map indicates the possessions of Great Britain, and the red spots, which look as if red smallpox—if there were such a thing—had broken out all over the Pacific Ocean, represent Great Britain's islands. There is not a single gateway in the waters of the Seven Seas which is not controlled by the guns of Great Britain's fortresses. There is not a single tactical or strategic point she does not control.

When you go to the Atlantic look over opposite the Panama Canal at the red spots which indicate England's islands. There is the cordon of England's islands commanding the canal, and the nearest important island to it you will see in red, the island of Jamaica.

North of the main islands of Japan lies the island of Sakhalin. We had a witty gentleman on the floor the other day who sneeringly talked about Russians crossing over on the ice. Napoleon Bonaparte found that the Russians could fight on the ice and in the snow. Five miles across, Japan is already in the possession of Russia's part of that island. Russia will be forced to attack that island if she has a war with Japan. According to the best evidences we have to-day, she is moving her troops in that direction now. Possibly before the snow flies again the Russian will be at grips with the Japanese, and the moment a Russian soldier puts his foot on that Sakhalin Island, then, under the terms of this treaty, we shall be bound to do something. The proponents of this treaty say we will be bound to do nothing except to talk.

I say that that is the silliest talk which ever fell from the lips of sensible men. We are making an agreement to do something, and yet we are agreeing to do nothing! That was not the construction placed upon this instrument when it was being written. It was not the construction placed upon this instrument by the statesmen who spoke of it.

We had a specimen of misrepresentation here the other day. Of course, it was inadvertent. Of course, it was not intended. We had three or four sentences read out of the speech of M. Viviani at the Disarmament Conference. I assert that Viviani's speech, properly read, demonstrates that he understands this to be an alliance of the powers, and that the words read from his speech were carefully selected and did not represent his sentiments, but represented the exact converse of what he really meant. Let me read M. Viviani's speech, which is very short. I will omit the polite French compliments which this great Frenchman passed to Mr. LODGE. He spoke of Mr. LODGE's speech as "an analysis at once so simple and so powerful." Of course, you would expect the Frenchman to say that much to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, but notice what follows:

The moment that the final ratifications have been exchanged here, France will assume the obligations growing out of this pact just as she will exercise the rights conferred on her by it.

He thought there were obligations, did he not?

Amid this gathering of nations whose custom it is to honor their signature I am entitled to say, speaking of this treaty, that France is in her rightful place here—France, who throughout the entire course of her history has scrupulously fulfilled her obligations and only a few years since offered up the blood of her sons that her plighted word might be kept.

He thought it was an obligation, did he not? You did not hear any of this foolish babble about the treaty amounting to nothing when he was talking. Notice what follows:

We have been enlightened as to the juridical and diplomatic value of this agreement by the simple words of Mr. LODGE's analysis. It is fitting, however, to pause a moment if only to mark the unity of our purpose. We fully understand that four great powers bind themselves to respect their mutual rights as far as the islands and dominions of the Pacific are concerned; we understand that if some controversy should loom up on the horizon which can not be settled through the ordinary workings of diplomacy these powers shall take counsel together; we understand that should the rights of these powers be imperiled by the aggressive action of another power measures would be taken to meet this situation.

What kind of measures? Getting together and passing a resolution? Holding a pink tea, when the waters of the Pacific are invaded by a hostile fleet? Twiddling thumbs or drinking highballs? Is that the sort of action you take when a hostile navy is bearing down upon you? Is that the course which nations follow? Shame upon men who would make such an argument! Let those who stand for this treaty have the honesty to confront the American people and say it is a treaty, just as Viviani said it was, under which we understand we will keep the faith, and that we understand that should the rights of these powers be imperiled by the aggressive action of another power, measures would be taken to meet the situation. I say it is sheer dis-

honesty to claim anything else. It is pusillanimous dishonesty to claim anything else. Mr. Viviani continues:

The treaty provides for a duration of 10 years. At the moment of its ratification the Anglo-Japanese alliance comes to an end.

So much for the juridical value of this document. So much for the legal obligations of this document. So much for the binding force of this document. Then said the orator:

We should, however, be remiss indeed—we should be slighting the open-handed and sumptuous hospitality offered us by America and failing in our manifest duty if we did not attempt to stress the moral worth of the agreement and thereby give this memorable day its true historic character. This moral value has just been alluded to by Mr. LODGE; he has pointed out that when four great powers are determined that peace shall prevail in a given part of the world, the concert of these powers, without provision for naval or military action, is all that is needed to assure the preservation, the guaranty, and the protection of that peace; and I say here, in this illustrious hall, in this tribune so exalted, that however feeble may be the voice speaking here it will be heard throughout the universe, that it is a good thing that this example of cohesion has been given to the world.

Now what does he say? He says that the treaty means a certain thing, that it is of binding force, that it does bind us to meet and consult and to contrive the measures to meet an attack, but, in addition to that, it has a high moral value. Very far is he from saying that it is not an instrument binding us to act, binding us to use force. On the contrary, his words expressly foreshadow and mean the application of force. He says there is a moral weight to it, too, and, of course, there is. Yet that speech was distorted here on the floor, distorted, I suppose, and sent to the people of the country with the assurance that Mr. Viviani had said there was nothing here but the moral value of four great nations agreeing to be friendly.

Now, I will proceed to read what some others said at that time. Before, in order to save the treaty, it was necessary to deny its virtue and its force, and such an opposition had begun to spring up as made it necessary to repudiate the meaning of the treaty in order to have it adopted.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WADSWORTH in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KING. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that Mr. Viviani, who is, in addition to being an eloquent man, a learned man, appreciates the difference between the juridical question and the moral question or matter of honor. He speaks of the obligation to which the Senator has called attention, and which the Senator insists imposes a legal obligation, as coming within the category of juridical or legal obligations. Then he proceeds to the moral considerations. So he considers the obligation there involved, in the words which the Senator read, first as being juridical, as binding as a legal obligation, and then he proceeds to a discussion of the moral aspect of the case. So it is a juridical legally binding instrument as well as a moral one.

Mr. REED. If one will read it in the light of the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts which just preceded it, in which that Senator undertook to sugar-coat this pill so the American people would swallow it thinking they were getting pure candy, it is perfectly plain that this great French statesman meant to place on record a clear and concise statement of disagreement to any such construction as might be gotten out of Senator LODGE's words.

He spoke of that Senator in flattering terms, complimenting him for his speech, but nevertheless took pains to say there is a juridical question here, and this is what we have agreed to in solemn form, so that if a controversy were to arise in the future and France were to call upon us to do something, if we were to say, "This treaty means nothing; Senator LODGE said something that could be construed in that way," the French statesmen of that hour would rise and read the words of M. Viviani, in which he said that it is a juridical document and contains juridical obligations. France could then say, "Our representative, M. Viviani, in that day challenged attention to the fact and no man gainsaid him."

Again I call attention to the statement of Baron Hayashi, who is the Japanese ambassador to Great Britain, as contained in an Associated Press dispatch of December 12:

The new pact is but an enlargement and indorsement of the old friendship between Great Britain and Japan, which will come as a welcome Christmas present to the world. The spirit of the old alliance, which has achieved such fine work, will continue, and the cooperation of the United States enables us to face the future with calm assurance.

What was the old pact to which he referred? It was the Japanese-British alliance, an offensive and defensive alliance, so construed and understood by all the world, an alliance which some of us feared, an alliance of so grave a character that we are now told the only reason for making this treaty or the chief

reason for it is to get rid of that alliance. That is, we get rid of it by becoming a party to it. We get rid of it just like the old woman got rid of the old man, by marrying him.

Here stand the proponents of these treaties in this absurd position. They say that the Japanese alliance was a thing of such moment that we must get rid of it, therefore we can afford to make this treaty in order to get rid of it. They then tell us that Japan took a treaty that meant nothing, bound us to nothing, in lieu of the treaty that bound to Japan the great British Empire, with her fleets and her armies, and bound her with chains of steel. They tell us that absurd and ridiculous thing, with the statement of Japan declaring that "the new pact is but an enlargement and indorsement of the old friendship between Great Britain and Japan, which will come as a welcome Christmas present to the world," and that "the spirit of the old alliance which has achieved such fine work will continue and the cooperation of the United States enables us to face the future with calm assurance."

Had the other alliance worked finely? Indeed it had. It enabled Japan to take Korea by the throat. It enabled her to overwhelm Russia. It enabled her to strengthen her army and her navy and to take a position among the first-class nations of the world. The old pact had worked so well that when Japanese soldiers invaded the mainland of Russia on one side, British soldiers went in on the other side.

Mr. President, these are not the only two men who have spoken on this matter. Mr. Balfour said:

Now, I am perfectly well aware that the treaty between Great Britain and Japan has been the cause of much searchings of heart, of some suspicions, of a good deal of animadversion in important sections of opinion in the United States.

I pause to inquire, if that caused searchings of our heart, what will the four-power pact do to the rest of the world that is left out of it? Notwithstanding the claim that we are tied to England by blood, though some people of this country would have us tied to her by political bonds, for there are tories to-day as there have always been tories, if a Japanese-English alliance alarms us and creates suspicions in our heart, what will this four-power pact do to the rest of the world?

But Mr. Balfour continued:

I think that from the historical point of view that attitude may at first cause surprise, for certainly nothing was further from the thoughts of the original framers of the treaty between Japan and Great Britain than that it could touch in the remotest way, either for good or for evil, the interests of the United States. The United States seemed as remote from any subject touched in the original agreement as Chile or Peru.

If that is true, if those words were spoken in good faith, will some Senator rise in his place and tell us what we are getting by this treaty? If we were getting the abrogation of a treaty that never was intended to affect our interests adversely, if we were getting the abrogation of a treaty that never contemplated an attack upon the United States, will some one tell me what we are getting out of this bargain? How can Senators stand here and pretend we are escaping a menace and at the same time concede the truth of Mr. Balfour's words that the Japanese-British treaty was never intended to affect the United States?

Even at the risk of repetition I say that if England would have joined with Japan against us in a causeless war—and they will never have a war with good cause with us—if those two nations would attack us after our blood had been spilled in their defense, if the blood bond would not hold them, then will some one tell me what ink upon a piece of perishable parchment will do and of what binding effect it would be? If your heart is so black, if your soul is so debased, that you are ready to murder your neighbor without cause, your neighbor who has sustained you and protected you and poured out his blood for you, then no agreement signed will give you security.

But I continue to read:

When two great nations have been united in that fiery ordeal—

Referring to the war—

they can not at the end of it take off their hats one to the other and politely part as two strangers part who travel together for a few hours in a railway train. Something more, something closer, unites them than the mere words of the treaty; and, as it were, gratuitously and without a cause to tear up the written contract, although it serves no longer any valid or effective purpose, may lead to misunderstandings in one nation just as much as the maintenance of that treaty has led to misunderstandings in another.

That is Mr. Balfour's statement. It is not very pointed, so far as the particular question I am discussing is concerned, but read properly it is a clear indication on Mr. Balfour's part that the United States and Great Britain and Japan are to form a closer union and the purposes of that closer union are written in the document, and one of the terms of that document is that whenever the waters of the Pacific are invaded by a hostile

fleet or the islands attacked, which is the same thing, then they will consult together and take action or with reference to the action to be taken.

Prince Tokugawa said:

The terms of the important pact assuring mutual security and friendship have just been made known. It is needless for me to say that all Japan will approve the consummation of this work. Japan will rejoice in this pledge of peace upon the Pacific.

What is the "mutual security"? Is there any "mutual security" in passing a resolution? Is there any "mutual security" in meeting and talking a matter over and agreeing to do something, and nobody to be bound to do it? Is it "mutual security," or is it tommyrot and foolishness? The "mutual security" is the security that comes out of the agreement we signed, and that agreement is that we will consult together and will devise the best means to repel an attack.

Senator Schanzer, speaking for the Italian delegation, said:

Any measure aiming at the creation of guarantees for the safeguard of peace in the world can not but meet with our fullest consent.

"Guarantees" of the peace of the world!

The principles involved in the agreement are entirely in accordance with the main lines of policy inspired by the high aim of the peaceful elimination of conflicts between nations.

We therefore express our full confidence that this agreement will represent the most firm and lasting guarantees for the safeguarding of peace in the Pacific.

Yet Senators say there is no guaranty; that we agree to nothing; that we are indulging in an empty form; that the treaty is a sounding brass and tinkling cymbal; that it imposes no obligation and it in no respect binds any nation to do anything; but, speaking with reference to it, the representative of Italy declared that it was a guaranty.

Viscount d'Alte, of Portugal, said:

It would, of course, be easy to evade any of the clauses of the treaty of which I am speaking; it would even seem as if the men who have drafted it have tried to signify that they did not place their main reliance and the achievement of their aims in a long series of carefully worded clauses. Only four powers, who repose the most implicit trust in the honor and integrity of each other, could sign a treaty such as this. And it is this fact that gives the agreement its tremendous binding power. The confidence so fully given no nation would dare to betray.

But already on this floor we are told that we have agreed to do nothing; already we are breaking the spirit of these words and violating the very ethics laid down by this Portuguese statesman. We are doing it here, but when we come to the council table of the four nations, what representative of the American people will dare assume the attitude of the coward and the poltroon and—I will use the slang term—the "welcher," and say, "We agreed to sit down with you; we agreed to devise the best plans of defense; but now we say to you that that is all we are going to do; we will not act in accordance with the manifest interests of the four powers concerned." That much. Mr. President, in reply to some of the statements which have been made here.

Now, I challenge the attention of those Senators who have yet an interest in these treaties and in their country to a statement regarding the condition in which our Navy is left. If I am not seriously mistaken, this demands the most careful consideration by every Member of this body. I have already challenged attention to the fact that the naval bases are in the hands of Japan and Great Britain, France holding some. We are substantially and practically without them in all the waters of the ocean. I do not mean to say that we have none, but those we have are so inefficient, so small, and so scattered that they scarcely need be referred to. A fleet with an abundance of naval bases starts out in any war with an infinite advantage over the nation that has no bases, no fortresses, no coaling stations, for her fleet can be made much more efficient thereby.

Among other things, the treaty provides: (1) That for a period of 10 years, with the exception of two vessels for the United States and two for Great Britain, there shall be no further construction of capital ships.

(2) With the exception above stated, all capital shipbuilding programs, either actual or projected, are to be abandoned.

(3) Further reduction is to be made by the scrapping of certain of the older ships.

(4) Capital ship tonnage is to be used as the measurement of the strength for navies.

Under the treaty the United States in effect agrees (1) to scrap 7 battleships and 6 battle cruisers, of 520,200 tons; (2) to scrap 17 of the older battleships, of 267,740 tons; or a total of 30 capital ships, of an aggregate tonnage of 787,940 tons, which are to be scrapped.

Of the 13 vessels mentioned in the first group to be scrapped, 1 battleship, the *West Virginia*, has already been launched. It is, of course, a new vessel. Six battleships and 6 battle cruisers are in process of construction. Let me here call attention to

the fact that we are scrapping vessels upon which construction has already begun, which are from 30 to 60 per cent completed, and upon which we have expended \$650,000,000. On the other hand—and I challenge the attention of Senators to this statement—Great Britain is scrapping no vessels whose construction has been begun, but is agreeing not to build two ships which she had planned to build and on which no work has been done. They are, as has been suggested, paper ships.

The Japanese agreement includes both classes. Some of their vessels are actually begun, while on others which they agree not to construct no work at all has been done; but they were used to trade with just the same.

The 17 older American ships mentioned in the second group are all in existence. Two of them, however, the *Maine* and the *Missouri*, of 12,500 tons each, are not on the active list. Eliminating these two, the total tonnage to be scrapped by the United States amounts to 762,940.

Great Britain agrees not to build two battle cruisers heretofore contemplated, the keels of which have not been laid down, aggregating 86,000 tons, and to scrap 24 of her older battleships. The 24 ships to be scrapped are as follows:

King George V, Ajax, Centurion, Thunderer, New Zealand, Lion, Princess Royal, Conqueror, Monarch, Orion, Australia, Agincourt, Erin, Commonwealth, Dreadnought, Bellerophon, St. Vincent, Inflexible, Superb, Neptune, Hercules, Indomitable, Temeraire, Agamemnon.

Of the ships above referred to, the first four, namely, the *King George V*, the *Ajax*, the *Centurion*, and the *Thunderer* are the only ships of the 24 on the active list. The remaining ships are all tied up at the docks and have all been offered for disposal at public sale. By scrapping them, therefore, Great Britain loses nothing. She is still at liberty to sell them, as she contemplated before the Limitation of Arms Conference was called.

Japan agrees (1) not to build 4 battleships and 4 battle cruisers the keels of which had not been laid down by November 11, 1921, aggregating 364,000 tons; (2) to scrap 2 of the new battleships and 4 of the new battle cruisers, aggregating 255,200 tons; (3) to scrap 11 of the older battleships, aggregating 163,932 tons; or a total of 17 capital ships, of 419,132 tons.

(a) The keels of none of the four battle cruisers mentioned in the first group which Japan agrees not to build had been laid on November 11, 1921. It is true, however, that while the conference was in progress Japan by rush work laid down the keels of two of the battleships. This was so manifestly a threat as to require no comment.

(b) Of the six battleships mentioned in the second group actually to be scrapped two battleships are in process of construction, two battle cruisers are in process of construction, and two battle cruisers had not had their keels laid by November 11, 1921.

(c) The 11 older ships mentioned in the third group are all now in existence. Japan is to be credited with scrapping 11 battleships actually in use. As a matter of fact, however, 3 of these, the *Kurama*, the *Ibuki*, and the *Ikoma*, until now have been classed merely as first-class cruisers. My authority for that is Jane's "Fighting Ships." Deducting these 3 vessels leaves but 8 vessels of a total of 120,982 tons, which, with the 4 vessels in process of construction which are to be scrapped, amounting to 168,200 tons, gives a total of 12 capital ships, of 289,182 tons, to be scrapped by Japan.

I desire now to give the summary.

Mr. OVERMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hale	McNary	Smoot
Ball	Harris	Myers	Spencer
Borah	Harrison	Nelson	Stanfield
Broussard	Heflin	New	Sterling
Calder	Hitchcock	Nicholson	Sutherland
Cameron	Johnson	Norris	Townsend
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Oddie	Underwood
Caraway	Kellogg	Overman	Wadsworth
Colt	Kendrick	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Cummins	King	Phipps	Warren
du Pont	Ladd	Pomerene	Watson, Ga.
Ernst	La Follette	Ransdell	Weller
Fernald	Lenroot	Rawson	Williams
Fletcher	McCormick	Reed	Willis
France	McKellar	Sheppard	
Glass	McKinley	Shields	
Gooding	McLean	Simmons	

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it appears, therefore, that of the capital ships now carried on the active lists of these three nations and of the capital ships in actual process of construction on November 11, 1921, the tonnage to be scrapped by these na-

tions is as follows—and I wish Senators would notice these figures:

	Tons.
The United States	762,940
Great Britain	92,000
Japan	289,182

It would be interesting to know why Great Britain is credited with scrapping 24 capital ships, 20 of which are obsolete, offered for sale, and, in fact, already scrapped, and why Japan is credited with scrapping 3 capital ships which are not actually capital ships. Is it merely an attempt to pad the lists in order to make a presentable appearance against that of the United States?

If the treaty is ratified, the navies of these three powers are to be reduced to the following basis:

- (a) The United States, 18 capital ships, 525,000 tons.
- (b) Great Britain, 20 capital ships, 525,000 tons.
- (c) Japan, 10 capital ships, 315,000 tons.

The foregoing demonstrates that the United States is required to scrap 7 battleships and 6 battle cruisers in process of construction, against 2 battleships and 2 battle cruisers for Japan and none for England. The United States is also required to scrap 17 older battleships, as against 8 for Japan and 4 for Great Britain. In other words, the United States is to scrap 30 capital ships, 17 of which are in the water, able to fight, and 13 new vessels in process of construction and upon which she has already expended over \$650,000,000, as against Japan scrapping 8 in the water, able to fight, and 4 new vessels in process of construction, and against Great Britain scrapping 4 of her older vessels now in active service, the remaining 20 of the total of 24 having, as heretofore stated, been offered for sale—that is, scrapped.

Somebody put something over on these delegates of ours, one of whom said that the strategic value of the islands had not even been considered. Evidently the fighting strength of the Navy was not considered. The fastest of our vessels go at 21 knots an hour. Notice the armament of the ships. We have three ships armed with 16-inch guns. All the rest of our ships except four are armed with 14-inch guns.

If the treaty is ratified, the particular capital ships eventually allowed to these three navies are as follows:

United States.

Vessel.	Com. pleted.	Dis- place- ment.	Speed.	Armor over vital parts.	Principal guns.	Broadside.	
						(1)	(2)
BATTLE CRUISERS.		Tons.	Knots.	In.	In.	No.	No.
None.							
BATTLESHIPS.							
Colorado	1922	32,600	21	16	18	8	16
Washington	1922	32,600	21	16	18	8	16
Maryland	1921	32,600	21	16	18	8	16
California	1921	32,300	21	14	18	12	14
Tennessee	1920	32,300	21	14	18	12	14
Idaho	1919	32,000	21	14	18	12	14
Mississippi	1917	32,000	21	14	18	12	14
New Mexico	1918	32,000	21	14	18	12	14
Arizona	1916	31,400	21	14	18	12	14
Pennsylvania	1916	31,400	21	14	18	12	14
Oklahoma	1916	27,500	20½	13½	18	10	14
Nevada	1916	27,500	21	13½	18	10	14
Texas	1914	27,000	21	12	14	10	14
New York	1914	27,000	21	12	14	10	14
Arkansas	1912	26,000	21	11	12	12	12
Wyoming	1912	26,000	21	11	12	12	12
Utah	1911	21,825	21	11	12	10	12
Florida	1911	21,825	21	11	12	10	12

See Jane's "Fighting Ships, 1921," pp. 179-187.

Under heading Armor over vital parts No. 1 is for belt and No. 2 for turrets.

The above includes the Colorado and Washington soon to be completed and omits the North Dakota and Delaware which are to be scrapped as soon as the Colorado and Washington go into commission, which will be in 1922.

Great Britain.

Vessel.	Com. pleted.	Dis- place- ment.	Speed.	Armor over vital parts.	Principal guns.	Broadside.	
						(1)	(2)
BATTLE CRUISERS.		Tons.	Knots.	In.	In.	No.	No.
Hood	1920	41,200	31	12	15	8	15
Super-Hood ¹		35,000	29	12	16
Super-Hood ¹		35,000	29	12	16
Renown	1916	26,500	22	9	11	6	15
Repulse	1916	26,500	22	9	11	6	15
Tiger	1914	28,500	29	9	9	8	13½

¹ See Jane's "Fighting Ships, 1921," p. 47; H. C. Bywater, "Britain's New Battle Cruisers"; and Scientific American, December, 1921.

Great Britain—Continued.										Japan—Continued.								
Vessel.	Com- pleted.	Dis- place- ment.	Speed.	Armor over vital parts.	Principal guns.	Broadside.		Guns.	Metal.	Vessel.	Com- pleted.	Dis- place- ment.	Speed.	Armor over vital parts.	Guns.	Broadside.		
						(1)	(2)	In.	In.							Guns.	Metal.	
BATTLESHIPS.																		
Royal Sovereign.....	1916	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Knots.</i>	22	13 13	8 15	8 15	15,360	<i>In.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>Pounds.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Knots.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>Pounds.</i>
Royal Oak.....	1916																	
Resolution.....	1916	25,750	22	13 13	8 15	8 15	15,360	<i>In.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>Pounds.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Knots.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>Pounds.</i>	
Revenge.....	1916																	
Ramillies.....	1917																	
Queen Elizabeth.....	1915																	
Warspite.....	1915																	
Barham.....	1915	27,500	25	13 11	8 15	8 15	15,360	<i>In.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>Pounds.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Knots.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>Pounds.</i>	
Valiant.....	1916																	
Malaya.....	1916																	
Benbow.....	1914																	
Emperor of India.....	1914	25,000	22	12 11	10 13½	10 13½	14,000	<i>In.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>Pounds.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Knots.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>In.</i>	<i>Pounds.</i>	
Iron Duke.....	1914																	
Marlborough.....	1914																	

See Jane's " Fighting Ships, 1921," pp. 39-52.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. REED. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona moves that the Senate take a recess for 20 minutes. [Putting the question.] The motion is lost.

Mr. REED. It is singular how it was lost, as there are only two Senators present on the other side, and only one of them voted; but I will proceed. In view of that ruling I think I ought to go on.

Great Britain has one ship of 41,200 tons, the *Hood*. She has two super-Hoods of 35,000 tons. She has the *Renown* and the *Repulse*, of 26,500 tons; the *Tiger*, of 28,500 tons; the *Royal Sovereign*, the *Royal Oak*, the *Resolution*, the *Revenge*, and the *Ramillies*, of 25,750 tons; the *Queen Elizabeth*, the *Warspite*, the *Barham*, the *Valiant*, and the *Malaya*, of 27,500 tons; the *Benbow*, the *Emperor of India*, the *Iron Duke*, and the *Marlborough*, of 25,000 tons. Notice how they outrank us in size.

Now, we come to the question of speed. The *Hood* has a speed of 31 knots an hour; the two super-Hoods, 29 knots; the *Tiger*, 29 knots; the five vessels—the *Queen Elizabeth*, the *Warspite*, the *Barham*, the *Valiant*, and the *Malaya*—25 knots. All the rest of her vessels have a speed of 22 knots, so that they outrank us in speed as they do in size.

Now, I come to the question of the caliber of the guns. She has two vessels equipped with 16-inch guns, and all the rest of her vessels, I believe, except two, are armed with 15-inch guns.

The same disparity between the two fleets appears in the matter of broadsides of metal thrown. It is to be noted that the *Renown* and the *Repulse* are classified as 26,500-ton vessels. Those vessels when built were so classified. They then had a belt of side armor of 6 inches; but the 6-inch armor belt of the *Repulse* has already been replaced by a 9-inch belt, and under chapter 2, part 3, section 1(d)(2) of the naval treaty, the same refitting is now being done on the *Renown*, and is to be completed. No allowance for these changes in the displacement allowance is made, although the defense of the vessels is thereby enormously increased.

Mr. President, Japan has four battle cruisers, with a displacement of 27,500 tons, and a speed of 27½ knots. She has two battle cruisers of 33,800 tons, with a speed of 23 knots. She has two battleships of 31,260 tons, with a speed of 23 knots. She has two of 30,600 tons, and a speed of 22 knots.

Those vessels are armed principally with 14 and 16 inch guns. I print a table displaying accurately the strength of each vessel, its speed, and its armament, as follows:

Japan.

Vessel.	Com- pleted.	Dis- place- ment.	Speed.	Armor over vital parts.	Guns.	Broadside.		Guns.	Metal.
						(1)	(2)	In.	In.
BATTLE CRUISERS.									
Kirishima.....	1915	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Knots.</i>	27½	8 9	8 14	8 14	11,200	<i>In.</i>
Haruna.....	1915								
Hi Yei.....	1914								
Kongo.....	1913								

Japan—Continued.									
Vessel.	Com- pleted.	Dis- place- ment.	Speed.	Armor over vital parts.	Guns.	Broadside.		Guns.	Metal.
						(1)	(2)	In.	In.
BATTLESHIPS.									
Nagato.....	1921	33,800	23	13 14	8 16	8 16	17,500	<i>In.</i>	<i>In.</i>
Mutsu.....	1921								
Hiuga.....	1918	31,260	23	12 12	12 14	12 14	16,800	<i>In.</i>	<i>In.</i>
Ise.....	1917								
Yamashiro.....	1917	30,600	22	12 12	12 14	12 14	16,800	<i>In.</i>	<i>In.</i>
Fuso.....	1915								

See Jane's " Fighting Ships, 1921," pp. 260-267.

Vessels bracketed are sister ships.

First figures under "Armor over vital parts" are for belt and second for turrets.

The *Setsu* is omitted from the above table because the *Mutsu* is now completed and the *Setsu* is to be scrapped.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, in what class among those vessels is the *Mutsu*?

Mr. REED. It is not listed in this table, but it has a displacement of 33,800 tons.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Probably it was not listed among those referred to when Secretary Hughes made his first announcement.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Afterwards, I understand, the Japanese persuaded him and our delegation to allow them to include the *Mutsu*, which, under his original proposal, was among those to be scrapped.

Mr. REED. I think I cover that later. I remember dictating a statement in regard to it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand it is the most powerful battle vessel in the world.

Mr. REED. It is understood that when completed it will be one of the most powerful ships in existence. The foregoing figures are taken from "Jane's Fighting Ships" and are exactly reproduced in the tables. Now, I call attention to a very important matter. It should be noted that Great Britain's tonnage figures are arrived at on a different basis from that by which the corresponding figures for our own ships are arrived at, the distinction being that when British ships go for a trial after being built they have aboard just enough fuel and stores to make the run. They do not carry spare oil, water, or sea stores, which they would have aboard in normal commissioned status. On the other hand, when American vessels make their trial runs they carry a full allowance of everything which they would take to sea in actual service. The result is that the tonnage of British ships is shown to be less than the tonnage of the identical American ships. An average of a number of instances has led to the conclusion that one-eighth of the listed tonnage of British vessels should be added to their displacement in comparing them with similar American ships. That is to say, an American ship of 30,000 tons would, in the case of an identical British ship, estimated by the British method, show a vessel of 26,600 tons. In order, therefore, to compare the tonnage of American ships as given in the table with British ships as given in the table we must add one-eighth, or 12½ per cent, to the British tonnage.

Accordingly, the total British tonnage allowed by the treaty as to existing ships will be 628,820 tons, as against America's 525,860 tons, a difference of 20 per cent in favor of Great Britain.

That fact has been concealed from the American people, whether designedly or stupidly I do not know. I charge it to be a fact, and I charge it to be an act of unspeakable perfidy to thus deceive the American people and the American Congress.

That the foregoing statements are accurate is further shown by the fact that in the treaty it is recited that—a vessel completed hereafter shall be rated at its displacement tonnage when in the standard condition defined herein.

The standard is laid down in paragraph 2, part 4, at the end of chapter 2. It will be observed, therefore, that as to existing tonnage Great Britain has an advantage of over 100,000 tons over the United States.

The Japanese follow the English method of measurement. We must, therefore, add to the Japanese tonnage one-eighth, or 12½ per cent, which raises the tonnage of Japan from 341,320 tons to 383,985 tons, creating the same proportion of disparity as exists between the ships of Great Britain and the United States.

Mr. KING. Would that give the United States, then, only 425,000 tons?

Mr. REED. It gives us 525,000 tons by our measure, but if we were to apply our measure to the British ships, they would have 628,820 tons.

The revised figures, therefore, as to the total tonnage are as follows:

	Tons.
Great Britain	628,820
United States	525,850
Japan	383,985

That is to say, the ships of Great Britain measured by the American rule and the American ships measured by the same rule give the results I have just stated in figures.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KING. During the conference negotiations, and during the meetings of the experts of the respective signatories to the treaties, when they were agreeing upon a limitation and setting forth the relative strength of each nation, was there not something produced which evidenced the discrepancy to which the Senator refers?

Mr. REED. I can not answer, but I am informed that there was a confidential statement made by some of our naval experts with reference to these fleets; that there were only about a dozen copies of it ever made, and those copies have never been made public. What our naval experts said further than that I can not say. Manifestly, we are all in the dark. We went into this conference with the Senator from Massachusetts protesting against the resolution of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] in favor of open sessions throughout. Finally the Harrison resolution, as I will denominate it, was passed with some amendments, and evidently for the purpose of keeping outside of the terms of that resolution they proceeded to keep no records. They met and agreed, and when they had something agreed upon, they wrote out the final conclusion in the form of a treaty, they came into a plenary session to which the public was graciously invited, and they told to the public what they had done, but not how they had done it, nor what evidence they had before them. Nothing was there of the character produced from the Versailles conference, where they did have what they called a *procès verbal*, which contained at least minutes of the various conferences.

This, I charge, was designedly the most secret conference which has been held between nations within the last 10 years, unless we except the time when France and England and Japan got together and agreed to divide up the possessions they intended to take from Germany, and they were concealing that from us.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I am at an utter loss to understand how there could be any misunderstanding as to the tonnage of Great Britain or Japan or the United States or any of the participating powers, because, as the Senator knows, for a number of years there has been available a vast amount of literature as to the tonnage of each nation. We know that just as soon as a ship is built in Great Britain, in Germany, or in the United States the tonnage, the size and the caliber of the guns, their range, and so forth, are known, and why our representatives here did not know of the tonnage of the nations and of these ships, and how such a discrepancy as the Senator has indicated could arise, is something which surpasses my comprehension.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator was out when I made that plain. Great Britain measures her ships when they are practically without a load. We measure our ships when they are loaded, ready for a cruise. Tonnage is estimated by the amount of water displaced. Two ships of exactly the same size placed upon the surface of the water, one of them loaded and the other unloaded, will show a great difference in tonnage. All of our figures of tonnage have been published, but they have been published according to the American method of estimating. All of the British figures have been published, but they have been published according to the British method of estimating. So if we take the works that have been written in regard to the various navies of the world and find the tonnage of an American vessel given and the tonnage given of a vessel of exactly the same size which is a British vessel, we get a great discrepancy in those figures; but the man who takes the book and copies the figures and does not understand that there are different methods of measurement makes the mistake of concluding that the two vessels are equal in tonnage when they are not equal at all in size or in tonnage, either, if they were measured by the same standard.

The statements I have made are made upon the authority of an expert whose name I can not give, but we can get this testimony if we will have an investigation. There is no question about the verity of what I am saying.

Now I come to the question of battle cruisers, having compared the strength of battle fleets. Here are the battle cruisers and here is a comparative table:

GREAT BRITAIN.

Super-Hood; speed, 29 knots; guns, 12 16-inch caliber.
Second super-Hood; speed, 29 knots; guns, 12 16-inch caliber.
Hood; speed, 31 knots; guns, 8 15-inch caliber.
Renown; speed, 22 knots; guns, 8 15-inch caliber.
Repulse; speed, 28 knots; guns, 8 15-inch caliber.
Tiger; speed, 29 knots; guns, 8 15-inch caliber.

These great cruisers, all of them except two, have very high ratings.

JAPAN.

Kirishima; speed, 27½ knots; armed with 8 14-inch guns.
Haruna; speed, 27½ knots; armed with 8 14-inch guns.
Hiyoi; speed, 27½ knots; armed with 8 14-inch guns.
Kongo; speed, 27½ knots; armed with 8 14-inch guns.

What has the United States? Absolutely nothing. We are required to scrap the six cruisers we were building which would have outrun and outshot any cruisers in the world. We enter upon this agreement without a single battle cruiser of any kind or character.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. OVERMAN. What is the reason why our delegates allowed every cruiser, which would seem to be the best fighting ship we have in case of war, to be scrapped? Why did they agree to scrap all our cruisers and then let England and Japan keep their cruisers?

Mr. REED. I can not tell the Senator any more than I can tell him why we give away all the islands in the Pacific, any more than I can tell him why we make an agreement in which we agree to do nothing, according to the construction placed on the treaty by those who stand here and tell us it is the most important treaty every proposed.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, is it not true that our Navy has been notoriously inferior because of our lack of cruisers? Is it not true that our present program was to make up that deficiency?

Mr. REED. Our present program was calculated to make up that deficiency. It was thought by our naval experts that they had designed a battle cruiser that would overmatch the battle cruisers of any other country. There is more in regard to the cruisers, to which I will call attention in a few moments. I am trying now, although figures are always dull and difficult to follow, to convince the Senate with these figures of the absolutely helpless condition in which this treaty will place the American Nation.

When we compare the battleships of the British Navy and the battleships of the American Navy, we find that on the battleships of the English Navy, on all her best vessels, the guns are larger in every instance except with reference to three of our vessels.

We have, it will be observed, four vessels armed only with 12-inch guns—the *Arkansas*, the *Wyoming*, the *Utah*, and the *Florida*. Vessels with 12-inch guns may be eliminated from consideration, for, as H. C. Bywater, a British naval engineer, states, the 12-inch gun is no longer considered equal to the tactical requirements of the near future. On page 14 of "Sea Power in the Pacific" he says:

Capital ships armed with these guns have ceased to be reckoned as first-class fighting units.

According to the same author—

Capital ships are now rated according to their heavy guns upon the following basis: First-class ships, guns of 15 inches or more; second-class ships, guns of 13½ to 14 inches; third-class ships, guns of 12 inches or less.

All of Great Britain's 20 capital ships, therefore, are or will be able to take their places on the line, while but 14 of the 18 United States ships can do so. Japan's entire fleet of 10 ships can also take its place in the first line. Of this American fleet of 14, but 3 are or will be of the first class based on gun power, the remaining 11 belonging to the second class. Of Japan's 10, 2 are of the first class and the other 8 of the second class. As against this Great Britain has or will have 15 first-class and 5 second-class ships. In tabular form it works out as follows, and I print the table:

Class.	First.	Second.	Third.
United States	3	11	4
Great Britain	15	5	0
Japan	2	8	0

In addition to this, of the 20 other ships the minimum speed is or will be 22 knots, the maximum 31. Of the 10 first and second class Japanese battle vessels, minimum speed is 22 knots,

maximum 27½ knots. Of the 18 American first and second class vessels, the minimum speed is 20½ knots and the maximum speed 21 knots. It must be remembered that when fleets engage in combat each fleet generally strings out in single file. It is at once apparent that as a general proposition the fleet speed must be measured by the speed of the slowest vessel in the line. If the speed of the various ships in the three navies is compared we find that the slowest British ship has or will have a speed of at least 21 knots, the slowest American ship 20½ knots, and the slowest Japanese ship 22 knots. If the British fleet maintains all of its 20 vessels in line against our 18 ships she would have a fleet advantage of at least 1 knot an hour.

Mr. OVERMAN. Suppose we fail to ratify the four-power treaty, but ratify the naval disarmament treaty, what position would we be in, in that event, under the statement the Senator has just made?

Mr. REED. It is pretty difficult to answer that sort of a question as to which would be the worst of two bad things. My position is that the United States to-day is in a position to negotiate and to make proper treaties. We are not foreclosed by any blunders or mistakes that have been made, and now is the time to make the right kind of a bargain.

Mr. OVERMAN. A gentleman said to me that all these treaties are interdependent; that one rests upon the other. It looks as though that might be the case, according to the statements the Senator has made.

Mr. REED. I think not. I think we can make a treaty with regard to disarmament or reduction of armament without any difficulty. I will tell you why we can make it. We can make it because we have a lever that always has moved Great Britain. We have a greater power to-day than she has in the matter of building ships. We can, if we were compelled to do so, build three ships to her one. A nation that can not pay its interest to the United States and that can scarcely meet the expenses of its Government could not enter a naval race with the United States. As badly taxed as we are, we can nevertheless get the money. That does not mean that I am in favor of getting the money and building an enormous fleet, but it does mean that we are in a position to say to Great Britain: "We will make a reasonable agreement on limitation of armament. We will do everything that is fair; but if you do not accept a reasonable proposition, then we are in a position to take care of ourselves." And that is an argument that every Englishman can understand.

If we compare these first-class ships according to speed, we find the following state of affairs: The United States has three first-class ships with a maximum speed of 21 knots, Great Britain has four with a maximum speed of 29 knots, five with a maximum of 25, six with a maximum of 22, and Japan has two with a maximum speed of 23 knots. This disparity in speed would enable the British capital ships and all those of the Japanese to keep out of the range of the guns of our ships if they so desired. Their superior speed would give them the option of engaging our ships or of refusing, and also give them the ability to overtake any isolated vessel of our fleet.

In gun power, if we consider gun power as measured by large-caliber guns, we find a similar disparity. The United States will have three vessels armed with eight 16-inch guns. Their speed, however, will be but 21 knots and their displacement 32,600 tons. As against this Great Britain has or will have the two super-Hood battle cruisers with a speed of 29 knots and a displacement of 35,000 tons, and eight or ten 16-inch guns; also the battle cruiser *Hood*, with 31 knots, a displacement of 41,200 tons, and eight 15-inch guns. Japan has or will have two battleships, the *Mutsu* and the *Nagato*, each with a speed of 23 knots, a displacement of 32,500 tons, and eight 16-inch guns. If we eliminate these vessels as of comparative equal value, which, of course, is by no means true, we find that the remaining 15 American vessels which are able to take their places in the line are of the second class and armed with 14-inch guns, and the remaining 8 Japanese vessels are also of the second class and armed with 14-inch guns, while 12 of the British vessels are of the first class and have 15-inch guns, the remaining 5 being of the second class with 13½-inch guns.

At least 15 of the British vessels could outdistance and outshoot 15 of our 18 allotted vessels. By their superior speed they could select their range, and, while keeping out of range of our ships' guns, could still keep our ships within range of their guns. This would practically enable them to engage our vessels without any risk to their own.

All will remember the astonishment with which we found that Dewey had sunk the Spanish fleet at Manila and yet only one or two stray shells had struck an American ship; but the mystery was easily explained when we learned that our guns outranged the Spanish guns, and, accordingly, Dewey, very

properly, stood off out of range of the Spanish guns and battered the Spanish fleet to pieces. The same thing occurred, as I understand, although here I do not speak by the card, in the battle between the Japanese fleet and the Russian fleet.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, it happened also in the battle between the Japanese fleet and the Chinese fleet on the Yalu River; and that was the beginning of Japan's ascendancy.

Mr. REED. Yes. Of course, it is elementary, and yet it is worth while to state that a man with a rifle that will shoot 200 yards can stand off with perfect safety and fight all day with another man who is armed with a rifle that can shoot only 100 yards. Then, if he can run faster than the other man he can always preserve the distance between them, so that he can constantly be within killing range of the other man without a chance of himself being hurt at all. That is as true on the water as it is on the land.

Apart from the three ships of the *Maryland* class, which are equaled by the Hoods and super-Hoods, there is not a single ship in our allotted list to which the British can not oppose a vessel of superior speed and armed with larger guns, and still have two battle cruisers to spare.

It is also to be noted—indeed, it has already been noted—that we have no battle cruisers, which would mean that six British battle cruisers, with their tremendous speed and their 15 and 16 inch guns, could play havoc with any and all of our 15 slower and less heavily armed ships.

I might add that they could sweep our commerce from the seas, sinking every vessel, and we would have not a single vessel which could overtake them.

According to Lord Fisher, who really invented the battle cruiser, that type of ship armed and armored as heavily as a battleship, but with greater speed, is superior to the battleship. In all the naval engagements of the World War it was the battle cruiser that carried off the honors. Admiral Beatty's fleet was composed of vessels of this type. In the battle of Helgoland in August, 1914, it was the British battle cruiser in the squadron under Beatty that determined the result. In the battle of Falkland Islands, in December, 1914, it was the battle cruisers *Invincible* and *Inflexible* that put an end to Von Spee's squadron, which had preyed upon British commerce for months and had previously destroyed Admiral Cradock's British fleet.

In the Battle of Dogger Bank, in January, 1915, it was Beatty's squadron of five battle cruisers which won the day. This action particularly emphasized the importance of speed and long-range guns. In the Battle of Jutland it was Von Hipper and Beatty's British squadron of battle cruisers which did practically all the fighting, and developed all the strategy of the two main fleets. In spite of this the United States has no battle cruisers, and under this treaty has agreed not to build them. In this connection I ask consent to print in the RECORD a list of authorities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list referred to is as follows:

- (1) Lord Fisher, "Memories and Records," Vol. I, 22, 209-210; Vol. II, 143-144, 198-199, 222.
- (2) See generally F. Young: "With Beatty in the North Sea" and Lord Fisher's "Memories and Records."
- (3) Stevens and Westcott, "History of Sea Power," pp. 351-355.
- (4) *Ibid.*, pp. 358-366.
- (5) *Ibid.*, pp. 369-374.
- (6) *Ibid.*, pp. 286-409.

Mr. REED. Bywater, on page 118 of his recent book, says:

The circumstance that the American Navy does not as yet possess a single battle cruiser * * * detracts very appreciably from its power and readiness for war * * * it is certain that the want of such ships would most seriously handicap the fleet in any warlike operation.

Lord Fisher says that—

In the Great War the fast dreadnaught battle cruisers carried off all the honors.

The United States has actually on the ways six battleships in various stages of completion whose names and characteristics are as follows:

Lexington, *Constitution*, *Constellation*, *Ranger*, *Saratoga*, *United States*.

Displacement, 43,500 tons; speed each, 33½ knots; armament, 16-inch guns and torpedo tubes.

If those vessels had been built they would have outfooted any ship afloat; they would have been able to meet any battle cruiser on the water. They would have been able to protect our commerce against commerce destroyers; they would have been able to turn to flight in times of battle; they would have been able to have met and destroyed every slow laggard ship unless it was of the very first class of battle type. We are

graciously permitted to complete and to convert two of these as aircraft carriers, but the tonnage is not to exceed 33,000. To meet this Great Britain is to be allowed to construct two of her super-Hoods as aircraft carriers with the same limitation as to tonnage.

It was stated by the late Admiral Mahan in his book on naval strategy that if the first-line ships of two powers are on a parity and one nation has a superiority over the other in second-line ships it would be the part of strategy to force an engagement of the first-line ships. By such an engagement the ships of the enemy might be destroyed or at least so damaged they would be compelled to resort to repairs and be removed from the fighting line for some time. Thereupon the second-line ships would automatically become ships of the first line, and the superiority in ships of this type would control the situation.

In view of this principle it is interesting to study the fleets of cruisers and other auxiliary vessels which by reason of the fact that there is no restriction in the treaty with reference to these types of vessels the signatories now possess or will possess when their proposed building programs are completed.

Mr. President, without reading I ask permission to print a table showing the smaller vessels of the type I am now discussing which the United States has and also a table of the vessels of similar type which Great Britain will have or has.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The tables referred to are as follows:

Cruisers, first line, in process of construction and uncompleted.

UNITED STATES.

Vessels.	Com-	Dis-	Speed.	Armor	Broadside.						
					placed.	place-	over	vital	Principal	Guns.	Metal.
		Tons.	Knots	(1)	(2)	In.	In.	No.	No.	In.	Pounds.
Omaha.											
Milwaukee.											
Cincinnati.											
Richmond.											
Raleigh.											
Detroit.											
Trenton.											
Marblehead.											
Concord.											
Memphis.											

Cruisers, second line, completed.

UNITED STATES.

Vessels.	Com-	Dis-	Speed.	Armor	Broadside.						
					placed.	place-	over	vital	Principal	Guns.	Metal.
		Tons.	Knots	(1)	(2)	In.	In.	No.	No.	In.	Pounds.
Salem.											
Birmingham.	1908	3,750	24	.2	0	{ 4	5	-----	-----		
Chester.						{ 2	3	-----	-----		
Charlotte.	1908										
Missoula.	1906	14,500	22	5	9	{ 14	10	4	10		
Seattle.	1905					{ 4	6	2	6		
Huntington.	1903					{ 12	3	6	3		
Pueblo.	1903										
Pittsburgh.	1903	13,680	22	6	6	{ 14	8	4	8		
Frederick.	1903					{ 14	6	7	6		
Huron.	1904										
Charleston.	1904	9,700	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	4	4	{ 12	6	7	6		
St. Louis.	1905					{ 4	3	2	3		
Rochester.	1891	8,150	21	4	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	{ 4	8	4	8		
Olympia.	1892	5,865	21.6	4 $\frac{1}{2}$		{ 8	5	4	5		
Chicago.	1885	4,500	18			{ 10	5	6	5		

¹ Guns of 1899 pattern.

First figures under "Armor over vital parts" are for belt and second for turrets.

Cruisers, first line.

GREAT BRITAIN.

	Com-	Dis-	Speed.	Armor	Broadside.						
					placed.	place-	over	vital	Principal	Guns.	Metal.
		Tons.	Knots	In.	In.	No.	No.	In.	No.	In.	Pounds.
Courageous.											
		18,600	31	9	3	{ 4	15	4	15		7,680
Glorious.		22,700	33			{ 18	4	6	4		186
Emerald.	1918	7,600	32	3	0	7	6	6	6		600
Enterprise.											

¹ First figure covers belt armor; second figure, turret armor.

² See Jane's "Fighting Ships, 1921," pp. 56-59.

³ Normal displacement is 18,600 tons, but with full load is 22,700 tons.

⁴ Speed under full load is 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ knots faster, i. e., 32 $\frac{1}{2}$ to 33 knots.

Cruisers, first line—Continued.
GREAT BRITAIN—continued.

	Com-	Dis-	Speed.	Armor	Broadside.						
					placed.	Dis-	Speed.	over	Principal	Guns.	Metal.
		Tons.	Knots	In.	In.	No.	No.	In.	No.	In.	Pounds.
Cairo.		1918									
Calcutta.		1917									
Carlisle.		1917									
Capetown.		1917									
Colombo.		1917									
Despatch.		1918									
Diomedes.		1918									
Delhi.		1917									
Dunedin.		1917									
Durban.		1918									
Danae.		1916									
Dauntless.		1916									
Dragon.		1916									
Cardiff.		1917									
Ceres.		1917									
Coventry.		1918									
Curacao.		1918									
Curlew.		1917									
Edingham.		1922									
Frobisher.		1922									
Hawkins.		1919									
Raleigh.		1921									
Caledon.											
Calypso.		1916									
Caradoc.											
Centaur.		1916									
Cambrian.		1916									
Canterbury.		1916									
Castor.		1915									
Constance.		1916									
Calliope.		1915									
Champion.											
Caroline.											
Carysfort.											
Cleopatra.											
Comus.											
Conquest.											
Cordelia.											
Galatea.		1914									
Inconstant.		1915									
Royalist.		1915									
Phaeton.		1915									
Undaunted.		1914									
Birmingham.		1914									
Lowestoft.											
Southampton.		1912									
Dublin.		1913									
Weymouth.		1911									
Yarmouth.		1912									
Dartmouth.		1911									
Antrim.		1905									
Carnarvon.		1904									
Essex.		1902									
Shannon.		1907									
Birkenhead.		1915									
Chester.		1916									
Penelope.		1915									

¹ Building.

² The Undaunted carries 2 6-inch and 6 4-inch guns.

	Com-	Dis-	Speed.	Armor	Broadside.						
					placed.	Dis-	Speed.	over	Principal	Guns.	Metal.
		Tons.	Knots	In.	In.	No.	No.	In.	No.	In.	Pounds.
Adelaide.		1921									
Melbourne.		1913									
Sydney.		1913									
Brisbane.		1916									
Encounter.		1902									
NEW ZEALAND. ³											
Chatham.		1912									
Philomel.		1890									

and *Glorious*—are indeed battle cruisers, though not classified under the treaty as such.

The treaty provides, in chapter 1, article 12, as follows:

No vessel of war of any of the contracting powers, hereafter laid down, other than a capital ship, shall carry a gun with a caliber in excess of 8 inches.

The words "hereafter laid down" in connection with chapter 1, article 11, which limits cruisers to a maximum of 10,000 tons, precludes any cruiser of more than 10,000 tons or carrying larger than 8-inch guns. By reason of these words, however, Great Britain is allowed to retain both the *Courageous* and the *Glorious*, and to class them as cruisers. They carry side armor of 3 inches, turret armor of 9 inches, are armed with four 15-inch guns and eighteen 4-inch guns, and steam 33 knots.

Lord Fisher, the real inventor of the battle cruiser, regarded these two cruisers and their sister ship, the *Furious*, now used as an airplane carrier, as he did the battle cruisers *Renoion* and *Repulse*, classified under this treaty as capital ships. In the fight of Helgoland Bight in August, 1917, these two cruisers and the *Repulse* determined the outcome of the battle. I ask leave to print here a table of Japan's cruisers of the first line and cruisers of the second line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The table referred to is as follows:

Vessels.	Com- pleted.	Japan. ¹				Princi- pal guns.
		Tons.	Knots.	Inches.	No. In.	
Nisshin.	1904	7,750	20	6	4 8	
Kasuga.	1904	7,750	20	6	14 6	
Aso.	1902	7,800	21	8	2 8	
Idzumo.	1901	9,750	20 $\frac{1}{2}$	7	4 8	
Iwate.	1901	9,750	20 $\frac{1}{2}$	7	14 6	
Adzuma.	1901	9,426	21	7	4 8	
Yakumo.	1901	9,735	20 $\frac{1}{2}$	7	12 6	
Asama.	1899	9,700	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	7	4 8	
Tokiwa.	1899	9,700	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	7	14 6	
CRUISERS, SECOND LINE.						
Nagara.	1922					
Kuma.	1920					
Tama.	1920					
Kiso.	1921	5,500	33	3	7 5.5	
Kitakami.	1921					
Oh-4.	1921					
Tenryu.	1919	3,500	31	2	4 5.5	
Tatsuta.						
Chikuma.						
Yahagi.	1912	4,950	26	3	8 6	
Hirado.						
Tone.	1909	4,105	23	3	2 6	
Niitaka.	1904	3,420	20	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	6 6	
Tsushima.	1904	3,420	20	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	6 6	
Chitose.	1899	4,992	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	10 4.7	

¹ Jane's "Fighting Ships, 1921," pp. 271-281.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if cruisers are measured by displacement—and I should like Senators to realize this, because we can build no more large cruisers, but the cruisers of this class are allowed to be retained without restriction—we find, as the matter now stands, that the United States has 16 cruisers with an aggregate tonnage of 161,000 or 165,000; Great Britain has 60 cruisers, with a tonnage of 311,500; and Japan has 24 cruisers of this type, with a tonnage of 113,328. Of the cruisers which Great Britain has, 43 have been built since 1915, while the United States has but four built since that date and three built earlier than 1893, one of these dating back to 1885—old, obsolete, worthless craft—and but 16 of them against Great Britain's 60 modern cruisers of this type.

If these cruisers are compared on a tonnage basis, we find that of cruisers of 20,000 tons or over the United States has none, Great Britain has two, and Japan has none.

Of cruisers of 10,000 to 20,000 tons, the United States has eight, Great Britain four, and Japan none.

Of cruisers of 5,000 to 10,000 tons, the United States has 9, Great Britain has 9, and Japan has 15.

Of cruisers of 3,500 to 5,000 tons, the United States has 4, Great Britain has 40, and Japan has 9.

If we compare the caliber of the guns carried by the cruisers, we find the following to be true:

Of cruisers having 15-inch guns, the United States has none, Great Britain has two, and Japan none.

Of cruisers having 10-inch guns, the United States has three, and Great Britain and Japan have none.

Of cruisers having both 6 and 10 inch guns, the United States has 13, Great Britain 53, and Japan 16.

Of cruisers having 3 and 6 inch guns, the United States has five, Great Britain none, and Japan eight.

If we compare speed in the various cruisers, we get the following results:

Of cruisers of speed over 30 knots, the United States has four, Great Britain eight, and Japan eight.

Of cruisers of speed of from 28 to 30 knots, the United States has none, Great Britain has 40, and Japan none.

Of cruisers of speed of from 25 to 28 knots, the United States has none, Great Britain has four, and Japan three.

Of cruisers of speed of from 20 to 25 knots, the United States has 16, Great Britain 3, and Japan 13.

Of cruisers of speed under 20 knots, the United States has one, and the others have none as slow as that.

In other words, Great Britain has 48 cruisers of over 28 knots' speed, as against 4 of the United States and 8 of Japan.

Great Britain has 52 cruisers of 25 knots or over, as against 4 of the United States and 11 of Japan.

Coming now to aircraft carriers, Great Britain has seven aircraft carriers, the United States one—not complete—and Japan one. I print them in a table, with their speed and their armament and their aircraft-carrying capacity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Vessels.	Com- pleted.	Aircraft carriers.				Princi- pal guns.
		Displace- ment.	Speed.	Airplanes carried.	No. In.	
Langley ¹ .	(2)	19,360	12	34	4 5	
GREAT BRITAIN.						
Hermes.	1922	10,950	25	20	10 6	
Eagle.	1920	22,790	24	26	6 6	
Vindictive.	1918	9,750	30	6	4 7 $\frac{1}{2}$	
Furious.	1917	22,900	31	20	10 5 $\frac{1}{2}$	
Argus.	1918	14,450	20 $\frac{1}{2}$	20	2 4	
Pegasus.	1917	3,070	20 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2 12	No. Lb.
Ark Royal.	1914	7,080	11	10	4 12	
JAPAN.						
Wakamiya.	1901	7,600	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	4	2 12	

¹ Converted from a collier in 1920.

² Not completed.

Mr. REED. Coming now to merchant marine:

In the consideration of vessels designed for or adapted to use as fleet or fighting ships an examination of the merchant marine is most necessary.

Mr. LASKER, chairman of the United States Shipping Board, recently stated:

Granting that the 5-5-3 naval program, or some equivalent, be adopted, and that we have a naval holiday for a term of years, the question of naval equality is not solved; because if, in addition to the equalized navies, any one nation possesses a merchant marine of convertible strength vastly beyond that of another nation, the nation possessing that added convertible merchant tonnage has the preponderance of naval power.

As already stated, Mahan laid down the principle that the nation with the greatest naval reserve force of secondary or tertiary power will in the last analysis, when the ships of greater power are eliminated from the struggle, control the naval situation. In the application of this principle it is obvious that if a nation's capital ships, cruisers, and vessels designed for fighting are equal to those of another nation, the nation which possesses the greatest number of merchantmen convertible into fighting ships will have the advantage.

Chapter 1, article 14, of the proposed treaty provides:

No preparations shall be made in merchant ships in time of peace for the installation of warlike armaments for the purpose of converting such ships into vessels of war, other than the necessary stiffening of decks for the mounting of guns not exceeding 6-inch caliber.

It should be noted, therefore, that this treaty recognizes and impliedly approves the "installation of warlike armaments" upon peaceful merchantmen for the purpose of converting them into "vessels of war." The treaty merely provides that such installation and such conversion shall not be made in time of

peace. However, the treaty provides that even in peace time the decks of vessels not previously so constructed may be made sufficiently strong to support 6-inch guns, the number of such guns not being provided for. The treaty, however, does not restrict merchant vessels as to the number of guns which may be carried, nor does it restrict such guns to a 6-inch caliber. An analysis of the merchant vessels possessed by the United States and of those possessed by Great Britain is therefore most illuminating.

The tonnage of the entire American merchant marine, according to the latest annual report of the Shipping Board, was 12,115,571. The tonnage of the British merchant marine was 16,916,664. The tonnage of the Japanese merchant marine was 2,132,601. I print a table setting forth a comparison of this tonnage.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Gross tonnage.	Number of vessels. ¹	
	United States.	Great Britain.
15,000 and over.....	7	36
10,000 to 15,000.....	39	113
5,000 to 10,000.....	333	1,245
3,000 to 5,000.....	735	1,394
Total.....	1,114	2,788

¹ Lloyd's Register 1920-21, Vol. II, pp. 327, 346.

Mr. REED. In vessels of the 3,000-ton type or over which may be converted into war vessels, the ratio is over 2.25 to 1 in favor of Great Britain.

In vessels of 5,000 tons or over, the ratio is 3 to 1 in favor of Great Britain.

Taking into account vessels building in both countries, the ratio of vessels of 8,000 tons or over is 5 to 1 in favor of Great Britain.

Mr. Lasker on December 14, 1921, said:

When speed is considered, and speed is essential for naval purposes, the ratio is even more startling in favor of Great Britain; as of vessels of 22 knots and over she possesses 5, the United States only 1, a ratio of 5 to 1; in all vessels of 12 knots and over, which is the minimum speed useful for naval operations, she possesses 234, and the United States possesses only 53, a ratio of 4.4 to 1 in favor of Great Britain.

It is apparent, therefore, that the great advantage which Great Britain has over the United States in the number of merchant ships capable of conversion into vessels of war would insure Great Britain a superiority in naval power over the United States if the actual vessels of war possessed by these nations at all approximated equality. When this fact is taken in connection with the similar advantage which, under the terms of this treaty, is accorded to Great Britain over the United States in actual fighting ships, the superiority of Great Britain over the United States in naval power is tremendously increased.

Mr. President, if this treaty is ratified the American Navy will be left without any battle cruisers. This means that we will have no fast wings for quick operation or change of formation in time of battle, and no fast commerce destroyers of a heavy type, and no vessels able to meet the commerce destroyers of Great Britain. Great Britain and Japan are each left in possession of four ships of the character I am discussing.

In the matter of cruisers, as distinct from battle cruisers, the American Navy is practically helpless. The ones in our possession are old, weakly armed, and slow. Those in possession of Great Britain average in date of completion about 1917. The Japanese vessels average in date of completion about 1918.

Furthermore, we are distinctly inferior to the British in the number of merchant ships which may be employed in war. The use of such armed craft in future wars is openly forecast by the provision of the treaty allowing their decks to be strengthened to carry guns, even in time of peace. The disparity in merchant-ship tonnage appears even more dangerous when an examination of their classification shows that in large ships and in fast ships British superiority is even more pronounced than in the matter of total tonnage.

From what I have said it will be seen that the treaty takes cognizance only of the comparative tonnage of capital ships and aircraft carriers. It completely disregards all the other units just as valuable to the strength of a navy, such as cruiser forces and merchant marine; but, regarding the capital-ship tonnage alone, it is apparent that under a seeming equality there really exists a distinct inequality between the Navy which will be left to us and the one which will be left to Great Britain.

In the matter of aircraft carriers, Great Britain has at present nearly all of such vessels that there are in existence. The United States has only one slow-going collier, which is being converted and which is not yet completed. Japan has only one small merchantman, with no flying-off deck to it. France has one converted battleship, not yet completed. Great Britain has seven completed aircraft carriers which have been in service as long as four years. It is, therefore, the only nation which has had actual experience with this kind of craft; and although two of them are just recently completed, and are therefore to all intents and purposes new ships, Great Britain is to be allowed to count them as experimental craft and to replace them when it is found to be convenient.

Mr. President, I make no complaint that figures such as I have produced have not been listened to with patience by the Members of the Senate. They are problems to be studied with the figures upon paper before the student.

I make no complaint that throughout my address there has been generally a maximum of two Senators on the Republican side, because I never complain if I individually am not listened to. Indeed, none of us have a right to complain if we are not listened to. It is not only the right of every Senator to leave the Chamber, but to refuse to listen to the remarks of another Senator, and sometimes it must be done in self-defense. No personal pride enters into what I am saying.

I want a disarmament treaty made which will reduce to the minimum the armaments of all the nations of the world. I want that treaty so made that the United States will be safe and not placed at a disadvantage, and I am imploring the Senators who now pay me the compliment of their attention, and those who have been called away by other business, to study these figures, which I believe in every singular particular to be accurate, for I have taken pains to have them checked by two experts, who know their business if any two men in the United States know the business of comparing naval armaments and the speed and quality of ships.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Has the Senator made a comparison between the figures which he has given as to tonnage, armament, equipment, and so on, with the figures given at the open conference by the Secretary of State?

Mr. REED. The figures I have given are the same figures which are printed in the hearings; that is to say, when a ship is listed in the hearings as having a particular tonnage I have employed the figures given there. The difference is, as I have explained at length, when perhaps the Senator happened to be out, the English ships are listed under the English measure and the American ships under the American measure, and there is an actual disparity between the two methods of measurement in the British of one-eighth, or 12½ per cent.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I heard the Senator make that explanation, and I have been trying to find in the hearings a statement made by Secretary Hughes to the effect that that difference between the British and the American plans had in some way been reconciled.

Mr. REED. The only thing I found of that character is the statement that as to new vessels, vessels to be hereafter built, they are to be measured according to a rule which is there laid down, and that, of course, would give a uniform rule as to new construction; but that does not apply to vessels now in existence.

Mr. President, not because it has to do with the matter I have just discussed, but because I am called out of town for a day or two, I suggest to Members of the Senate, merely to think about, a question which I think is of importance. We have provided as follows in a recent act of Congress, the merchant marine act of 1920:

That from and after February 1, 1922, the coastwise laws of the United States shall extend to the island territories and possessions of the United States not now covered thereby.

And * * * that the foregoing provisions of this section shall not take effect with reference to the Philippine Islands until the President of the United States after a full investigation of the local needs and conditions shall, by proclamation, declare that an adequate shipping service has been established as herein provided and fix a date for the going into effect of the same.

In a word, the proposition is, upon the proclamation of the President, to extend our coastwise laws so that they will cover trade with the Philippine Islands.

The question I want to put to Senators for their consideration is, whether that will not raise a question justiciable by the four powers; whether the inevitable result would not be that Japan and Great Britain would insist that we had no right to extend to the Philippines our coastwise service and the protection of our coastwise laws, which would, of course, exclude foreign vessels from that trade?

Japan has already, not officially, but through the representative of one of her large steamship lines, raised the question and made a protest. At the same time, Japan has extended her coastwise regulations so as to include Formosa.

I am not prepared, because I have not been able to give study to the question, to state a conclusion, but two things occur to me as within the possibilities, and I suggest them without asserting them: First, that if we undertake to control the trade between the Philippines and the United States under our coastwise laws there will be a sharp protest on the part of Great Britain and Japan, and probably of France, and they will insist upon that as a question of dispute coming within article 1 of this treaty, and will insist on sitting down about the council table to determine it. When they do, every one of them will have an interest against the claim of the United States, and we can look for a three to one vote against us.

The second proposition I make is that it is well worthy of study, since Japan has already extended her coastwise regulations to Formosa, whether she may not assert a similar claim with reference to all of the islands she receives through these various treaties. I repeat, I merely suggest the question for thought, but I believe these two questions are worthy the most serious attention of the Members of the Senate.

My attention was called to this matter a few minutes before I took the floor, and called to my attention, as such things usually are, by a gentleman who could not have his name used because he is connected with the Government service. As soon as a man gets into the Government service he becomes tongue-tied. I do not blame this gentleman, who is a splendid man. If I were to tell his name, it would be recognized that he is a man for whom Senators have the highest regard, as I have. Such men are tongue-tied by virtue of their positions; but, as I said, my attention was called to it by this gentleman, who is so situated that he naturally might anticipate danger from such a proposition as is here involved.

I appeal to the Senate to give that consideration. It may be necessary, even if these treaties are ratified, that some reservation which will clearly protect American rights shall be put in.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Do our coastwise laws at present extend to the islands of the Hawaiian group?

Mr. REED. I think so.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is my impression. But they do not extend to the Philippines.

Mr. REED. They have not been extended to the Philippines, but I think they extend to the Hawaiian Islands; I am very sure they do.

Mr. President, there is much else I might say along the line I was previously following. I have a few concluding words which I present for the consideration of the Senate as to the naval strategy and the advantages we are giving other nations. The observations I am about to make are not mine. They were prepared for me in this form by a man who undoubtedly ranks high as a naval authority:

The general conduct of a war depends on many things. The elementary test of one navy's power as compared with another's depends on the strength which can be brought to and kept in the main theater of action. It is not what is back in the navy yards or in some distant bases, but what strength can be steadily maintained in the neighborhood where the fighting is to take place that is going to count.

The matter of equality of strength is directly connected with the capability of a navy to bring that strength to bear in the proper locality. The British have fleet bases all over the world, completely fitted with coal, oil, reserve supplies of ammunition, and dry docks. To count only the main ones outside of the home islands, they have Gibraltar, Malta, Suez Canal district, Colombo, Singapore, and Hongkong. Outside of the limits of the United States we have nothing to compare with any of these except for the docks at Panama.

The Japanese main bases are all in her home islands. But there is this great difference between her position and ours: If there is to be any war with Japan, it is understood all over the world that the nation fighting her must carry the conflict to her home waters. Her bases are just where she needs them. We have no base west of Honolulu equipped as a major fleet source of supply or repair.

The four-power treaty was so drawn as to make sure that we shall never be able to construct one and by that restriction, regardless of the size of Navy we may have, we are rendered helpless in the Pacific. If our Navy were ten times as large as it is, the fact that there will be no bases to receive it when it arrives in the vicinity of operations, no reserve supplies of food, fuel, and ammunition and no docks to receive wounded vessels or keep the fleet's bottoms clean, will prevent the operation of that force at any such distance from our bases as the Asiatic mainland.

Remember what happened to the Russian fleet in 1904. When it arrived at the end of its long voyage from the Baltic, the crews were worn out and exhausted by the extended passage; the machinery was crippled and the bottoms fouled by months at sea. The Japanese waited in their home waters for the coming of the Russian fleet. They trained their crews in perfect security. Their ships were clean and ready. The men were rested and confident. The complete obliteration of the slow, exhausted Russian fleet was effected in one day.

The point to be made here is that the Russians had to fight when they arrived. There were no bases to which they might go to rest and refit and clean their ships. The Japanese fought when they pleased and they had plenty of time in which to get ready to do it.

Furthermore, on the subject of fleet bases, it should be noticed that the longitude chosen to designate the western limit of the area in which no further fortifications are to be made was carefully chosen to exclude Singapore. And it is here that the British have repeatedly indicated their intention of establishing their main fleet base for the East and on which the New Zealand, Australian, and East Indian Squadrons are to be concentrated on a declaration of war, there to await the arrival of the main British fleet.

Hongkong comes within the area in which no expansion of the facilities and fortifications of bases is to be allowed. But Hongkong does not need any more. It is impregnably fortified already. It has been the main British base in the East for 60 years and neither trouble nor expense have been spared to make it perfectly secure.

On the other hand, public utterances and public articles have informed the people of this country that Manila and Guam can be captured with ease. The same articles have informed them that these American harbors (and the only ones fit to serve as a fleet base in the East) may be securely defended at a relatively small expense; that without them we shall be helpless in a war in that part of the world; that the four-power treaty will insure that helplessness.

With the restriction of our Navy and the provisions against preparing any fleet bases in the western Pacific, Japan will have gained an absolutely free hand in the Far East. If at any time we are not in accord with her policies, it will make no difference. We will be completely unable to interfere. In agreeing not to fortify the western bases, we have, to all practical purposes, abandoned that part of the world, and we are helpless to shape any action in it. In a word, the Japanese will have gained more from the results of the Limitation of Arms Conference than she could have hoped to secure by a successful war.

Great Britain, on the other hand, will be immediately relieved of the necessity of paralleling our new Navy, partially built. The flat saving to her will be about \$800,000,000, or the approximate cost of her fleet. She could, therefore, afford to pay almost any price for the success of the disarmament agreement. And the day it is signed she will sink six of the newest, biggest, and most formidable battle cruisers in the world and seven battleships of the same characteristics without firing a shot. In other words, her bag will be thirteen times as big as it was the day she met the Germans at Jutland.

She is further relieved of the extreme embarrassment which attended the expiration of the Anglo-Japanese treaty. It is a well-known fact that the conference of premiers of the British Dominions last summer refused to sanction the renewal of this treaty; that the opposition to the renewing of this pact was so severe that the British Home Government was unable to announce its policy in regard to the Anglo-Japanese treaty. This situation will be entirely and pleasantly cleared up by the four-power treaty.

Mr. President, all that I have laid before the Senate may be disregarded. We may close our eyes and go blindly forward to confirm these treaties, trusting in some way or other to the god of fortune to look after us, for it is perfectly plain that we can not trust to those who represented us when they tell us that the strategic value of the islands of the Pacific was not even considered.

A possible scene rises before me. I can see this Nation unhappily involved in war with Great Britain. I can see our fleet moving out, and as it goes every man upon the decks understands that in case the British Navy is met and overcomes the American Navy there will be no colors struck, there will be no surrender, but that as a vessel sinks, even as its decks are awash, the guns will still thunder their defiance and the last man will go to a watery death. That is the tradition of our Navy. It is also the tradition of the British Navy.

As the fleet sails out the men walking its decks will know, the men on shore will know, the women will know at that time if they do not know now that in tonnage the British have one-eighth more than we in battleships, that in guns they are vastly superior, that they can hurl broadsides far outweighing ours, and that their guns for the most part outweigh ours. They will know that we have not a single battle cruiser. They will know that Great Britain's battle fleet can sail away from us and that her cruisers can run around our fleet and utterly defy it. They will know that our slow-going fleet can not bring the British to a fight unless the British are willing to fight and to make the circumstances satisfactory to themselves when they enter the fight; to pick their day, their time, and their place, and they, of course, as sensible men, will pick the right day for them and the right time and place for them.

They will know, with cold hearts they will know, that we have sent our men out to a desperate venture, where they do not have a fair and equal chance. If you do not think of these disparities to-day, if you live until the event comes of which I am speaking you will think of them then, you will think of them with souls that will be horrified at your present carelessness, and you will think of them with the curses of fathers and mothers burning in your ears because you did not think and act when it was your duty to act.

You say we will never have a war with Great Britain. God knows I hope we will never have a war with any country; and yet as long as nations build great battle fleets, as long as they insist in bargaining that they shall have the advantage of the weapons, we know that war may come; and he who does not

look ahead and anticipate not certain dangers but possible dangers is unworthy the name of statesman and is a disgrace to the Government he pretends to serve.

I do not know what the result of this treaty fight will be, but I do know that there is to be a propaganda in the country, organized, systematized, and capitalized. I know that it has money to send out its agents, for I see the tracks of the agents. I know that it has the money to send out circulars and letters and telegrams by the thousands, for we see the evidence of them. Who is it that carries on this propaganda? What interest is back of it? Why is it done? Why this haste to drive these treaties through? Why the threat of night and day sessions until there was forced an agreement to vote? Why should not these measures have been submitted to the American people? The very men who now cry, "Haste, haste; drive on; drive on; make haste," a few months ago were standing across this aisle insisting that another great treaty involved the interests of America, and that it should be submitted to the grand assize of the people. The very men who now insist on driving through to a quick conclusion were the men who then insisted that the people had a right to know, to be advised, to understand. The very influences that are now propagandizing this country were then insisting upon submitting the question to a great referendum of the people. We had the grand assize; we took the vote. The present occupant of the White House had given the people of the United States to understand there never would be a treaty made while he was President that would involve the United States in any kind of a binding obligation, in any kind of an alliance. Upon the faith of his word he secured a majority of nearly 7,000,000 votes in the United States. I shall on another occasion put his language into the RECORD, and I hesitate not to charge that he has broken faith with the American people; that he has broken faith with millions of men who voted for him.

I hesitate not to charge that those upon the other side of the Chamber who stood with him a few short months ago have turned their coats, have altered their opinions because, forsooth, they now have a treaty presented to them by a man of their party; yet I can hear their words echoing in my ears when they proclaimed a few short months ago that they stood above all party alignments, that no party prejudice controlled their action, and that they were voting as Americans and lovers of their country. They repudiated reservations then; they insisted upon the doctrine of Washington then; they stood squarely fronting the issue; but now they crawl under the miserable veil of a miserable reservation. They have "gone to heel" as well-trained setters "go to heel" at the master's command.

And the master—from whom is he taking his commands? From Root? The man whose close connection with great and sinister interests was commented upon by a very distinguished gentleman at the time. From Root, who was in favor of the compact that was brought here from Versailles, and ready to swallow it in its entirety; who talked of reservations only because he hoped to allay the rising storm and to save the body of the instrument from defeat.

The President selected another as his chief adviser, the present Secretary of State, who was also in favor of entangling alliances, but who wanted to put in some reservations which every lawyer who has read the documents knows took out of it not one single essential quality. He was selected and placed at the head of the State Department.

The President chose another of those who stood ready to do that which he had throughout his long campaign denounced as a betrayal of his country, and elevated Mr. Taft to the highest judicial position in the world.

He went further. He found a gentleman who had lived all his life in Great Britain after he was 21 years of age; who has never yet voted in the United States; whose house and home were in England; who came to this country, and when he was asked his politics, said he was "a liberal," not knowing at that time enough about American politics to know our party names. Some months later, not knowing enough about our party politics successfully to classify himself either as a Republican or a Democrat, not himself knowing and nobody else knowing, accordingly a number of Democratic papers started running him for the Democratic nomination for President and a number of Republican papers started running him for the Republican nomination. He was also looked on with great favor by the Socialists and people of that kind. That man, Herbert Hoover, who was also in favor of world entanglements, was put into the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

Another member of his Cabinet has been quoted repeatedly as so favorable to foreign interests that he has advocated the cancellation of the American foreign debt, and I have never heard his denial of that statement.

The President calls a conference for the purpose of agreeing upon the reduction of armament, a thing dear to the hearts of all the people of this country and dear to the hearts of all the people of the world. Having called it for that purpose there comes out of it this alliance, which we are now told does nothing, and yet there is not a man who makes that statement, in my opinion, who makes it in good faith. I do not believe it possible for an intelligent man to make that sort of statement and believe it.

We are told that the conference has produced an agreement for naval equality. I have exposed the iniquity and subterfuge of that proposition.

As I stand and look at these empty benches I wonder where now are the gallant 18, the "irreconcilables," the men who said they would never put this country into an alliance with other countries; that they would never subject it to the decision of foreign powers; that they would stand by the doctrine of George Washington, which they declared to be immortal and indestructible. They have turned. They join not in the debate; they sit with silent lips. They apparently are ashamed of their own attitude, and take refuge in two statements: First, that this is a great treaty which will preserve the peace of the Pacific and prevent all onslaught in that direction by any power on earth; that it is a treaty of great power and great potentiality. They point to it and say, "there it stands, the Gibraltar of our hope, the protection of the peace of the waters of the Pacific, indeed of the waters of the world." Then, in the next statement they say, "the agreement amounts to nothing; it binds nobody to do anything; it is so weak and poor a thing that we can sign it because it is innocuous and can do neither harm nor good." That is the picture these gentlemen paint of themselves; and so they stand before the American people, one hand holding a treaty which they declare is powerful, potential, compelling, and the other hand holding a repudiation of all they have said. But it is now said the Republican Party has to do something; it has not done anything as yet, and so it had better do something, even if the something amounts to nothing.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, while I was absent yesterday afternoon in attendance upon the Committee on the Judiciary, which was considering the resolution inquiring into the eligibility of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] and Representative BURTON to membership on the World War Foreign Debt Commission, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] delivered a speech, from which I quote a brief extract. I read from page 3908 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The Americans who fought the War of Independence were Scotch and English and Welsh and Scotch-Irish. This crowd, now howling and pleading the baby act, had nothing to do with it.

A reading of the Senator's previous remarks indicates the Senator from Mississippi, in that elegant vernacular which he sometimes employs in the Senate, in referring to this "crowd" meant the large body of citizens of Irish extraction. I insist that, at least in the Senate of the United States, a man who pretends to be an historian, who has a reputation throughout the United States as an historian, ought not be permitted, unrebuked and unchallenged, to fall into such an egregious blunder as to say that the citizens of Irish extraction had nothing to do with aiding the patriot cause in the Revolutionary War.

Mr. President, in the latter part of the year 1778 and in the early part of the year 1779, during our American Revolution, there was dissatisfaction in England, and especially in Parliament, with reference to some of the movements of the English generals.

Severe strictures were made in Parliament against Sir William Howe, commander of the English forces on the American Continent, and a parliamentary investigation was had as to the evolutions and movements of the English troops in America.

Hon. Joseph Galloway, who had been for some 12 years speaker of the house of delegates or the house of assembly of the Pennsylvania Legislature, was called upon to testify before a joint committee of the two houses of Parliament. His testimony was published in the Royal Gazette, then printed by James Rivington, printer to the King, and in the issue of the Royal Gazette of Wednesday, October 27, 1779, the original of which is in the Congressional Library, and photographic copy of which I have here, the following testimony was given by Mr. Galloway:

Q. That part of the rebel army that enlisted in the service of the Congress, were they chiefly composed of natives of America or were the greatest part of them English, Scotch, and Irish?

Mr. Galloway answered:

A. The names and places of their nativity being taken down, I can answer the question with precision. There was scarcely one-fourth natives of America; about one-half Irish; the other fourth were English and Scotch.

The Senator from Mississippi is an historian, and he surely must know that in the fields of war the Irish race has furnished more luminaries than have been furnished by any other race in Europe. In our own Revolution we recall Gen. Greene; Gen. Richard Montgomery, who fell at Quebec and who was so highly esteemed as a soldier by that other great soldier, Aaron Burr, that when Montgomery fell at the head of his men, Burr rushed forward alone and, under fire of the English guns, carried back the precious body of Gen. Richard Montgomery; Gen. George Clinton, brigadier general, governor of New York and twice Vice President, was an Irishman; Andrew Jackson, whom as a soldier and statesman neither man nor muse can praise too much, was born of Irish parents who came from Carrickfergus.

We perceive that the Duke of Wellington, the Iron Duke, was an Irishman. So were Lord Kitchener and Lord Roberts and Gen. French.

Gen. James Shields, Senator from three States, was an Irishman.

In our war between the States we remember Generals Phil Kearney, McDowell, McCall, Thomas, Meagher, and gallant Pat Cleburn, all of Irish origin; and who does not recall the great triumvirate, Sherman, Sheridan, and Grant, all of Irish parentage? While on this subject let me remark that no more splendid figure arose out of the Civil War than the Irishman, Stonewall Jackson.

Charles Thomson, patriot, was born in Maghera, County Derry, Ireland, November 29, 1729. He was brought to this country in 1740, attended the academy of Francis Allison, and while very young was made principal of a Friends academy at Newcastle, Pa. He was respected and trusted by the colonists, and was a prominent local leader during the strained relations with the mother country. He was the secretary in every Continental Congress, 1774-1789, and from the private memoranda that he made compiled a history of the Revolution.

It will be remembered that Judge James Wilson, the grandfather of President Wilson, was born in County Down, Ireland; that the ancestors of President James K. Polk came from Donegal, Ireland; that the ancestors of President James Buchanan and President McKinley came from the same vicinity; that the ancestors of President Arthur came from Antrim, Ireland; and that the mother of President Roosevelt was Irish.

Agricola, who was born A. D. 37 and lived until about A. D. 93, advised the empire builders of his day that—

Rome should war down and take possession of Ireland so that freedom might be put out of sight.

Thus, in this early Roman reference to Ireland we pick up for the first time the golden thread of Irish militant resistance to imperial exploitation, and this thread of courage and patriotism runs through all Irish history.

On the one side is the "warring down" so that freedom might be put out of sight, and on the other it is the eternal struggle to uphold the rights of free men.

Contemplating the Europe that existed before the Christian era, in the east we find Greece; in the west we find Ireland, and it is Ireland alone amongst the lands of western Europe that preserves the recorded traditions of its speech, culture, and song that connect the half of Europe with its ancestral past.

It was the Irish race that lit the lamp of genius in the brain of Europe.

When the unlettered Welsh and English ancestors of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself were staring in mute amazement at the Phoenician and Carthaginian navigators who, before the Christian era, visited the Scilly Islands, then called the "Islands of Tin," to obtain a supply of that metal, the Irish race was fully acquainted with the use of precious metals, the fabrication of fine linens, was fond of music and song, and was enjoying its literature.

When the Druids at Stonehenge, on Salisbury Plain, made their last midnight sacrifice, the triennial council of the Irish people was held at the great hall or court of Tara, where Irish kings and nobles assembled.

King Alfred the Great ascended the English throne in the year 871 A. D., and he was indeed one of the world's wisest and noblest men. He ruled for 30 years, and he proved himself to be a valiant warrior and an earnest patron of whatever promised to promote the good of his people, but long before Alfred ascended the English throne the Irish race had scattered throughout Europe manuscripts of priceless masterpieces limned by Irish scribes, such as the Book of Kells in the library of Trinity College at Dublin, acknowledged to be the most beautiful book in the world; indeed, into its pages are woven such a wealth of ornament and it has such an ecstasy of art that the colors are as lustrous, as fresh, and as soft as though it was the work of yesterday, but the book was made 1,200 years ago.

In the fields of oratory and poetry history swarms with the names of Irish orators and poets whose lips were touched by the Promethean fire.

Shakespeare tells us how imperial governments looked upon Ireland in his day. Historians will recall that Richard II landed in Ireland the first time in 1394, and Shakespeare, who erected a mighty dome which fills and glorifies the intellectual sky, made Richard II say this of Ireland:

We will ourselves in person to this war.
And, for our coffers, with too great a court,
And liberal largesse, are grown somewhat light,
We are enforced to farm our royal realm;
The revenue whereof shall furnish us
For our affairs in hand; if that come short,
Our substitutes at home shall have blank charters;
Whereto, when they shall know what men are rich,
They shall subscribe them for large sums of gold,
And send them after, to supply our wants;
For we will make for Ireland presently.

Again, speaking of his uncle, John of Gaunt, brother of Lionel, Duke of Clarence, Shakespeare said:

Now put it, Heaven, in his physician's mind
To help him to his grave immediately!
The lining of his coffers shall make coats
To deck our soldiers for these Irish wars.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that I am interested in his remarks, and he reminds me of the fact that my ancestors, the Northmen, sometimes called the Norse pirates, occupied Ireland for a hundred years. They had Norwegian kings in the city of Dublin, and I have an idea that they left some of their warlike and piratical spirit among the Irish.

Mr. ASHURST. I have no doubt they did; the Senator from Minnesota frequently leaves with us no piratical spirit, indeed, because he is too honorable to be a pirate, but he frequently leaves his warlike spirit with us, and when the seats here, which have known him for so many years, no longer know him, which I hope will be many years yet, he will be remembered with affectionate regard by his fellows who served with him here, because never in all his long service in public life has he seen fit to insult any of the races making up the United States, or any of our fellow citizens.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NORRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I am sure it must be in the mind of the Senator, though he has not mentioned it, that the Irish planted religion and education in Europe. The great Emperor Charlemagne imported school-teachers from Ireland, and the great missionary Columbanus and others carried the Christian religion into western Europe. The greatest lawyers, the greatest orators, and some of the greatest poets, as well as the greatest warriors who ever lived, were Irish.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator for his reinforcement of my argument. I confess I would have overlooked it if I knew it. I do not know that I was aware of the fact, but since the Senator has refreshed my mind I will be glad to rest the case there, because I prefer to trust to the accuracy of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WATSON] rather than to the accuracy of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] on this Irish question, because I think the Senator from Georgia has no bias and no prejudice against any race, and for that he is to be congratulated.

As in legislative session,

LEGISLATIVE SUGGESTIONS.

Mr. McNARY. I have received a very interesting letter from a citizen of the State of Oregon, open in its character, and he desires me to request that it be read in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it may be read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

An open letter to all Members of the United States Congress, Senators and Representatives, Washington, D. C.

PORTLAND, OREG., March 5, 1922.

GENTLEMEN: In order that you may get an intelligent idea of economic conditions throughout the United States, I suggest that at the close of the present congressional session each of you don the usual dress of a farmer or industrial worker, have but a dollar or two in your pocket, and no check book.

Thus, traveling incog, hike from your present luxurious surroundings to your home wherever that may be. Camp with the wayfarer; visit mines, factories, and farms; take potluck with Uncle Sam's children everywhere. See their daily routine, hear their plaints and prayers, heft their load of handicap and responsibility, estimate their love of home and country, their loyalty, courage, patience, and perseverance, get in touch with the great, throbbing heart of the American people.

Then, when you have arrived at your own home, gather about you the most reliable and complete statistics of our Government and civil activities and figure out how these people are to pay the usury—wrongly

called interest—on our aggregated indebtedness, which—national, State, county, municipal, school districts, port districts, improvement districts, transportation corporations, industrial corporations, private mortgages, notes, and bank loans—is not less than \$200,000,000,000, approximately \$2,000 for each man, woman, and child in the United States.

At 6 per cent compounded annually this sum doubles itself in a little less than 12 years. Is it not time we quit the little side shows and gathered in the one big circus of human woes under one canvas?

In another 10 years mortgages will have taken both the Republican elephant and the Democratic ass. On what, gentlemen, will you then ride?

The estimated wealth of the United States is approximately \$400,000,000,000. If we persist in our present monetary insanity, we have but to consider the accumulated results of the last 10 years to know what our circumstances will be 10 years hence.

The equilibrium beyond which even big business dare not go now confronts us. What are you going to do with the usury system which has brought us to our present deplorable state of affairs?

Cordially yours,

C. L. LOCKE.

MR. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Oregon whether this is an argument in favor of the League of Nations, or against the bonus, or in favor of abrogating and repudiating the public debt entirely?

MR. McNARY. I think it is very largely a reflection of some of the speeches and notions so eloquently expressed by the Senator from Utah.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2897) to appropriate \$5,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain and of feed to be supplied to farmers in the crop-failure areas of the United States, said amount to be expended under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and that the House receded from its amendment numbered 4 to the said bill.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

MR. JONES of Washington submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10559) "making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 32, 33, 34, 37, 40, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 58.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 39, 44, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, and 57; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,598,410"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$802,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 10

of the bill, in line 14, strike out "\$1,741,780" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,737,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,176,975"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,206,810"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$18,651,805"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$589,380"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,916,920"; and the Senate agree to the same.

W. L. JONES,
SELDEN P. SPENCER,
WM. J. HARRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

MILTON W. SHREVE,
E. C. HUTCHINSON,
W. B. OLIVER,

Managers on the part of the House.

MR. JONES of Washington. This is a full agreement. I ask for the immediate consideration of the report.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NORRIS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

THE MUSCLE SHOALS PLANT.

MR. McNARY. Mr. President, a few days ago a desultory debate took place in the Senate regarding Muscle Shoals and the nitrate plant there, particularly with reference to the offer of Mr. Ford. The eloquent and distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] seems to have agreed upon a verdict favorable to Mr. Ford, and evidently wants the Government to accept his offer. At that time I suggested and counseled that all these offers be given serious consideration, and, I think, expressed the opinion that the plant is more or less obsolete and that a change in the process would be necessary.

Having that in mind, I call attention to the fact that on Tuesday, March 14, there appeared an article in the Washington Post regarding the matter, which I ask unanimous consent to have read by the Secretary.

There being no objection, the Assistant Secretary read as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Tuesday, Mar. 14, 1922.]
SAYS FORD WOULD LOSE "LAST PENNY" ON PLANT—MUSCLE SHOALS, EXPERT DECLARES, CAN NOT PRODUCE COMMERCIAL FERTILIZERS.

Charles L. Parsons, consulting chemist and former technical adviser to the Government on nitrate fixation, testified yesterday before the House Military Committee that Henry Ford or any other person or company would "lose their last penny" before they ever produced commercial fertilizers at nitrate plant No. 2, at Muscle Shoals, Ala. The plant which has cost the Government about \$69,000,000, the witness said, was designed to be operated only by the cyanamid process of nitrate fixation, an obsolete method, and was worthless as a fertilizer producer.

The cyanamid process was condemned by Mr. Parsons as obsolete and economically impossible, having been superseded, he declared, by improved methods. It was his conviction, he added, that the Muscle Shoals plant could not be redesigned to produce commercial fertilizers. This judgment was based, he explained, on a thorough investigation of the cyanamid plants in Europe, many of which were being closed down by bankrupt operators, while others already had gone out of business because they could not compete with establishments using the improvements.

MR. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word at this juncture. Replying to the statement in the Washington Post which was read by request of my good friend the Senator

from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], it is in keeping with the suggestion I made a few days ago to the effect that the present plant at Muscle Shoals does not manufacture a complete fertilizer. Henry Ford will put in the necessary equipment at Muscle Shoals to manufacture fertilizer complete. I can not understand how any man of intelligence would write an article to the effect that fertilizers can not be manufactured at Muscle Shoals. There are a few fertilizer factories in my State now operating on a small scale. If they can manufacture fertilizer complete, why can not a man of Henry Ford's financial strength, skill, and genius put up a plant on a large scale and manufacture commercial fertilizer? There is no doubt on earth but that he will be able to do that. He is going to contract with the Government that he will do it and there is no doubt about his being able to do it. With the equipment already established at Muscle Shoals certain fertilizer ingredients can be manufactured now. Henry Ford has been to Muscle Shoals. He has seen the plants that now turn out certain fertilizer ingredients and he says that he can manufacture and that he will manufacture a complete fertilizer at Muscle Shoals. That is all I care to say just now.

RELIEF OF FARMERS IN CROP-FAILURE AREAS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. LADD. I ask leave to call up the conference report on Senate bill 2897, which I submitted yesterday. I do not think there will be any discussion of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the following conference report, which will be read.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2897) to appropriate \$5,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain and of feed to be supplied to farmers in the crop-failure areas of the United States, said amount to be expended under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 3, and 6, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum \$1,000,000 proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,500,000"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"An act to appropriate \$1,500,000 for the purchase of seed grain to be supplied to farmers in the crop-failure areas of the United States, said amount to be expended under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture."

And the House agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the amendment of the House numbered 4.

E. F. LADD,
PETER NORBECK,
JOHN B. KENDRICK,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
G. N. HAUGEN,
J. C. McLAUGHLIN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. KING. This is a partial report, I understand?

Mr. LADD. No; it is a full report. The House recedes from amendment numbered 4.

Mr. KING. There are two messages from the House then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the action of the House receding from amendment numbered 4 to the bill. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WARREN. Let me ask the Senator to what figure the report reduces the amount?

Mr. LADD. From \$5,000,000 to \$1,500,000. It cuts out the appropriation for feed altogether.

Mr. WARREN. This is for seed?

Mr. LADD. For seed entirely.

The report was agreed to.

BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2531) to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and

for other purposes. It is a local bill reported unanimously from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. KING. Let the bill be read.

Mr. HARRISON. Reserving the right to object, I should like to know something about the purposes of the bill.

Mr. CAPPER. It proposes to create a board of accountancy in the District of Columbia. There is no regulation of any kind in so far as accountancy is concerned in the District. The bill is in line with the law in two-thirds of the States of the Union and is recommended by the Government departments in Washington, especially the Internal Revenue Bureau, which is most concerned.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Is it not correct that a school has been organized in the District to teach accountancy and is giving certificates, or rather diplomas, to people as certified public accountants without any regulation of the District or otherwise?

Mr. CAPPER. That is true.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The purpose of the bill is to provide a regulatory body to control and put them very much on the basis of similar work in the States where they are now controlled by State laws?

Mr. CAPPER. That is exactly the purpose of the bill. There is a so-called school here now that is issuing or pretending to issue certificates or diplomas which have really no value. The bill is intended to protect the District of Columbia against that sort of business.

Mr. HARRISON. So if the bill becomes a law, anyone who desires to become a public accountant must make application to some commission or board and pass an examination before a certificate is issued and before he can become a public accountant?

Mr. CAPPER. Before he can be a certified public accountant, I suggest that the report of the committee be read. It will explain the matter.

Mr. HARRISON. The bill is unanimously reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. CAPPER. Oh, yes.

Mr. HARRISON. And it has passed the House?

Mr. CAPPER. No; it is a Senate bill. It has the approval of the District Commissioners; it has the approval of the accountants of this city and of the various departments of the Government.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I rise for a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the record show that the Senate has returned to legislative session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does not.

Mr. LODGE. It is done by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Kansas is for unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of a bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. I merely wish to understand the status.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah ask that the bill be read? He made that request, and the reading was interrupted.

Mr. KING. I wish to ask a question or two in regard to the measure, and probably, if those answers are satisfactory, I shall not ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has submitted the request of the Senator from Kansas for the present consideration of the bill, which has not yet been agreed to by the Senate. That is now pending.

Mr. KING. I do not object to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2531) to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Washington or the Senator from Kansas whether they regard a bill of this character as necessary in the District?

Mr. CAPPER. There is a very strong demand for it. The District Commissioners believe that it is necessary. The Government departments here are very much interested in it. The Internal Revenue Bureau, which employs a large number of accountants and which is interested in accountancy as it is carried on in the District, particularly requests a measure of this kind. It is in line with laws that are now in effect all over the

country. It simply guarantees careful accountancy and some responsibility by certified public accountants.

Mr. KING. I understand there is a demand throughout the country, and I have had hundreds of letters from all parts of the United States urging that I support the bill. It seemed to me there must have been some propaganda or some persons interested in securing the passage of the measure, or there would not have been this appeal, which is nation-wide in character, in favor of the bill.

It looks as though this is in line with the demand that everybody who intends to prosecute a business shall get a license; that you have to put the stamp of the Government or some Government functionary upon everybody; that you must get a license before you can engage in any business.

Of course, I appreciate the fact that it is difficult to draw the line. Lawyers have to pass an examination. Even barbers now have to pass an examination. Practically everybody who practices any sort of a profession is compelled to pass an examination and get a license. After a while no one can be a farmer or a bricklayer or even a worker upon the streets unless he passes an examination and gets a license. You will have to have a Government stamp upon your back before you can do anything.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the Senator will permit me, I think this is very much in line with the profession of law or of medicine and matters like that, because the certified public accountants do a special kind of business and that business requires special qualifications if it is to be done properly. I understand, although I may be mistaken, that there are only about 2,500 or 3,000 certified public accountants in the United States. To be a certified public accountant a man is supposed not only to have experience, but special training as well.

As I understand the situation here in the District, a school has been organized and issues what purports to be, and I suppose are, in the absence of regulations, certificates under which a person may claim to have a certificate as a duly certified public accountant. They may have practically no qualifications such as are generally required by public accountants in the States.

It is the purpose of the bill to see that the men who hold certificates as certified public accountants are duly qualified, just like I think everybody would concede that a man who is admitted to the bar should be admitted under such circumstances and regulations as will be a reasonable guaranty to the public that he has had the necessary training and has gone through the necessary studies. That is, the purpose of the bill with reference to certified public accountants in the District of Columbia is to see to it that the man who holds himself out as a certified public accountant has had the training that is generally required of those who hold certificates of that character. As I understand it there are now no such regulations in the District.

Mr. KING. May I say that a number of individuals have written me protesting against the bill. They say it is an attempt upon the part of a certain select few to monopolize the accountancy business of the United States; that the few want to get control of the bookkeeping or the accounting business in the various States, and then in the United States, and that they want to keep out of the work of accountancy those who do not take examinations.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The purpose of the committee, I am satisfied, is to protect the public, as far as it can be done by reasonable regulations, from men who are not fitted to do work they claim they are able to do, and which is work that requires special training and special qualifications.

Mr. KING. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that in many lines of activity men representing themselves to be competent are employed, and the employer soon discovers their incompetency, if they prove to be incompetent, and discharges them and seeks somebody else to perform the task.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course, that is true; but I do not think the Senator would contend for a moment that anybody who wants to practice law should be permitted to do it without any preparation or special qualification. I think that the work of a certified public accountant, so far as I know it, although I am not an accountant, is work which requires special training and special study in order that a man may be fitted to do it. If I had anything of the kind to be done, I would want to know that the man I was employing had had reasonably proper training.

It is a question of the interest of the public. It may, of course, result in keeping some people out of that business who would like to go into it without any special preparation. Possibly a good many people might like to go into law without being required to go through a certain course of study, and all that sort of thing, but in the interest of the public regulations

are made and boards are provided, so that the man who holds a certificate along certain lines may be assumed at least to be reasonably well qualified to do the work.

Mr. KING. I wish to call the attention of the Senator to a complaint which was made by a merchant in a communication to me. He stated that in order to get credit he had to furnish from a certified accountant the condition of his business, his liabilities, assets, and so forth, and that the certified accountants seemed to be banded together; that they charged him \$50 a day to make the examination; and that it took weeks, whereas a competent bookkeeper, one who had kept his books and who knew the business, could have furnished such a statement within a day or two, or two or three days, at the outside; but he was not permitted to employ him or one of that character; that his own bookkeeper knew far more about accountancy than did the certified accountant; and that he was compelled to pay hundreds of dollars in order to furnish that statement.

There is complaint that legislation of this kind is in the interest of a select few; that it is to build up an organization composed of the elite and to let them monopolize the business. Of course, they convey the idea that no one else is competent to submit a report or to examine books except members of their particular organization. I am not criticizing the public accountants, for I know many of them, and they are very able men.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to suggest that in the case cited by the Senator the public accountant probably was not responsible for the request that he be employed, but that the man to whom application was made for a loan insisted before he would make the loan, or whatever the transaction was, that a report should be made to him by persons in whom he had confidence. That is a very natural attitude. While the merchant to whom the Senator from Utah referred may have been satisfied that his bookkeeper could have made a satisfactory report—and he might have been able to do so; I do not know—nevertheless, as I have indicated, the man who was furnishing the accommodation would not be satisfied with such a report. I can very naturally see how that would be true. If I had a large amount of money to invest in a very complicated business, at any rate, or in making a loan, I should want a report from a man who I was confident knew what he was doing when he was preparing his report.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, this legislation, of course, is in line with the legislation which is being enacted in the States and in municipalities and in Congress. It presupposes the incapacity of the people to look after their own business. We have to have boards and commissions and organizations and Federal and State and municipal supernumeraries to put their hands upon the people. After awhile we shall have more boards and commissions and officials than we shall have persons who work; we shall have just two classes—those who toil and the great class of officeholders, and the latter will outnumber the toilers. Instead of each toiler carrying a soldier on his back he will carry an officeholder or some member of a commission. I suppose, however, we can not stem the tide of this legislation, for it seems to be quite agreeable to the sentiment of the people.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have much sympathy with the latter suggestions of the Senator from Utah, I will say.

Mr. SHEPPARD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has the Senate resumed legislative session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the request to consider the bill was granted. The Chair considered the bill, of course a legislative proposition, and assumed that the Senate had resumed its legislative session only to the extent of the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I did not understand that the request was to have the bill considered as in legislative session. I simply wanted to have the RECORD show that it was being so considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understood. The amendments reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia will be stated.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, in section 4, page 3, line 12, after the word "or" to insert the word "one"; in line 15 to strike out the letter "c" and to insert the letter "b"; in the same line to strike out the letter "d" and insert the letter "c"; in line 17 to strike out the letter "e" and insert the letter "d"; in line 20 to insert a comma after the word "accountant"; in line 22 to strike out the letter "f" and insert the letter "e"; on page 4, line 4, to strike out the letter "e" and to insert the letter "d"; in line 11 to strike out the letter "e" and insert

"d"; and in line 14 to strike out the words "provided such person also holds the diploma required in said clause (e)," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That the board of accountancy shall not grant a certificate as a certified public accountant to any person other than (a) a citizen of the United States, or one who has duly declared his or her intention of becoming such citizen, who is over the age of 21 years, and (b) of good moral character, (c) who is a graduate of a high school with a four years' course or has had an equivalent education, and (d) who has received a diploma from some recognized school of accountancy and has had one year's experience in the employment of a practicing certified public accountant, or has had three years' experience in the employ of a practicing certified public accountant, and (e) except under the provisions of section 6 of this act, who shall have successfully passed examinations in the theory and practice of general accounting, in commercial law as affecting accountancy, and in such other related subjects as the board may deem advisable: *Provided*, That the board of accountancy may waive the provision for accounting experience as set forth in clause (d) above, and in lieu thereof may hold in abeyance a certificate to any person who shall otherwise have qualified until such time as the applicant can prove to have served two years in the employ of a practicing certified public accountant: *Provided further*, That the board may waive the requirement for service in the employ of a practicing certified public accountant, as set forth in clause (d) above, in the case of any person who has had not less than five years' actual and continuous experience in auditing the books and accounts of other persons in three or more distinct lines of commercial business, but nothing contained in this act shall be construed as granting any power to waive any provision of this act other than as set forth herein, nor shall any such waiver be granted except by the unanimous vote of the members of the board.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KING. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Kansas whether this bill imposes any charge upon the District of Columbia and whether it imposes any limitation upon the compensation which the board of accountancy may charge for their services?

Mr. CAPPER. It provides for a charge of \$25 for an examination, which will take care of the cost of conducting the examination and the expenses of the board.

Mr. KING. The board, then, may absorb the entire amount they receive from the applicants for licenses?

Mr. CAPPER. The board is appointed by the commissioners, and are officers subject to their direction the same as is any other board in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KING. The point I am trying to get at is that there is no charge upon the District?

Mr. CAPPER. Not at all.

Mr. KING. Is this board permitted to absorb all of the income which is derived from the applicants?

Mr. CAPPER. No; they must turn in the fees to the District of Columbia?

Mr. KING. What will they receive for their services? If there were 1,000 applicants in a year, the collections would amount to \$25,000. Would the board absorb it all? Is there any limitation?

Mr. CAPPER. The provision of the bill governing that matter reads as follows:

From the fees collected under this act the board shall pay all expenses incident to the examinations, the expenses of issuing certificates, and traveling expenses of the members of the board while performing their duties under this act; and if any surplus remain on the 30th day of June of each year the members of the board shall be paid therefrom such reasonable compensation as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may determine: *Provided*, That no expenses incurred under this act shall be a charge against the funds of the United States nor the District of Columbia. The board shall annually report the number of certificates issued and the receipts and expenses under this act during each fiscal year to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. KING. Then, they have to wait until the end of the year to find out how much has been received, and the commissioners then determine what compensation shall be paid each member of the board?

Mr. CAPPER. They make return of the fees received to the District Commissioners.

Mr. KING. The Senator read something about traveling expenses. What traveling expenses will they have?

Mr. CAPPER. Traveling expenses in the District of Columbia, of course, can not be very much of an item.

Mr. KING. It is not intended that they shall go outside of the District to make examinations?

Mr. CAPPER. Not at all.

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

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

GULF, FLORIDA & ALABAMA RAILWAY CO.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2599) for the relief of the receiver of the Gulf, Florida & Alabama Railway Co. The bill was introduced over a year ago, and was referred to the Committee on Claims. It has the unanimous report of that committee, and the recommendation of

the department. It has also passed the scrutiny of the Budget authorities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida for the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. KING. Reserving the right to object, I ask that the bill be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$27,008.04, for the relief of the receiver of the Gulf, Florida & Alabama Railway Co. as full compensation for amounts expended and unreclaimable in connection with the construction of an extension of tracks to the United States naval air station and yard at Pensacola, Fla.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator if appropriations have not been made for the Navy Department to meet that charge, if it is a charge against the Navy Department?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; the Navy Department have no funds out of which to pay it. The Secretary of the Navy recommends the passage of this bill; the Navy Department have examined it and admit they ordered the railroad track built to the air station and the expense to be incurred by the railroad company. They have checked up the amount and find it accurate and recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, would the Senator object to having an amendment added to the bill providing that the amount appropriated shall be a charge against the Navy Department? The point I have in mind is this: We frequently make appropriations for Army expenses or for Navy expenses which are not charged either to the Army or to the Navy, and when we seek to ascertain the expenses of the Army or the Navy many items which are chargeable against those services are charged to some other fund, and the result is we do not always know what the Army and the Navy cost.

Mr. FLETCHER. The transaction involved in this bill was incident to the operations carried on during the war. The track was built for the naval air station during the war, and the expense was incurred at the instance of the Navy Department. There is no question about that. I repeat the Secretary of the Navy has recommended this course. I do not know how we could amend the bill so as to provide that the amount appropriated shall be charged to the Navy. The bill speaks for itself in that connection. As I have said, it grows out of the naval operation at the naval air station at Pensacola.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator why it has not been included in some naval bill?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not know that it belongs on the naval appropriation bill. It should properly, I think, come in the form of a separate bill. The Navy Department has no funds to take care of it otherwise.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, is this one of the expenditures made by the Director General of Railroads under the Federal control act?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the director general ordered it.

Mr. CUMMINS. If this is one of the expenditures made by the director general as an addition to or a betterment of a railroad of which he was in possession, then the railroad became bound, under the terms of that act, to repay the Government of the United States the amount so expended. I do not know just how the expenditure was made, or when it was made; but if it is one of the expenditures made by the director general for additions or betterments to a railroad the Government is under no obligation whatever to pay that money.

Mr. FLETCHER. This is only what has remained after salvaging everything in connection with it. This expenditure was incurred at the instance of the Navy Department and is the balance due this company. The Secretary of the Navy reports:

Further replying to the committee's letter of October 24 last, you are informed that careful consideration has been given to Senate bill 2599, "For the relief of the Gulf, Florida & Alabama Railway Co."

In May, 1918, it was deemed advisable to obtain the extension of the tracks of the Gulf, Florida & Alabama Railway Co. to the naval air station at Pensacola, Fla., and an arrangement was made with the receiver of the road having that end in view.

The right of way was acquired by the receiver and the grading done and the material necessary purchased, but the road had not been finished at the signing of the armistice, with the consequent discontinuance of its construction.

Such portions of the material as were available were used by the receiver on other parts of the railway under his control, but there remained expenditures for right of way, grading, bridges, etc., which could not be salvaged. These amounted to \$27,008.04—

The amount in this bill.

While it is probable that the receiver at the inception of this work anticipated that he would be reimbursed through the traffic to be obtained, it is also true that the early discontinuance of the work, before the receipt of any traffic earnings, was not anticipated. I am therefore

of the opinion that this legislation should pass, and recommend favorable action by the Congress.

A clear comprehension of the entire question may be obtained from the statement of claim filed by the receiver, of which a copy is herewith transmitted for your information.

This proposed legislation has been submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as required by paragraph 3 (b) of Circular No. 49 of that bureau, and the director advises that this request for legislation is not in conflict with the financial program of the President.

Sincerely, yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. CUMMINS. I take it from the statement just read that the Senator is in error with regard to the conditions under which the additions or betterments were made. They were not made by the director general.

Mr. FLETCHER. No; and they were not really completed when the armistice was signed.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Federal control act did not end with the armistice.

Mr. FLETCHER. No. They were made by the receiver at the instance of the Navy Department.

Mr. CUMMINS. With that understanding I make no objection to the bill; but if the director general made the improvements or ordered the betterments, then under the terms of the act which control him there would be no liability on the part of the United States. On the contrary, the railroad company itself, if the director general expended the money, would be under obligation to return the money so expended.

Mr. FLETCHER. I misunderstood the Senator. That was not the situation here. The claim is a very just one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether this provision, which I find in the report, would change the conclusion which he now apparently has reached? I see an agreement here signed by the syndicate managers of the reorganization of the Gulf, Florida & Alabama Railway Co., and so forth, as follows:

Agreement made this —— day of June, 1918, between John T. Steele and W. F. Fuqua & Co., as syndicate managers under the plan and agreement for reorganization of the Gulf, Florida, & Alabama Railway Co., dated November 2, 1917, party of the first part, hereinafter known as the "syndicate managers," and the Capital Issues Committee, party of the second part, hereinafter known as the "committee."

Then the agreement proceeds to set forth certain conditions under which, I suppose, issues might be made. Is there anything there which would indicate—

Mr. CUMMINS. No; the War Finance Corporation furnished some of the money which the director general expended, but under the law the director general went forward and spent or agreed to spend whatever money was necessary to put properties in the proper condition to operate and to make such extensions as the war service required at that time; but the same agreement provided that the railroad companies should return to the Government the moneys thus expended, and they are doing that now. They must return altogether more than a billion dollars; and I thought, from the first reading of the bill, that this might have been an expenditure made under that act.

Mr. FLETCHER. No.

Mr. CUMMINS. From the reading of the report, however, I take it that it was not made by the director general at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. No; not at all. The road was released entirely in order that the receivers might make this contract with the Navy Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

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

LANDS IN HAWAII.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed, as in legislative session, to the consideration of House bill 7881, Order of Business 495.

I do not think there can be any objection on the part of anyone to the consideration of this bill. It is meant to correct an injustice worked upon a few natives of the Hawaiian Islands who undertook to take up homestead lands and whose cases were confused for them by the authorities themselves. They have complied with the law in every respect.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon an interruption, I think this is a just bill, but some objection was made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. Does the Senator know whether or not he has abated that objection?

Mr. NEW. I never have heard of that objection. I do not think the Senator ever objected to this bill. I think perhaps

the Senator from Utah is confused as to the bill to which the Senator from Montana did object. He never has interposed any objection to the consideration of this bill, so far as I know, and I am quite certain that that is the case.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, I may suggest that I recall that the Senator from Montana did object to a measure granting certain franchises in Honolulu.

Mr. NEW. Oh, yes; I recall that perfectly, but that was an entirely different bill. I will say for the information of the Senator from Utah, if he desires further light on this subject—

Mr. KING. Oh, no; I will say to the Senator that I am familiar with the bill, and I think it ought to pass.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7881) to authorize the governor of the Territory of Hawaii to ratify the agreements of certain persons made with the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii, and to issue land patents to those eligible under the terms of said agreements, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the governor of the Territory of Hawaii is hereby authorized and directed to ratify and carry into effect the agreements made by the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii with certain homesteaders, referred to in the resolution adopted by the senate and house of representatives of the Territory of Hawaii, April 26, 1917; also to issue land patents to those living up to the terms of the agreements when the same have been completed; also to issue land patents to those who have already complied with all the terms of their agreements, and to ratify and confirm the land patents already issued to homesteaders in accordance with the provisions of the resolution of the senate and house of representatives, Territory of Hawaii, of April 26, 1917, above mentioned.

Sec. 2. That the governor shall report to the Secretary of the Interior the action taken by him hereunder.

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

J. B. WATERMAN.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, some days ago—the last day we worked on the calendar—the Senate passed over Order of Business 467, Senate bill 1059, for the relief of J. B. Waterman. That is a bill in which I am very much interested, but it was passed over on objection of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who desired an opportunity to examine it. I wondered whether he had sufficiently examined it so that he would permit it to be taken up at this time.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have asked for some additional information in regard to the bill. I have it on my desk. I shall be glad to have the Senator call up the bill for consideration on the next calendar day.

Mr. WILLIS. That will be satisfactory.

REVENUES AND EXPENSES OF RAILROADS.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, on Monday last the Senate passed Senate resolution 257, which provided for printing as a Senate document volumes 3 and 4 of the hearings before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate on the railroad question. Before introducing that resolution I made inquiries which showed, as I thought, that it was authorized as to cost; but it seems that the cost will be in excess of the amount which, under the law, can be expended for the printing of a document. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which that resolution was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no objection to that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote whereby the Senate adopted the resolution will be reconsidered. The question now is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, I desire to say that I have made closer inquiry, and I find that one of these volumes—volume 4—can be printed easily within the limit of expense allowed in the case of such documents. I therefore send to the desk a substitute resolution which I ask unanimous consent to have considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, will be read.

The reading clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document volume 4 of the hearings before the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the United States Senate, held pursuant to Senate resolution No. 23, Sixty-seventh Congress, relative to the revenues and expenses of railroads which report to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that 2,500 additional copies be printed for the Senate document room.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not intend to object either to the present consideration of this resolution or to its adoption; but I think I ought to state in connection with the adoption of this resolution, if it be adopted, that this request

must inevitably be followed by other requests which will include other parts of the testimony which has been taken under the original resolution to which reference has been made.

The committee of which I am chairman has been taking testimony now for 10 months—not all the while, of course, but we have taken a great deal of testimony—and I suppose that the evidence, broadly speaking, presents the most complete statement of railroad earnings and railroad expenses and railroad history that can be found in any one volume or any one place. If this part of the testimony is made a public document—and I have no objection in the world—then when other requests are made that other parts of the testimony shall also be made public documents, I shall feel constrained to insist that those requests be granted, in order to be entirely fair to all the interests that are involved in this investigation.

The testimony as a whole is very voluminous. I do not know how much it would cost to reprint all of it, but it would cost a very considerable sum.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I am a member of the committee which held the investigation. The subject matter of the investigation is one of very vast importance. I wish the railroad question were settled, if it could be settled right, but it is still a question which is before the Congress and before the country. These hearings have been held. It is not alone for the benefit of the members of the committee that the hearings were held. The reflected view of the country should be had on these hearings. Some of the testimony which has come before the committee I can agree with; other testimony I disagree with; but I would like to hear the viewpoint of those who are interested, and unless we publish these hearings I do not see that there is a great deal accomplished by having the hearings.

It is not like an ordinary case. These hearings involve almost a scientific determination of this question, and I think the best evidence of the necessity of the publication is the desire on the part of people to read it. It may cost a good deal of money, and I am in thorough accord with the idea of cutting down expenses where we can; but this is not a dead issue; it is a live one. The purpose of the committee in taking the testimony was to make it public, and unless we are going to allow a resolution of this kind to go through, when there is a real demand for the testimony, which I have no doubt is backed up, or the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] would not request it, there is no necessity for holding hearings. So I think the resolution should be agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not objecting to the adoption of this resolution, but it must be remembered that all this testimony has been printed and is now in print, but all the copies which the law allows to be printed have been exhausted. There is a very general, widespread demand for this testimony. One class of people want one volume of it; another class of people want another volume of it.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Is the Senator informed as to what it would cost per thousand to reprint this testimony, it being in print already?

Mr. CUMMINS. No; I am not informed. There is one volume, and possibly a little more, which comprises the evidence of a single witness, covering 450 or 500 pages, somewhere in that neighborhood. Certain unions which are particularly interested in the testimony of that witness, who was a very highly accomplished economist, ordered fifteen or twenty thousand copies of it, paying for it, of course; but in printing that number the type, if it be called type, was worn out, and all of it will have to be reset. So I can not give an estimate of the cost of reprinting the whole of the testimony.

Mr. KENDRICK. I want to say to my colleague that the estimate given to me of the cost of printing 2,500 copies of volume 4 is \$414.80. I have no objection to a reprint of the entire testimony given before the committee, of course, but this is the only part of the testimony for which I have had requests.

Mr. WARREN. I thank my colleague for that information. A continuous demand has come to my office for copies of the entire hearing, and I would be glad to know at the earliest opportunity what it would cost to print a very large number, for I am satisfied that the demand will be very great. I shall support the resolution of my colleague, and after that is disposed of I hope we may get further information as to what it would cost to reprint the whole testimony.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does not the Senator think it would be well to refer the resolution to the Committee on Printing, which is supposed to look into all such matters for the

Senate? I have no objection to the resolution, except that it does seem to me that the committee of the Senate which is supposed to advise the Senate with reference to such matters should give it consideration. It might be well, in considering it, to go into the question of printing some of the other testimony. The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has just stated that he has had requests for other parts of the testimony.

Mr. FLETCHER. Has the Senator from Wyoming obtained an estimate of the cost of printing what he asks shall be printed?

Mr. KENDRICK. The estimate is \$414.80 for this one volume. The Senate on last Monday authorized the publication of volumes 3 and 4, but I was informed later that the publication of those two volumes would cost an amount in excess of the \$500 limit.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senate can expend only \$500 for printing. A greater cost requires a concurrent resolution of the two Houses.

Mr. KENDRICK. I therefore ask the Senate to adopt this resolution instead, so that we can have volume 4 for immediate use. I have had a number of requests for it, and I find that almost every Senator with whom I have discussed it has also had requests for it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Was the resolution which was passed last Monday, and for which this is offered as a substitute, referred to the Committee on Printing and reported by that committee?

Mr. KENDRICK. It was passed without referring it to the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am very sorry that was done. I think all such resolutions ought to go to the Committee on Printing; but as the resolution has passed the Senate and the Senate now has reconsidered its action on that resolution, so as to consider a resolution which does not carry such a large appropriation, I shall not object to it at this time. Hereafter, however, if such a resolution is offered when I am on the floor, I think I shall insist that it shall go to the Committee on Printing, which is supposed to advise the Senate with reference to such matters.

Mr. KENDRICK. The only objection I would have to referring it to the committee is that it would delay the printing just that long. Demands have been coming to my office for these volumes for several weeks past.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] to the pending resolution.

The READING CLERK. On page 1, line 2, strike out the words "volumes 3 and" and insert the word "volume," so that it will read:

That there be printed as a Senate document volume 4 of the hearings, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION WITH CLOSED DOORS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business in secret session.

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.

RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate, as in legislative session, took a recess until to-morrow. Friday, March 17, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 16, 1922.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

John W. Hering, of Milford, Del., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Delaware in place of Henry T. Graham.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frank O. Northrup, of Oregon, to be receiver of public moneys at Portland, Oreg., vice George I. Smith, term expired.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Andrew J. Beard to be postmaster at Jacksonville, Ala., in place of E. G. Caldwell, removed.

ARIZONA.

Nell Carlson to be postmaster at Camp Verde, Ariz. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

ARKANSAS.

Fred H. Price to be postmaster at Gurdon, Ark., in place of A. D. Agee. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922. Bunyan Gilbert to be postmaster at McRae, Ark. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

CALIFORNIA.

William F. Knight to be postmaster at Pasadena, Calif., in place of Clark McLain. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Charles H. Windham to be postmaster at Long Beach, Calif., in place of W. J. Desmond. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Lena E. Reed to be postmaster at Stagg, Calif. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

Carl G. Lykken to be postmaster at Palm Springs, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Lillian C. Linde to be postmaster at Keeler, Calif. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

Wayne E. Dorman to be postmaster at Casmalia, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Eugene S. Franscioni to be postmaster at Soledad, Calif., in place of William Weber. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1920.

Warren A. Bradley to be postmaster at Gustine, Calif., in place of W. A. Bradley. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

COLORADO.

Frank L. Dodge to be postmaster at Denver, Colo., in place of B. F. Stapleton, resigned.

Edward F. Watt to be postmaster at Fraser, Colo. Office became presidential August 1, 1921.

Edward W. Roscoe to be postmaster at Ridgway, Colo., in place of Judith Nichols. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

CONNECTICUT.

James Geddes to be postmaster at Waterbury, Conn., in place of E. M. O'Brien, resigned.

George A. Engisch to be postmaster at Cornwall Bridge, Conn. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

FLORIDA.

Edith H. Frazier to be postmaster at Zephyrhills, Fla., in place of J. L. Geiger. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1922.

Silas E. Yon to be postmaster at Blountstown, Fla., in place of S. E. Yon. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1922.

GEORGIA.

Emmett D. Dial to be postmaster at Woodstock, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Henry A. Moses to be postmaster at Uvalda, Ga. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

James E. Mathis to be postmaster at Stockton, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Robert J. Walsh to be postmaster at Garfield, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

IDAHO.

Russell C. Plummer to be postmaster at Homedale, Idaho. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

Florence M. Shockey to be postmaster at Firth, Idaho. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

ILLINOIS.

Oliver E. Ray to be postmaster at Poplar Grove, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

May B. Rush to be postmaster at Edgewood, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Robert L. Endicott to be postmaster at Crossville, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Ira A. Coltrin to be postmaster at Cave in Rock, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Gustav H. Beckemeyer to be postmaster at Beckemeyer, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

George E. Stauffer, Jr., to be postmaster at Baylis, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Edward F. Guffin to be postmaster at Pawpaw, Ill., in place of W. A. Woods. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

Henry W. Schilling to be postmaster at Noble, Ill., in place of F. M. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired August 1, 1921.

William Sargent to be postmaster at Griggsville, Ill., in place of A. P. Ferguson, removed.

Roger Walmark to be postmaster at Ava, Ill., in place of F. W. Meisenheimer, removed.

INDIANA.

John L. Walker to be postmaster at Lexington, Ind. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

IOWA.

Earl P. Tucker to be postmaster at Panora, Iowa, in place of J. W. Morris. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Earl E. Shibley to be postmaster at Lone Tree, Iowa, in place of M. J. Harty. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

KANSAS.

Florence M. Heinz to be postmaster at Grainfield, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Francis E. Williams to be postmaster at Elgin, Kans. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

Ellen G. Fairley to be postmaster at Chautauqua, Kans. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Bertha McClair to be postmaster at Carbondale, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Ernest W. Sloop to be postmaster at Lyndon, Kans., in place of R. H. Miles. Incumbent's commission expired July 23, 1921.

KENTUCKY.

Snowden Shirley to be postmaster at Sanders, Ky. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

LOUISIANA.

Clifford P. Connell to be postmaster at Haughton, La. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Jesse M. Talbot to be postmaster at Bernice, La., in place of J. M. Melton. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1922.

MAINE.

Ambrose W. Kneeland to be postmaster at Easton, Me. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Mae L. Berry to be postmaster at Denmark, Me. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

Edward Johnson to be postmaster at Monson, Me., in place of A. C. Gilbert. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

MARYLAND.

Carroll L. Smith to be postmaster at Walkersville, Md. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Alice C. Widmeyer to be postmaster at Hancock, Md., in place of Benjamin Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Myron M. White to be postmaster at South Duxbury, Mass. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

Delano E. Chase to be postmaster at Linwood, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Raymond C. Hazeltine to be postmaster at Clevsford, Mass., in place of P. H. Haley. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

MICHIGAN.

Otto L. Wickersham to be postmaster at Onaway, Mich., in place of J. F. McEvoy. Incumbent's commission expired September 1, 1920.

James M. Bonine to be postmaster at Vandalia, Mich. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

George W. Davis to be postmaster at Tekonsha, Mich., in place of B. R. Osborn. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

MINNESOTA.

Francis H. Densmore to be postmaster at Wilmont, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Elmer H. Magaw to be postmaster at Lester Prairie, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

George M. Young to be postmaster at Perham, Minn., in place of M. J. Daly, resigned.

Joseph Huelskamp to be postmaster at Gaylord, Minn., in place of Joseph Huelskamp. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

MISSISSIPPI.

Laura L. McCann to be postmaster at Norfield, Miss. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Sedley B. Thomas to be postmaster at Terry, Miss., in place of S. B. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

MISSOURI.

Albert G. Reeves to be postmaster at Lucerne, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

Fred L. Mills to be postmaster at Commerce, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

James L. Creason to be postmaster at Camden, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

Edward Early to be postmaster at Baring, Mo. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Thompson F. Wommack to be postmaster at Fair Grove, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

Clarice H. Lloyd to be postmaster at Valley Park, Mo., in place of J. S. Herrington. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1920.

NEBRASKA.

Minar Anderson to be postmaster at Elwood, Nebr., in place of Frank Haworth, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Josie L. Pascoe to be postmaster at Chocorna, N. H. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

NEW JERSEY.

La Mott Hartshorn to be postmaster at Manville, N. J., in place of G. E. Holladay, resigned.

Harvey K. Trumpore to be postmaster at Califon, N. J., in place of J. B. R. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

NEW YORK.

Chester J. Hinman to be postmaster at Palenville, N. Y., in place of C. J. Hinman. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

William F. Hadley to be postmaster at North Bangor, N. Y., in place of W. F. Hadley. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Isaac Bedford to be postmaster at Thiells, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

Truly Merritt to be postmaster at Brewerton, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

May L. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Blue Mountain Lake, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

Sutherland Lent to be postmaster at Sloatsburg, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

Everett W. Penney to be postmaster at Eastport, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

Albert H. Clark to be postmaster at Silver Springs, N. Y., in place of L. R. Grover. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Alfred B. Kent to be postmaster at Nunda, N. Y., in place of J. P. Boyle. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Donald M. Dickson to be postmaster at Andes, N. Y., in place of G. M. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John L. Vest to be postmaster at Rosemary, N. C., in place of W. C. Bass, resigned.

Lawson M. Almond to be postmaster at Albemarle, N. C., in place of J. D. Bivins. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Arthur T. Willoughby to be postmaster at Ahoskie, N. C., in place of L. T. Sumner, removed.

Julia B. Greer to be postmaster at Moravian Falls, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Minnie T. Moore to be postmaster at Atkinson, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Jethro A. Hooper to be postmaster at Elizabeth City, N. C., in place of A. L. Pendleton. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Bernard E. Rierson to be postmaster at Regan, N. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

George Klier, jr., to be postmaster at Bisbee, N. Dak., in place of J. W. Schulenberg. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

OHIO.

Cassius C. Stephenson to be postmaster at Yellow Springs, Ohio, in place of C. H. Hackett. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1922.

Monto B. Coffin to be postmaster at New Vienna, Ohio, in place of R. C. Hale. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1912.

Wilbur M. Shaw to be postmaster at Lakeview, Ohio, in place of E. L. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

Francis M. Hiett to be postmaster at Spring Valley, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

Franklin H. Smalley to be postmaster at Jeromesville, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

Bertha Warner to be postmaster at Macksburg, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

Ruth Seabert to be postmaster at Alger, Ohio. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Mary B. Wanamaker to be postmaster at Cortland, Ohio, in place of C. C. Hadsell. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1922.

James F. Bumpus to be postmaster at Butler, Ohio, in place of I. L. McCullough. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1922.

OKLAHOMA.

Dan Voorhees to be postmaster at Walters, Okla., in place of J. H. English, deceased.

Roscoe C. Fleming to be postmaster at Tishomingo, Okla., in place of J. M. Loper. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Bruce Hueston to be postmaster at Kellyville, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Philip W. Hunt to be postmaster at St. Davids, Pa., in place of E. D. Lockard, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Mollie W. Tittle to be postmaster at Troy, S. C. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

James Gaynor to be postmaster at Springfield, S. Dak., in place of James Gaynor. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1922.

Edward M. Schmida to be postmaster at Letcher, S. Dak., in place of J. L. Davis, resigned.

John D. Smull to be postmaster at Summit, S. Dak., in place of H. H. Millard. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1922.

Arthur Griffin to be postmaster at Selby, S. Dak., in place of Frank Wall. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1922.

Irene E. Jackson to be postmaster at Lebanon, S. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

TENNESSEE.

Mamie B. Riley to be postmaster at Humboldt, Tenn., in place of J. W. McGlathery, resigned.

Bethel C. Brown to be postmaster at Cleveland, Tenn., in place of J. R. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1921.

John H. McKenzie to be postmaster at Manchester, Tenn., in place of C. E. Rodes. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1921.

William P. Whaley to be postmaster at Liberty, Tenn. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Arthur Hall to be postmaster at Lancing, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

TEXAS.

John F. Warrington to be postmaster at Valley Mills, Tex., in place of Pope Allen. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Thomas J. Bailey to be postmaster at Royse City, Tex., in place of W. A. Medlen. Incumbent's commission expired July 10, 1920.

Louis J. Scholl to be postmaster at Malakoff, Tex., in place of J. W. Duncan. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Walter W. Layman to be postmaster at Bangs, Tex., in place of H. H. Taylor, resigned.

Almyra L. Williams to be postmaster at Taft, Tex., in place of A. L. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

McKinley H. Frank to be postmaster at Grapevine, Tex., in place of M. E. Hendrickson. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

William H. Tallant to be postmaster at Chico, Tex., in place of M. D. Parnell. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Roy K. Duphorne to be postmaster at Aransas Pass, Tex., in place of G. P. Tarrant. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Arthur C. Polk to be postmaster at Manning, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Ada H. Worley to be postmaster at Malone, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Lottie H. Rector to be postmaster at McCaulley, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Loren G. Wilder to be postmaster at George West, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Wilce V. Garton to be postmaster at Booker, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Daniel B. Bynum to be postmaster at Eustace, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

VIRGINIA.

Thomas J. Wilson to be postmaster at Clifton Forge, Va., in place of J. B. Graves, removed.

Thomas L. Woolfolk to be postmaster at Louisa, Va., in place of G. V. Cameron. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Myron B. Bickers to be postmaster at Standardville, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Hannah Y. Smith to be postmaster at Newport, Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Lilly G. Cook to be postmaster at Madison, Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

John W. Gibbs to be postmaster at Howardsville, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Ruth E. Brown to be postmaster at Hamilton, Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

William R. Berry to be postmaster at Meherrin, Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

Ida Valley to be postmaster at Grundy, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

Henry H. Hardenbergh to be postmaster at Fredericks Hall, Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

William J. Ivey to be postmaster at Catlett, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Sydney B. Elliott to be postmaster at Belle Meade, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

WASHINGTON.

William G. Menerce to be postmaster at Carson, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

William W. Woodward to be postmaster at Darrington, Wash. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Robert E. Horan to be postmaster at Summersville, W. Va., in place of J. L. Evans, resigned.

John W. Mitchell to be postmaster at Wayne, W. Va., in place of W. B. Spurlock, resigned.

Godfrey B. Beebout to be postmaster at New Cumberland, W. Va., in place of H. C. R. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1920.

Roger T. Price to be postmaster at Widen, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

WISCONSIN.

Fred S. Thompson to be postmaster at Superior, Wis., in place of F. A. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired September 8, 1921.

William A. Roblier to be postmaster at Coloma, Wis., in place of W. A. Roblier. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

William L. Chesley to be postmaster at Lena, Wis., in place of A. H. Dionne. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Thomas P. Edwards to be postmaster at Hazel Green, Wis., in place of D. S. York. Incumbent's commission expired September 8, 1921.

Hazel I. Hicks to be postmaster at Linden, Wis., in place of H. I. Hicks, resigned.

Alexander F. Fleischmann to be postmaster at Campbellsport, Wis., in place of T. N. Curran, resigned.

James Kelly to be postmaster at Ridgeway, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Roy E. Lawler to be postmaster at Gordon, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16, 1922.

APPRAYER OF MERCHANDISE.

Bert Kahn to be appraiser of merchandise, district No. 28, San Francisco, Calif.

ASSISTANT APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

Denis E. O'Keefe to be assistant appraiser of merchandise, district No. 28, San Francisco, Calif.

Jacob Shaen to be assistant appraiser of merchandise, district No. 28, San Francisco, Calif.

POSTMASTERS.

ALASKA.

D. W. Stoddard, Anchorage.

Jacob Otness, Petersburg.

ILLINOIS.

Clarence L. Kiger, Cisne.

Arthur F. Eberlin, Hardin.

KENTUCKY.

Mary B. Bishop, Dry Ridge.

Ben H. Lott, Lewisport.

MONTANA.

Erling B. Richardson, East Helena.

James S. Hounold, Joliet.

Edward M. Erickson, Paradise.

NEBRASKA.

Ernest E. Goding, Dix.

Erma L. Thompson, Dunning.

Peter Rasmussen, Elba.

Orville E. Bicknell, Elk Creek.

Charles Leu, Elkhorn.

Elbert L. Taylor, Haigler.

Bert L. Strauser, Madrid.

Frank A. Melvin, Murdock.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Alberta W. Wight, Berlin.

Webb Little, Campions.

Samuel G. Blaisdell, Milton.

NEW YORK.

James Avery, Aurora.

Earle L. Burdick, Belmont.

William J. Scott, Black River.

Hugh M. Hall, Cassadaga.

James E. McDonald, Cohoes.

Lincoln G. Hawn, Evans Mills.

Harvey S. Decker, Germantown.

Winfield S. Carpenter, Horicon.

Clarence E. Hirsch, Lindenhurst.

Charles D. Overacre, Manchester.

George E. Gladstone, Margaretville.

William L. Buck, Mexico.

Benjamin S. Helmer, Mohonk Lake.

Milton Jeffery, New Woodstock.

George P. Hammond, Pearl River.

Frederick Harrigan, Roosevelt.

Robert L. Smith, St. James.

Gilford L. Hadley, Sandy Creek.

Howard M. Brush, Smithtown Branch.

Scott E. Phinney, Westport.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate March 16, 1922.

POSTMASTER.

Henry J. Keller to be postmaster at Hogansville, Ga.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 16, 1922.

POSTMASTER.

Raymond Kemmer to be postmaster at Holgate, in the State of Ohio.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, March 16, 1922.

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

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

O Lord our God, who knowest our necessities and art merciful to hear the humblest petition, bend over us, and may we speak to Thee even as we would to a dear earthly friend. Help us to live nobly, simply, and humbly; leave no need untouched. Meet us in the way of duty and make it plain and sure. Give us light and make the truth bare. Go where our thoughts go, into our business, into our social life, into our homes, and may we always keep Thee in heart and in life. O be with us every step of the road and never go away. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to—
Mr. SUTHERLAND for five weeks, on account of business.
Mr. MORGAN for five days, on account of illness.

ELECTIONS TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I present the following nominations for membership on the standing committees of the House and move the election of those nominated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming presents the following nominations to membership on the standing committees of the House, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

To be members of the Committee on Appropriations: HENRY Z. OSBORNE, of California; FRANK MURPHY, of Ohio.
To be a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, OGDEN L. MILLS, of New York.
To be a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, A. PIATT ANDREW, of Massachusetts.
To be a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, CYRENUS COLE, of Iowa.
To be a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, WALTER F. LINEBERGER, of California.
To be a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, MICHAEL J. HOGAN, of New York.
To be a member of the Elections Committee No. 1, HERBERT W. TAYLOR, of New Jersey.
To be a member of the Elections Committee No. 3, MARTIN C. ANSORGE, of New York.
To be chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce, CLARENCE D. COUGHLIN, of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming, that the gentlemen named be elected to the committees named.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. May I ask the gentleman whether or not the delay in the assignment to the Committee on Ways and Means of Mr. OGDEN MILLS until after the bonus bill had been reported out of that committee was at his request, or at the instigation of the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. MONDELL. The election of these gentlemen to the committees for which they were nominated depended in a number of cases upon their resignation from other committees, and the presentation of the nominations has awaited the presentation and acceptance of the resignations by the House.

Mr. GARNER. But, as far as the record shows, I notice that on the morning before the bonus bill was reported out of the committee all of the resignations now being filed had been filed with the Speaker and had been accepted by the House, and it was currently reported, I will say to the gentleman, that the gentleman from Wyoming was keeping the gentleman from New York off the Committee on Ways and Means until the bonus bill had been reported. It was also rumored that the gentleman from New York had requested the gentleman from Wyoming to keep him off until after the vote had been taken. Which one of those is true, if either?

Mr. MONDELL. If one were to be interrogated in regard to all of the rumors that float about the cloakrooms, we would have time for little else. The floor leader being rather busy, did not find time to prepare and present the list until this morning. It was necessary to go over the resignations to see if they had all been turned in and accepted before the list could be presented.

Mr. GARNER. Then, if I understand the gentleman from Wyoming, one of the reasons why he did not submit the list at an earlier date was not the fact that he did not want Mr. OGDEN MILLS on the committee before the bonus bill was reported?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is inferring a very great deal.

Mr. GARNER. I am asking a question.

Mr. MONDELL. The list was presented as soon as convenient after it was prepared, and it was prepared as soon as possible after the resignations had been received.

Mr. GARNER. Did that influence the gentleman in delaying the preparation of the list?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman prepared the list as soon as it was convenient after the resignations had been received.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming, that these gentlemen be elected to the committees named.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the order previously agreed to, business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule is in order to-day, and the Clerk will call the roll of committees.

IMMIGRATION.

The Clerk called the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization I call up House joint resolution 279, to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens admitted temporarily under bond in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington calls up House joint resolution 279, to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens admitted temporarily under bond in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921. This being on the Union Calendar, the House will automatically resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the resolution, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House joint resolution 279, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House joint resolution 279, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That aliens who entered the United States before March 1, 1922, in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved May 19, 1921, and were temporarily admitted under bond, may, if otherwise admissible, and if not subject to deportation for other causes, be permitted by the Secretary of Labor to remain in the United States without regard to the provisions of such act of May 19, 1921. In the case of any alien so permitted to remain the bond shall be canceled.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the figure "1" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "7."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman from Washington will have his hour. Will the members of the committee who made the minority report be recognized for the other hour?

The CHAIRMAN. This bill is being considered under the Calendar Wednesday rule permitting two hours of debate, one hour for and one hour against.

Mr. RAKER. I desire to be recognized in opposition to the bill, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be notified when I have used 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the resolution, I think, is simple and easily understood. It is necessary; it is humane; it is proper; and it is an aid rather than a hindrance to the great cause of the restriction of immigration. I desire to present a statistical statement, which, I think, will be of interest not only to the membership of the House but to the country at large. You will all remember that an act was passed May 19, 1921, less than a year ago, which changed the United States on short notice from an asylum or dumping ground for the rest of the world to a country with a plan of restricted immigration. That act has been in effect now since July 1 and 27 days in the previous June. It was a big act, a great step; it ended the asylum idea. The immigrants coming into the United States for the year ending June 30, 1921, were, in round numbers, 805,000. Under the 3 per cent act of May 19, 1921, there have been admitted as immigrants within the quota only 197,521 persons. There has been admitted within that same length of time in excess of the quota 2,453 persons. Nearly all of these excess admissions have been admitted for humane reasons, which I shall explain a little later. To have turned them back would have hurt the cause of restriction, in my opinion.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me finish the statistical statement first. There have been deported or sent away from the United States on account of excess of quotas from July 1 to February 28, or in eight months, 1,153 persons only.

What I want to call attention to is that, in spite of the enactment of the 3 per cent restriction act, which greatly limits immigration, there have not come to our doors great numbers in excess. There have come all told in excess of quota a total that will be found by adding 2,453 and 1,153, which shows, to me at least, that all concerned have made a sincere effort to

keep within the quota limitations. I considered that a good showing. I myself was under the impression during the hearings which we held that large numbers had come to Ellis Island in excess of quotas and had failed of admission. I was mistaken, as the actual figures show.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In just a moment. We did not get the exact number or get the statistical report until quite recently, and the official figures showed us, as I say, that the number which came in excess and was not admitted was 1,153 persons. Now, there were admitted in excess of quota 2,453, and it is to make legal and give the Secretary of Labor the right to admit those who have been admitted temporarily under bond that we come to the House with this resolution. Note that these are to be admitted only if otherwise admissible. Account has been kept and reason could be shown for the admission of everyone who have been admitted, or who is otherwise qualified to be admitted under the permanent immigration law, and if not so qualified they are not admissible under this resolution.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Where did the gentleman get the information of the number he quoted under the quota law?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I got the figures from the Commissioner of Immigration. They are in his office and available to all.

Mr. RAKER. How many were there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will hand the gentleman the slip, which shows the actual figures.

Mr. RAKER. I would rather have the gentleman's statement than the slip.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have stated it, but I will state it once more. The number of aliens deported on account of excess of quota from July 1 to February 28 was 1,153.

Mr. RAKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Many persons fail to realize that the deportation of aliens is a serious matter; deportation is not done easily, as some people think, but under restriction of immigration deportations are being made more frequently and with more time for proper inquiry. This 3 per cent act, which has reduced immigration to date to 197,000 people in eight months, has afforded not only opportunity for closer examination of those who come to be admitted within the quota but has afforded opportunity for deportation of other aliens throughout the country who were entitled to be arrested and deported.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In just a minute. For the entire fiscal year ending July 1 last we deported for all causes 2,342 persons. Those were the ones deported throughout the country, picked up for deportable causes and deported—2,342. But between July 1 and December 31—that is, six months of the present fiscal year—we have deported, not counting those who have failed to get in on account of excess of quota, a total of 2,394, or more in six months than during the entire previous year. We are literally cleaning house. [Applause.]

Now, all who have followed this subject will remember when the quota act was written both the House and the Senate, and later the conferees of the two bodies, undertook in every possible way to find words by which a little margin could be provided for the Secretary of Labor so that he might take care of proper exemptions. We wanted the law to be humane.

It was not possible to find the words. The law requires the limit of admissions to be at a maximum 20 per cent per month per country. We proposed to make that monthly limit 15 per cent and let the Secretary withhold the 5 per cent. But if that had been in the law the 5 per cent would have been quickly absorbed. You will notice in some recommendations for amendment to the 3 per cent resolution which is now pending in the other body and which was passed in this body one recommendation indorsed by the Federal Council of Churches is that there be added to any restrictive immigration act the following:

A general clemency clause authorizing the Secretary of Labor to deal humanely with exceptional cases in order to avoid hardships amounting to inhumanity.

We have not been able to find quite the words in which to do that. We have had to depend on the ninth proviso of the third section of the Burnett Immigration Act, which authorizes the Secretary to admit temporarily, under bond, certain aliens. Under the old law, of course, that applied to the inadmissible. But I think it is properly applied now to those who have right and reason for appeal to remain in excess of quota, but, of course, if applied temporarily only, the time must come when they should go out. I think the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Davis,

and the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. Henning, have acted justly, literally, wisely, and with reason. Note that nearly all of these 2,400 cases which are to be covered by this resolution are cases which have been admitted for causes of extreme humanity.

Mr. LAYTON. What do you mean by that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I mean, for instance, a wife to join her husband. Perhaps the wife had been born in Poland and husband in Germany, and the Polish quota was exceeded, while the German quota was not. Perhaps, I mean a case where a family in transit, coming from Russia and being a whole year on the way, was detained a while in Turkey, and while there a child was born, and the child under the law is called a Turk and inadmissible if the Turkish quota is full. I refer, perhaps, to the four or five hundred cases which came on an American ship from over in the Asia Minor country somewhere, bringing four or five hundred Armenians, assuming that they would be admitted under the Armenian quota, which was not exhausted, but on arrival it is found that they were from Turkish Armenia and were to be counted under the quota for Turkey, which was exhausted. In that party there were many orphan children from 5 to 10 years of age, in charge of an English-speaking teacher from the Beirut College. To deport those children to Constantinople under any circumstances would have been the height of inhumanity. In fact, it could not have been done, in my opinion.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Are the facts which the gentleman is recounting here in the hearings before the committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They are scattered all through the hearings. In an effort to perfect the quota act there were extensive hearings, and in an effort to make various amendments to that act these facts appeared all through those extensive and exhaustive hearings.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But no hearings were held on this resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Not on this particular resolution, but on an earlier resolution of similar import. In every effort to amend the 3 per cent act we ran into hearings on this phase of the situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not a fact that the committee held extensive hearings on the resolution that was passed here a few weeks ago extending the 3 per cent quota act for another year?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is what I referred to. And still earlier we held, after five months of operation of the 3 per cent act, hearings on the operation of it, and many of these cases I mention you will find described in detail in the pamphlet entitled "Operation of the Quota Act for Five Months."

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. What provision was made for these four or five hundred Armenian children?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Do not misunderstand me. They were not all Armenian children. They were mostly women and children, and quite a large party of orphan children. And let me tell you something before it gets out of my mind. There are in Armenia to-day 200,000 orphan children. We talk about the United States as an asylum. Even those most interested in those children know it would not be possible for us to bring any considerable number of them to the United States, no matter how much it is desired.

Mr. LAYTON. You imagine that there are many millions of orphan children in the world to-day?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Undoubtedly.

Mr. LAYTON. What I am trying to get at is this: The gentleman said unless this bill was passed these Turkish Armenians would be deported and would go somewhere, probably falling into the hands of the Turks, which would be a matter of great inhumanity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The charge was made literally in these hearings by Armenian ministers here that we deported some 27 or 37 who were, upon reaching Constantinople, outraged and murdered.

Mr. LAYTON. Who is going to take care of those over here?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The bond has been put up. They are admitted temporarily under bond. Church organizations and charitable people stand ready to adopt them, and in some cases they have done so or have guaranteed that they would do so. Our committee had before it a plan by which orphans might be admitted under sufficient bond to provide that they should not become public charges before they became of age, but that of itself was impracticable, because if they came in great number it would be impossible for the United States to provide that they should not become "bound-out" children, such as we had a couple of generations ago.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I want to ask the gentleman, if this resolution is passed admitting those who are here illegally, what assurance has the Congress that immigrants in the future will not come in under the same circumstances?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Many of these cases developed at the expiration of the five months with the 20 per cent per month limitation. You will remember the law reads not to exceed 20 per cent a month. So the quotas of many countries ran out all in a lump just before Christmas. There was a considerable congestion and also a misunderstanding as to whether one was an exemption or a quota. That 20 per cent made the congestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will take five minutes more.

Now, then, the quotas having been completely exhausted from many countries, the number coming in is very much smaller; in fact, it is almost nil.

For instance, last week, covered in for the week from March 1 to March 7, 10. This present week, 4. From countries where the immigration would have come there is only now and then an exceptional demand for admission, owing to a misunderstanding as to the total count or as to place of birth. The number arriving at Ellis Island last week was less than a thousand. The number detained at Ellis Island yesterday was less than 300. But still there is an occasional excess of quota. For instance, the other day there was a woman from the Azores Islands with five or six children, two or three of which were born abroad, and three or four born here, American citizens; she went a few months ago back for a visit, which is permitted under the law, and while she was away a baby was born. She returned to Ellis Island, herself admissible under the law, but with a 2-months-old baby in her arms, born in Portuguese territory, and the Portuguese quota was exhausted months ago. Her 2-months-old baby is a Portuguese immigrant in excess of quota and is not admitted. The law was new, an untried instrument, its effect changing the United States from that of an asylum to a country of restriction. We also require passport visés. Reservations were not made quickly. Our consular officers all over Europe were issuing passport visés in excess of the quotas. But they are not doing that now. Here was confusion as to the quotas and the figures given out by us. All these things are now working more and more on a uniform method.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I do not think the steamship companies want to understand it very much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Well, if we succeeded in cutting off immigration from what it was before to 200,000, we have not stretched it so badly.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I do not know whether the gentleman has covered this by the statistics of how many people will be admitted by reason of the enactment of this law in addition to what are already here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Less than 3,000 instead of a possible 600,000 or 700,000.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does the gentleman think that these men—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They are not men. Most of them are mothers and children, and grandmothers.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Well, will not positions be taken from our people here for them? I think we have enough idle people in this country now under this Republican administration without bringing these people here.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GENSMAN. Would a man who came into this country by way of the Mexican border and who was under bond be admitted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Not at all. This resolution says "otherwise admissible." No insane man can be admitted, no sick person, no defective, no helpless dependent.

Mr. GENSMAN. But would a man be entitled to be admitted who got over the Mexican border, and was captured and put under bond? Would he be admitted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Not if he came in illegally. And before this 3 per cent act starts on another year's operation I shall place before you an amendment requiring that the residence of such immigrants in Mexico and Canada shall be five years instead of one year.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box].

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

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at the outset to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I ask not to be interrupted until I have completed my statement, because the time is very short.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] do constitute something of an argument against the enactment of the act of May 19, 1921, and much of an argument in favor of its amendment, but no argument against its enforcement.

The chairman and majority of the committee will have to hurry this resolution through before other shiploads of immigrants excluded by the law arrive, embarrassing them with the question whether their unlawful admission shall be charged to this breakdown or breakdown resolution or the third one which must follow it soon. New admissions are being made in violation of the law from time to time. Up to and including October 31, 1921, according to official reports, such admissions numbered 843. Up to the end of November 9, 968 were admitted. November 16, a week later, it stood at 1,195. From that time to this every weekly report has shown additional illegal admissions, until the number is now three times what it was four months ago.

Moreover, I object to this method of handling the situation, because it keeps the gentleman from Washington busy writing these resolutions ratifying illegal admissions made for the accommodation of alien groups and steamship lines. I now hold in my hand several such resolutions presented by the gentleman. They are House joint resolution 153, House joint resolution 237, House joint resolution 273, and House joint resolution 279—all to the same general effect, introduced at different times. The two last admit many aliens who could not be admitted under the former.

I can fish into the basket almost any day and take out a resolution by the chairman of the committee ratifying the illegal admissions of aliens, the later ones being more and more liberal to the aliens and steamship lines.

Since I am fully convinced that such resolutions go far toward breaking down the law, and since the Commissioner General of Immigration has advised the committee that a similar resolution, which did not ratify or authorize the admission of more than one-third as many as this does, tended to break down the law, I think these deathblows should be as few and infrequent as possible.

Speaking of House joint resolution 237, one of this troupe, the chairman himself asked the Commissioner General of Immigration the following question:

Do you think a resolution of that kind running for a time coincident with the emergency act would break the act down?

Mr. HUSBAND. Very largely. (Hearings of Dec. 19, 1921, p. 215.)

The act of 1917, embodying the general immigration laws, contains the following:

That the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall issue rules and prescribe conditions, including exaction of such bonds as may be necessary, to control and regulate the admission and return of otherwise inadmissible aliens applying for temporary admission. (Immigration Laws, p. 8.)

The following is one of the rules for the enforcement of the clause quoted:

In cases in which aliens who are mandatorily excluded from permanent entry apply for the privilege of entering the United States temporarily, they shall be required to show that their temporary entry is an urgent necessity or that unusual and grave hardship would result from a denial of their request. (Immigration Laws, pp. 57-58.)

This is the provision under which they have been pretending to admit these people.

First, I call your attention to the fact that it applies only to people who are inadmissible under the immigration laws. No man who can be legally admitted under the immigration laws, the act of 1917, can be permitted to enter the United States temporarily under this clause.

Second, the "admission and return" are connected and always jointly provided for. The idea of admission under it—in fact permanent—is inconsistent with the terms of the law itself and foreign to the very purpose of it. If an alien was critically ill on board ship and could not be admitted under the immigra-

tion laws, he could be placed in a hospital within the custody and under the control of the immigration authorities and treated until he could be deported. Other emergency situations of a similar nature were foreseen and provided for. But the very fact that none but inadmissible aliens were governed by the provision certainly excludes the idea that admissions expected to be made permanent could be made under it.

Neither are these people admissible under the 3 per cent act of May, 1921, which provides:

That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted under the immigration laws of the United States in any fiscal year shall be limited to 3 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910.

Note that this applies only to aliens admissible under the act of 1917. The clause quoted from that act applies only to those who are inadmissible under it.

The 1921 act further provides:

When the maximum number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted in any fiscal year under this act shall have been admitted all other aliens of such nationality, except as otherwise provided in this act, who may apply for admission during the same fiscal year shall be excluded.

It will be noted that this provides that all aliens who may be admitted under the act of 1917 in excess of the 3 per cent limitation "shall be excluded."

There you have it.

First. These people have to be inadmissible under the 1917 act in order to come within this clause in that act relating to temporary admission.

Second. That those admitted under the act of 1917 shall not exceed the 3 per cent, so that if these people were legally admitted under the first act they are mandatorily excluded by the second act.

Their admission, as has been done recently, is not even an evasion of the law. It is a flagrant violation of it.

I take the immigration law seriously. I take all laws seriously. Anything else is bolshevism. The act of May, 1921, should be repealed or amended or enforced as it is. House joint resolution No. 279, and all of the several companion resolutions presented by the gentleman from Washington for the same purpose, contemplate neither.

There is no reason for this course. There is no excuse for it. The excuse which they present—and it is only an excuse—is that the law works a hardship on those who come in conflict with it. That is exactly what all law does. The laws of nature visit harsh consequences upon those who come in conflict with them. The laws of civilized people do. Our quarantine laws work hardships on individuals, very painful ones. Our penal laws work hardships on criminals and innocent members of their families, often extending through a lifetime. Our draft laws, which call individual citizens from the safe and peaceful walks of life to the conflict, suffering, and death, inseparable from military service, work hardships on the men and on their loved ones at home.

The gentlemen say that we can not deal with immigrants as with sacks of flour. Law rarely deals with sacks of flour. It usually deals with men and women and visits its consequences, its painful punishments, upon men and women. When the Government of the United States refuses to enforce its law because somebody suffers as a consequence, those who administer it should have repeated in their ears the old, old saw:

No man e'er felt the halter draw
With good opinion of the law.

But it is pretended—and it is no more than a pretense—that the 3 per cent act of 1921 is especially bad, so bad that it should not be enforced uniformly, in that it works hardships. In that respect it is not different from other immigration laws, all of which have worked hardships in hundreds of thousands of cases. But these gentlemen seem to think that because this law was passed by the Sixty-seventh Congress and approved by the present administration that it should be subjected to all kinds of contemptuous treatment. It is the child of the present Congress and administration, and may be suffering from "inherited constitutional psychopathic inferiority," but since it is the law it should have the respect at least of the Congress that enacted it and the administration which approved it and is charged with its enforcement. But is it peculiar in producing cases of hardship? The law as it stood for 20 years, beginning in 1901, worked hardships in that it divided families, turned back many people who wanted to come in, who suffered and even died because they were deported. They were the most unfortunate of people, too. For instance, during that time, 295 poor idiots were turned back into the wretchedness of Europe; 445 imbeciles went back in their weakness; 299 feeble-minded were turned back; 2,128 insane were rejected or deported. Who is more unfortunate

than an insane man? Unfortunate epileptics numbering 369 were rejected or deported; 18,813 persons, who were suffering from constitutional, mental, or nervous inferiority and other things of kindred nature, were rejected or deported after having been admitted.

Persons to the number of 37,719 suffering from loathsome diseases, sick and diseased as they were, were turned back into the sources of their infection, doubtless to die there. Orphans, or children under 16 years of age, unaccompanied by parents, numbering 5,560, were turned back or deported from the United States to the wretchedness of the Old World without a guardian. Can you imagine anything more unfortunate? People numbering 154,156, who were so poor, so helpless, so friendless, so incompetent, that even in the abundant opportunity of America, they were liable to become a public charge, were sent back to Europe, where life is so much harder and where, doubtless, tens of thousands of them begged in wretchedness for a while and then died and were buried in potter's fields. The figures from which these totals are made will be found on pages 117 and 118 of 1921 report of Commissioner General of Immigration. But the laws under which these people were excluded and deported were passed under the administrations of McKinley and Cleveland and Roosevelt and Wilson, and therefore were taken seriously and were understood as having been made to be enforced.

I object to the favoritism practiced in the admission of these people. The Commissioner General of Immigration testified before your committee:

The reason is that the law is an uncertain quantity. It is recognized as such because it has—they have brought people over who were in excess of the quota and they have been admitted, and they have brought others in excess of the quota and they have been sent back, and others have been admitted temporarily or something like that. (See p. 218, hearings, Dec. 19.)

Is the National Government to openly practice favoritism in the administration of its law? To admit that it is doing so is to admit that it has been debauched. I warn you and the country that an effort has been made, with a regrettable degree of success, to demoralize and debauch the Immigration Service and break down the immigration laws. [Applause.]

I shall here attempt to expose that effort and show the measure of success which it has met.

1. I read you a telegram placed in the hearings by the chairman of the committee:

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, December 19, 1921.

Representative ALBERT JOHNSON,
Chairman House Immigration Committee,
the Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

Mary Olexa, among Hungarian immigrants detained for deportation at Ellis Island, comes to her uncle, Frank Vasko, one of the best known American citizens of Hungarian birth in the Mahoning Valley, willing and able to take care of her, and file bond to guarantee that she does never become a public charge. Vasko is large property owner here and resides at 1020 Ford Avenue. Other cases are still under investigation. Kindly try to arrange for her admission as a special favor.

AMERICAN HUNGARIAN JOURNAL,
N. GROSSHANDLER, General Manager.
(Hearings, Dec. 19, 1921, pp. 223, 224.)

We have many of these.

Note that many such telegrams were sent to the chairman.

Mr. Henning, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, administering the immigration laws, said:

We have received the same telegram. We have received many of them exactly like that. (Hearings, Dec. 19, 1921, p. 224.)

I wonder if they were exactly like it in wanting these people admitted because their relatives were large property owners? I wonder if they were exactly like it in asking the admission of these aliens "as a special favor." I wonder if they were exactly like it in being sent by managers of the foreign-language press? I want you to note that this telegram was dated December 19, 1921, and that about that time great numbers came to the chairman of the committee and to the Assistant Secretary of Labor administering the immigration law.

Next, I call your attention to this statement by the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mr. Henning, speaking of the time when he was receiving these telegrams. He said:

Just as I was trying to get out some Congressman's stenographer came in with an armful of them and I went through them hurriedly. (Hearings, p. 224, Dec. 19.)

In the same connection I call attention to the following language by the chairman of the committee, as reported on page 235 of the same hearings:

* * * Neither do I think we are justified in leaving conditions just as they are, with Members of Congress working for their constituents, with Senators working for their constituents, and further pressing the department.

Next, I call your attention to the fact that on that very morning of December 19 a whole battery of steamship-line magnates filed in and occupied places in the committee room. That

day they appeared before the committee urging the passage of House joint resolution 237. There were Mr. Franklin, Mr. Farley, Mr. Sanford, and other big ones, and they came, or some of them came, from the committee room and took seats in the gallery to watch the gentleman from Washington "play ball." On that very day House joint resolution 237, by the gentleman from Washington, was presented on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Washington, who did not take time to have it printed. When I first saw it after the House met on December 17 it was written with a lead pencil. When I saw it next it was typewritten. He presented it in that form, but it had to be withdrawn at the request of the Speaker because it interfered with other business. It was printed the next day. The telegrams from the foreign-language press and the pressure by the steamship lines, the appeals to Congressmen and their pressure on the department, all together brought results that very day, or else there was a remarkable coincidence.

Next, I call your attention to the following, which appeared in the New York Times of December 25:

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, December 24.

Representative ALBERT JOHNSON, Republican, of Washington, will introduce a resolution, when the House convenes January 5, to make permanent the temporary 90-day release granted yesterday to 1,100 aliens held at Ellis Island because quotas for their countries under the immigration law had been filled, according to a telegram from Mr. JOHNSON received here to-day by E. N. Meymenyi, editor of a Hungarian-language newspaper which has been active in urging release of aliens.

Gentlemen, these foreign-language alien groups, represented by the foreign-language newspapers and the steamship companies, and the pressure of Representatives here who feel constrained to serve their foreign-born constituencies, subject your committee and your Department of Labor to more pressure than is safe. The American people should know when such unhol influences are bearing so heavily upon their Government. [Applause.]

The steamship group sat in the gallery all the afternoon of December 19 and left looking "real disgusted" when the gentleman from Washington did not get action on his House joint resolution 237. That night the scene was transferred to the committee room. I was there; the steamship group filed in again; Assistant Secretary of Labor Henning came; Mr. Husband, the Commissioner General of Immigration, came. I do not approve of his course, but I sympathize with his position. He is a subordinate under great pressure suffering from lack of support. He told the committee in the face of the steamship people and in the face of his superior, Mr. Henning, that that resolution would largely break down the immigration laws.

Mr. Farley said that he was for it, and that Mr. Franklin, the president of the International Mercantile Merchant Marine, was for it. Mr. Henning, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, said he was for it. It being the chairman's own output, he was for it. Mr. Henning showed a disposition to be critical of his subordinate, Mr. Husband, because he said it would break down the immigration laws. Here is what Mr. Henning said about the attitude of Mr. Husband in opposing it:

* * * I am for it. Mr. Husband always has some one he can pass the buck to. But when it gets to me my back is against the wall. I do not know who to pass the buck to.

The CHAIRMAN. I am with you. (Hearings, p. 224.)

That probably made Mr. Husband feel lonely. I do not know whether the chairman meant that he was with Mr. Henning in his criticism of Mr. Husband or whether he was with Mr. Henning in his effort to find somebody to whom to pass the buck. I do know that he is now helping Mr. Henning, after you have excluded, to pass the buck back to you and make you and the President say whether or not you meant what you said in the passage and approval of the act.

While this hearing was drifting in the direction indicated by these quotations, the chairman of the committee remarked:

I can readily see why Mr. Husband doesn't want to let it go. [Referring to the 3 per cent law.] It is Mr. Husband's baby, line for line. Mr. Box. I think Mr. Husband is trying to carry out the law, and that he hasn't any pride of authorship in it. (Hearings, p. 223.)

Since I made this offhand remark I have become convinced that because of a lack of support Mr. Husband is not enforcing the law steadily.

Gentlemen, my fear—my conviction—is that certain foreign-born and un-American groups in New York and elsewhere, the steamship line managers, and perhaps other powers have very largely debauched your Immigration Service at certain of your greater ports, and that men and their friends are literally buying their way into the United States. It is my conviction, based on a careful study of what I have observed. I do not pretend that I can prove this, but I warn you and the country that I believe it is true, and direct attention to it in the hope that it can be discovered and corrected. [Applause.]

My more immediate purpose is to show that demoralization does actually exist in Washington—that it has gotten into Congress—as evidenced by this resolution and the facts I have stated. For instance, the committee amendment proposed, changing the date from March 1 to March 7, has no purpose other than to admit some people in whom the gentleman from New York, the Hon. ISAAC SIEGEL, is specially interested.

I regret to have to advise you that I am no longer able to rely on the correctness of the reports that come from the Bureau of Immigration. They issue weekly reports showing how many excess admissions there are. Up to the close of December 21, 1921, the number of these as stated in this official report was 1,456. On December 24 and 25 they admitted from 900 to above 1,200, and yet the official report showing the total excess up to and including December 31 showed only 1,597 in all, or an increase of only 141 within a period within which there had been from 900 to above 1,200. I crave your patience while I give you the basis for this statement.

The New York Times of December 25 contained the following item:

Of the 1,100 immigrants detained on Ellis Island as excess quota, whose release Secretary Davis ordered on Friday morning, only a few hospital cases remained last night.

The entire article bears that out and shows that about 1,100 were admitted at that port at that time, but it may be said that this is only a newspaper report. We will see, then, what Mr. Husband said about it at another time and place. I read from the hearings of December 14 (p. 209):

Mr. Box. About how many are there?

Mr. HUSBAND. Well, at Ellis Island specifically there are about 1,125 to-day. There are perhaps about 75 at Boston. Now, the difficulty is this: These people are there almost permanently. At least these 1,125 have been sifted down to about the last limit, and they have got to stay there until they are deported.

The CHAIRMAN. When you have sifted out all that you can, you have about 1,125 left?

Mr. HUSBAND. About 1,125. That is the residue of a very much larger number.

Mr. SIEGEL. There are 1,125 at Ellis Island and about 75 at Boston?

Mr. HUSBAND. Yes.

Mr. SIEGEL. A total of about 1,200?

Mr. HUSBAND. Yes; strictly quota cases. (Hearings, p. 209.)

Further down, as shown on page 210, Mr. Husband said:

They are all quota cases. There were more deportations, of course, but these are on account of the quota.

Now, I call your attention to the order under which they were admitted and remind you that this order admits all who were then at Ellis Island, all who were then at the Boston station, all who were then at all other seaports, and all who should thereafter arrive on the 24th or 25th day of December, 1921, at any of the seaports of the United States. We had 1,200 at the New York and Boston immigration stations, according to the statement of Mr. Husband, plus the number then at all other stations, plus the number everywhere on shipboard, plus the number arriving at all other ports, during December 24 and 25.

Besides that number at the station at New York and Boston there were some 2,300 immigrants in the harbor of New York and about 380 "coming up the bay," many of whom were Hungarians, Italians, and Poles, and many of whom were probably quota cases. (See statement by Mr. Husband, hearings, Dec. 19, p. 208.)

The admission of all these and subsequent arrivals at these and all other ports on December 24 and 25 were covered by the order of admission, which I shall read you soon. Yet in the weekly report of the Commissioner General of Immigration the number of excess quota admissions was increased only 141 from December 21 to December 31, covering that very time. The number reported up to and including December 21 was 1,456, and up to and including December 31, 1,597. On December 24 and 25 all these new admissions were made. Yet the report of such admissions up to and including December 31 was only 141. The majority report says that these admissions numbered only 906. That is not correct, but it is more than six times the increase shown by the report of the Commissioner General of Immigration.

Then the increases ran along at about the normal rate which had characterized these admissions before Christmas. Each report stating:

Total excesses up to and including January 4, up to and including January 18, up to and including January 25, up to and including February 8.

The total increase from December 31 to February 8 was 313, about the normal rate of increase. Then, on February 28, 671 were added. But, making no allowance for the normal increase which had gone on before Christmas, the total number of excess admissions from December 21 to February 28 is less than those

shown to have been admitted at New York and Boston December 24 and 25.

The report of the committee accompanying this bill has the same unfortunate weakness of not stating the facts. I will undertake to show this by its own contents. I read you two sentences:

To avoid great hardships the Secretary of Labor ordered releases under conditions stated above. (Majority report, p. 2.)

Then above that I read the following:

All these temporary admissions were made on individual showings.

Now, gentlemen, listen to this reading:

To officers of the United States Immigration Service:

By direction of Secretary, aliens now being held in detention all seaports solely because in excess of quota, and those who may arrive on or before the 25th instant and be so held are hereby landed for a period of 90 days on execution of their personal bonds or personal bonds relatives, with additional understanding that bonds with qualified sureties may later be required.

This order will not apply to those seeking admission and who are therefore in detention. Expedite to fullest possible extent release for all aliens who may be affected by this decision.

W. W. HUSBAND,
Commissioner General.

(P. 2, majority committee report.)

That order includes the 1,200 who were at the stations in New York and Boston, and, in addition, all quota cases among the Hungarians, Poles, and Italians in the harbor and coming up the bay at New York, and all who might be on the sea on December 24 and December 25, and all who might thereafter arrive at any seaport of the United States. Yet the committee in its report tells the House that "all these temporary admissions were made on individual showings."

You may wonder why House joint resolution No. 237 was not presented for final action and why subsequent ones had to be introduced. Well, I shall state to you the effect of the two resolutions, and you will have to form your own conclusions as to the reason for the abandonment of House joint resolution No. 237 and the subsequent introduction of House joint resolution No. 273 and House joint resolution No. 279.

House joint resolution No. 237, presented on December 19, it was found on a hearing before the committee would not let in all of these aliens in whose behalf the steamship companies and the alien groups were working so vigorously. It provided for the admission of cases the exclusion of which would work great hardships upon people having certain blood relatives in the United States. The hardships were the excuse for all these resolutions, but it was later found that even House joint resolution No. 237 would exclude a lot of these aliens because they could not show the facts which are made an excuse for these resolutions—that is, extreme hardship and certain relationship. Concerning House joint resolution No. 237 the testimony is as follows:

Mr. BOX. How many of these that you have in port now would be released by this resolution?

Mr. HENNING. I should say one-third.

Mr. BOX. About one-third. You would send two-thirds of these urgent cases back, then?

Mr. HENNING. Yes. (Hearings, pp. 227-228.)

These cases are spoken of as urgent ones involving hardship. The urgency is the urgent desire to get in the United States and the hardship consists of being excluded. Any such rule as that destroys the immigration law, and that as it is being done the people should know it. While Representatives and Senators having foreign-born constituencies, alien groups, the foreign-language press, and the steamship lines are exercising pressure which is proving too strong for their Government, the people should understand the situation, and I have spoken with that end in view. Nothing less important would have prompted me to have spoken as I have.

If the chairman and majority of the committee would go straight on in the preparation of proper restrictive and constructive legislation, and insisting on its uniform and steady enforcement, they would have my constant and best support. I believe they would have the support of the House. The approval of the country would be assured.

But this situation deeply disturbs me. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE].

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is very hard, indeed, to take issue with men with whom you entirely agree on most of their theses. The three members who signed the minority report are men of the same views as mine. We only differ on what appears to me to be a very small matter of detail. It strikes me as unfortunate, indeed, that those of us who believe, with almost religious fervor, in strong restriction of immigration, who have worked for it in and out of Congress, who have spent most of our time discussing it from the public platform and endeavoring to arouse the country to the immi-

nent dangers of the mongrelization of our American blood and the decay of our American ideals attendant upon the admission of vast alien hordes—it strikes me as unfortunate, I say, that we of identical views on the main point should now be split on such a minor matter as is here involved.

Up to 1907 the United States had no general law limiting immigration. In that year Congress passed the act excluding those who were likely to become a public charge, those who were insane or mentally deficient—polygamists, anarchists, and people who were the bearers of contagious diseases.

In 1917, under the leadership of that patriotic statesman from Alabama, the Hon. John Burnett, former chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Congress passed the literacy test law over the veto of President Wilson, after a similar bill had been vetoed in previous Congresses by Presidents Taft and Cleveland.

In 1921 the last preceding Congress took the great step of the 3 per cent limitation law, cutting down the number of admissible aliens of any nationality to 3 per cent of the unnaturalized aliens of that nationality residing in the United States according to the 1910 census. The House of Representatives of the present Congress has passed a resolution extending that law for another year from June 30, 1922. We expect that the Senate will soon agree. The 3 per cent law is not perfect. It was not exactly the kind of a restrictive measure which we presented to the House in the last Congress, but we hope and expect before this law, as so extended, runs through its second year that we shall pass, in the present Congress, a more permanent and constructive plan embodying some kind of selection on the other side, a problem which is hedged about with many difficulties affecting our foreign relations.

For 10 years prior to the act of 1921 our immigration approximated a million a year. In 1908 it got up to 1,300,000, more than 100,000 a month. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, which included 27 days under the 3 per cent law, it was less than 900,000, but this was due largely to the destruction of ships, to the very low value of money in Europe, and to the inability of foreign-born people resident in America to get money to their relatives who wished to come. There are now plenty of ships to bring them, and plenty of money is being sent to them to make up for the low rate of exchange of foreign money. And those of us who have studied the subject at all are certain that without the 3 per cent law our immigration in the current fiscal year would considerably exceed 2,000,000.

In the eight months of its operation the 3 per cent law has cut immigration down to less than 200,000, and right now through the operation of the same law immigration has dwindled to less than 1,000 a week.

All of our restrictive immigration law, except as applied to orientals, has been made in the last 15 years, and in this present fiscal year we have cut immigration down to one-fifth of its former annual amount, and I believe to less than one-tenth of its reasonably to be anticipated amount.

Now, in changing to an entirely new and drastic system there has been a little margin which could not be taken care of by the new law. It is a very small margin, about 1½ per cent of the total number who have been admitted under the new law, and the purpose of this resolution to-day is to take care of that small margin.

It consists of 2,453 people who have already been admitted temporarily under bond by the Secretary of Labor to avoid extreme hardship and suffering in individual cases. The cases are those of people coming from countries which supposed—in some cases through our own error—that they had a quota left and where it was afterwards discovered that the quota had been exhausted. There are some Armenians who came because the quota from Armenia was not exhausted, but who found that having been born in Turkey they were Turks, and the Turkish quota was exhausted. Many of these Armenians were orphan children. If we send them back, we would simply be sending them to their death. There are cases of wives, husbands, parents, and minor children so admitted, notwithstanding the quota was exhausted, in order to join their families. There are cases of babies born in a country whose quota was exhausted while their mothers were en route here from a country whose quota was not exhausted. All of the 2,453 cases are cases of manifest equities in favor of the aliens who have been so admitted, and it was practically inevitable that there should have been such cases when we changed to an entirely new system, especially at a time when the very boundaries of the countries from which these people came were not settled.

Now, the three gentlemen who signed the minority report of our committee and who are here on the floor leading the opposition to this resolution are ardent advocates of restriction of

immigration. They have voted for each of the restrictive measures I have mentioned which came up during their respective terms in Congress. These gentlemen, as you know, are all judges—Judge RAKER, Judge WILSON, and Judge Box. As you look at them sitting here they are men of the most amiable and humane appearance in the world, and I know from my several years' acquaintance with them that that is in fact their character. But somehow when they get into the House considering a proposition of this sort involving a few hundred unfortunate people they seem to be possessed with the idea that they must have a kind of Rhadamanthine severity.

Rhadamanthus, as you will remember, is described in Greek mythology as the particularly hard-boiled magistrate who presided as the chief justice of the supreme court of hell. There were—the coincidence is a little singular—three of those unrelenting judges, the associate members of the bench being Minos and Æacus. Of course I do not want to suggest that at any time except the present moment my kindly judicial friends from California, Louisiana, and Texas possess any of the characteristics of those mythical judges. Neither do I want to suggest any comparison between the territorial jurisdiction of the court of Rhadamanthus and the place where these three colleagues of mine are now delivering their opinions. But exactly that comparison will occur to some two thousand poor people if the House does not pass this resolution to-day.

Let us see how our congressional judges have steeled their hearts to the performance of the task which they have set for themselves at this hour.

My friend from Texas, Judge Box, stands up here and talks about this exception, this act of Congress, as a violation of law. I am reminded of two Presidents of the United States who, in a sense, violated the law of this country—President Lincoln, when he pardoned several boys, soldiers in the service of their country who were condemned to be shot because they had violated the Articles of War in sleeping at their posts in time of war. President Wilson violated the law in the same way in pardoning several men. I do not really believe that the gentlemen now opposing this resolution, who have been distinct ornaments to the bench, have always practiced such extreme severity in the business of their own courts. I am reminded of the words of that great philosopher, the Bard of Avon, who looked at humanity with a clear and at the same time a humane eye, and said—this is from Measure for Measure, an appropriate source since we are considering a numerical measure of immigration:

Not the king's crown, nor the deputed sword,
The marshal's truncheon, nor the judge's robe,
Become them with one half so good a grace
As mercy does.

Now, what are we trying to do here to-day, gentlemen? We are trying to make, in the interest of mercy, a variation of about 14 per cent in the number admissible under the 3 per cent law. To be sure that is a larger variation than we allow in the case of the prohibition law, but that deals with things and, as my friend from Texas remarks, we are dealing now with human beings. We are asking to let in 2,400 people who have already come, who have been admitted, on the ground of particular hardship.

Mr. BURROUGHS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAILE. I will.

Mr. BURROUGHS. Is it the gentleman's position that these people were admitted legally?

Mr. VAILE. Certainly.

Mr. BURROUGHS. Do I understand the gentleman to take the position that there was any discretion whatever from the administrative standpoint to admit people after the quota was full?

Mr. VAILE. I do not know that I can answer the question to the gentleman's satisfaction, and I am not sure that I can answer it to my own satisfaction, but was there any discretion in the Presidents of the United States in pardoning young men condemned to be shot for sleeping at their posts? We are by this measure legalizing the action of the administration in admitting them. This is to remove the doubt on the subject, if there be any.

Mr. BURROUGHS. It is my understanding that the President of the United States at the time he pardoned these young men had full authority to grant a pardon, and that it was not in violation of any law.

Mr. VAILE. We are asking Congress to exercise its undoubted authority to remove any question of illegality from these particular admissions. As a matter of fact, we do somewhat similar things every day. We pass bills for claims against the Government; we pass private pension bills; we pass bills granting homestead or other rights in the public lands—all for

the benefit of people who can not bring their cases directly within the provisions of some general statute, but who do exhibit strong circumstances disclosing a moral or equitable right which we decide to recognize.

Nor do I think that the chairman of this committee should be criticized for busying himself humanely in drawing resolutions to cover such cases as those presented by this resolution. This is the first of such resolutions to be presented, except one, and that was merely in favor of people who started when the 3 per cent law became operative and who were found to be coming in excess of the monthly quota. These were, of course, charged against the quota for succeeding months, and are not involved here. This resolution does increase by the very small margin which I have indicated the quotas admissible from certain countries, but it will have no effect at all to increase the total number who would be admissible under the 3 per cent law from all countries, because a number of countries have not used and will not use anything like their full quota.

Nor is there any reasonable apprehension that we may have to present other relief bills of a similar nature to this, because the 3 per cent law is having its effect. It served notice on the world that the United States is henceforth not to be a dumping ground. That that notice has been heeded is shown by the fact that we are now getting in a week only about half as many immigrants as we formerly got in a day. Anyone could expect, and most everyone did expect, that there would be some slack to be taken up in the first year of the working of this law. We are not trying to take it up by indirection or evasion. We are coming to the House of Representatives with a full statement of the facts, asking for specific authority. We are by no means ashamed of the statement we present. On the other hand, we are proud that the 3 per cent law has worked so well as to require only an adjustment of approximately one and a quarter per cent of the less than 3 per cent already admitted.

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

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman grant me a few minutes more?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute more.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I can not say much in one minute. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. VAILE. No; I can not yield. In my one minute I shall ask these gentlemen, my friends, the minority of the committee, to heed again the Bard of Avon, and I slightly paraphrase the last line by changing the pronouns from the first to the second person:

Having thus far proceeded—
Unless thou thinkest me devilish—
Is't not meet
That you did amplify your judgment?

I hope, gentlemen of the minority, that you will do so, in the interests of humanity. These 2,400 unfortunate people will not flood the country and they are all admissible if they are excused, for the special reasons applicable to them, from the quota requirement.

Mr. GERNERD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two minutes. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GERNERD. What assurances have we, if this be agreed to, that there will not be a repetition of it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have already stated that now passport visés are issued, as far as possible, in accordance with the limitation, and that is the principal assurance. Then there is the fact that the law is understood, and the fact that quotas are exhausted. I presume that under an absolute, literal interpretation of the quota law, when the quota has reached the point of exhaustion, there should be no appeal to the Secretary or to anyone else. I presume that we should send a man or a part of a man back, even if we have to cut him in two; that we should send his wife back and let the man in; but the appeals came from the fact that there were questions as to geographical boundaries, questions as to nationalities, questions as to the legal residence of children. We developed these appeals, and these 2,400 cases, all of which have been properly acted on. To say that I agreed with the Assistant Secretary of Labor is correct. Certainly I was with him. I am with him, and I am doing now what I conceive to be my duty in coming to Congress and asking Congress, if it so desires, to grant this

act of grace, of mercy, and of right to 2,400 people at a time when we are reducing immigration from 1,000,000 a year to 250,000 a year, and that is all there is to it. [Applause.]

I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CABLE].

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, there is no question of more vital importance to the American public, and particularly the workers, than the subject of immigration. Before the war immigrants came to this country at the rate of a million a year for at least 10 years. During the war immigration subsided; the number coming in was very small. Since the war the number has been on the increase until during the last fiscal year over 800,000 again came here. The condition became alarming. It was necessary for Congress to act. Because of the conditions in Europe, a million or more, I may safely say, would have come to this country to escape from the chaotic conditions as a result of the war. The coming of large numbers would have been a calamity to the country and to the American workers as well as to the immigrants themselves. There were no homes to shelter the immigrant or his family and no work whereby he could earn money to support them. The 3 per cent law was enacted for the very purpose of restricting immigration, and it has accomplished its purpose. During this fiscal year there will be not to exceed a net increase of at least 50,000 immigrants. They are now coming into this country at the rate of about 2,000 per week, but at the same time emigration is equal to at least that number; so that from now on, by reason of many exhausted quotas, emigration and immigration will be about equal. Many are emigrating from this country because in Europe their money converted into money of their native country will give them greater purchasing power than if they had remained here.

This resolution puts the question squarely up to Congress whether or not they will permit these additional 2,400 persons who are now here under bond to remain. Many of them can not be sent back to their own country because there is no one to receive them.

Congress is to be congratulated on the able work of the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Davis, and the Commissioner General of Immigration, Mr. Husband. They have provided quotas for these alien immigrants from countries that did not exist according to the census of 1910; they have provided quotas for countries whose boundaries have been changed since 1910; they have had a thousand and one obstacles to overcome; and I do not believe there is a man here in Congress who can point out a single instance where under the administration of the 3 per cent law there has been a failure. The purpose of the law has been accomplished. The restrictive law is, in fact, almost prohibition.

Whenever and wherever a man can hang out a card "Employment wanted" and have 10 employers seek his services, and he can take his pick and send nine away, conditions are good for the worker. If labor is scarce, it usually gets what it wants, be it better wages or working conditions. When more workers are needed than this country can supply, a law limiting the immigration into the United States is not as necessary as a strict selective system. Prosperity attracts aliens to this country. They come by the hundreds of thousands without a restrictive law. Because of the abundance of laborers and expansion of new and competitive industries, more goods and products are often manufactured than the public can consume. Money and working capital become tight. Directly following each peak wave of immigration comes a period of depression. Work is not so plentiful. The unskilled is the last to be hired; he is the first to be let go. Mr. Jones, the Director General of the United States Employment Service, advises me that a majority of the American workers are placed in the unskilled class. More than 75 per cent of those immigrants who do come here are also in the unskilled class; so that immigration without restriction does the most harm and injury to the unskilled American workman.

The competition is always between the unskilled laborer of America and the immigrant. It is not a fair competition. The latter are used to lower standards of living and lower wages in Europe. The skilled workers fare better. A good industry does not like to lose its organization of skilled men and they are retained as long as possible.

Whenever the country has many unemployed, immigration recedes; many emigrate to their own country. The number of unskilled diminishes. Then gradually industry gets another start. The employer gets ready, he hangs out a card "Men wanted." Ten men apply for every job. He takes his pick

and sends the others away. If immigration had not been restricted or diminished during the period of depression, there would be many more to send away. Conditions are now easier for the employer. Then is the time for restrictive immigration. An American Congress should care for Americans first. If there is not enough work for all, we should see that our countrymen have the first opportunity.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] is opposed to the 3 per cent restrictive measure. He is against the literacy test. On the day the resolution extending the 3 per cent law was before the House he said that only "the vicious, the diseased, and the imbecile should be excluded." He was one of the 36 against the resolution, while 281 Members of the House were in favor of further restricting immigration. The negative votes were almost entirely from New York, Chicago, Cleveland, and other centers of foreign population.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] on the day the resolution was under consideration asked the question in his debate on the resolution: That if it is desirable to restrict immigrants, why should it not be more desirable to prohibit them? In reply, I ask if it is desirable for you to stop eating when you have enough, would you say it is more desirable not to eat at all? Or, I would ask you western Members, if it is desirable to restrict the flow of water on a piece of irrigated land, is it more desirable to cut the supply off altogether from that land?

Economic conditions must balance. Rainfall is necessary to produce crops, but too much rain drowns them out. In the construction of a brick wall, referred to by the gentleman from New York, the skilled laborer—the bricklayer—is first necessary. Next comes the man who carries the bricks, but there is a limit to the number of carriers that can be used. If we have too many carriers, there will soon be a surplus of bricks and the carriers will have to cease work. We do not need more of that which is now abundant—workers—but we do need more of that which is scarce—necessary capital to start the wheels of industry. The more wheat or corn we have the better off is everyone except the farmers. The price goes down. The more houses that are constructed the better it is for everyone except the landlord. Rent is lower. The more manual workers we have the better it is for everyone except the workers. Working conditions or wages may not be so good.

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

Mr. CABLE. Yes.

Mr. FESS. My colleague is on the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CABLE. Yes.

Mr. FESS. In the House we suspended immigration entirely in the first bill, but that was not accepted by the Senate. It is now 3 per cent of the nationals, as I understand it?

Mr. CABLE. That is correct.

Mr. FESS. If we accept the 2,400 that the bill proposes, what effect will it have on the unemployment situation?

Mr. CABLE. As I see it, it will have but little effect, because emigration from this country now equals immigration to it. Those 2,400 consist chiefly of women and children, who will not compete with the workers of America.

Mr. FESS. Emigration is now equal to immigration?

Mr. CABLE. That is my understanding. There are now coming into this country about 2,000 per week, and at the same time, in the months of January and February of this year, close to 8,000 emigrated from this country.

Mr. FESS. What is the purpose of their returning in such numbers? That is an interesting matter to me.

Mr. CABLE. I will try to explain that, and I will refer again to the statement of the gentleman from New York in his discussion on extending the 3 per cent immigration law. He contends that we never emerge from a period of depression except under the influence of increased immigration. On the contrary, a flood of immigration always directly precedes a period of depression. The flood recedes during depression. Only when business activity reaches normal does immigration again increase. Increased immigration is one of the causes of bad times. History tells us that we always emerge from a period of depression by the aid of American workers only; then when times get better the immigrant is attracted by the good wages in this country and he returns to America. He is with us in times of prosperity, but always absent in periods of depression.

If you will take the year 1882 as an example, the tide of immigration reached its high point up to that time—almost 800,000. Overproduction, inability to consume, capital tied up, money tight, directly followed. At the end of that year, with the huge number of immigrants, came a period of depression. The low point of the depression occurred in 1885, when prosperity and business began to increase; business went back to normal by

July, 1886. Let us see what part immigration played in bringing the country out of a depression and back to normal. Figures of the Department of Labor show us that immigration did not increase until 1887—that is, probably a year after the country was back to normal and only when wages were good did they start to come back here in any large numbers.

Or, again, take the depression of 1907. There is always a cycle of immigration the same as there is a cycle of depression, and one fits into the other. In 1907 occurred the high mark of immigration to this country, over 1,285,000. Another depression immediately followed. Then came a slump in immigration as a result of the depression. Immigration fell off, but in the meantime business began to pick up in the summer of 1908, and was back to normal in the summer of 1909. If immigration had anything to do with pulling America out of a depression, as the gentleman from New York contends, it must be shown that the immigrants came here in times of depression in large numbers, but the fact is not so. The official records show that it is not until business hits normal and there is a return to prosperity that there is always a return of the immigrants.

A more striking example is the depression of 1914. In 1913 and 1914 more than 2,400,000 immigrants came. If these people create work, as the gentleman from New York contends, why then in 1914 did we have such a depression instead of prosperity? Why was it that business returned to normal in 1915 while the gentleman's increase of immigration necessary for the return of prosperity was entirely absent? In fact, there was a decrease of immigrants of almost 900,000 less than the year previous.

We should not put the alien and his interest first. To hold that his presence here in large numbers is necessary for prosperity is contrary to history itself. Let us act humanely, justly, and fairly to both the would-be immigrants and to the Americans, but America should first be for the Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, this resolution proposes to admit into the United States some 2,443 immigrants from the various nations of Europe in excess of those who would be admitted under the 3 per cent quota law. The 3 per cent quota law is the most restrictive measure we have ever had upon our statute books with respect to immigration. After the House passed the first bill suspending immigration it went to the Senate, and this bill was written in its stead as being the only restrictive measure possible to get through the Congress. I supported it. Later, when the resolution came in to admit something over 1,000 immigrants who were to be admitted over the quotas of the various nations, I supported that resolution, broke with my colleagues on the committee in order to do so, because that did not increase the number of immigrants coming from any country and because there was some confusion in the early stages of the working out of the immigration act. Now, this resolution comes up on a different basis. The restrictive act has been in operation for quite a long period. The authorities have had every opportunity to work out its details and the nations of Europe have had every opportunity to know what the quotas were, because they have been published and sent over, and the steamship companies, who have persisted in violating every immigration law that has ever been on the statute books of this country, not only knew about it, and yet they have taken advantage of what they thought would be a failure of those charged with the enforcement of this act in America to live up to the law, and so the immigrants have continued to come in excess of the quotas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. What is the reason for this exception?

Mr. WILSON. From my standpoint there is no reason why we should make any exception, and the only reason that has been given is that just stated in the majority report and that just stated in the very interesting speech of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE]. The majority report gives as the reason that it would be an act of grace on the part of the United States; that is what the report says. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE], after quoting a few lines of poetry, stated it would be an act of mercy to admit those people. Gentlemen, if you are going to vote for this resolution at all that would be the reason that you follow—that there are 2,443 people from various nations of Europe who have been permitted

to land here in violation of the statute whom they are going to ask to admit, and we say we will admit them as a matter of grace, or, in the language of Mr. VAILE, as a matter of mercy.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I am wondering what the gentleman would do with some of these, particularly infants, who have been mentioned by the chairman of the Committee on Immigration?

Mr. WILSON. What would I do with them? Do what we ought to do and say to them, as to everybody, that here is a statute, a solemn act of Congress, that ought to be obeyed and ought to be enforced. No one knows who these people are—

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. What are you going to do with the baby of this woman from—

Mr. WILSON. There is no evidence before the committee or the House that there are babies, or who these 2,443 people are. Now, that is the sentimental side of this question, and that happens to be a situation that becomes very interesting just at this time.

I do not know any better way to answer the argument for this resolution, the argument of grace or the argument of mercy, than to read you a few extracts from a very interesting editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post of March 4. It seems, whether we are dealing with immigration or any other question, that there is a disposition in this country to concede everything to the Europeans, whether it be a question of financial consideration, of immigration, or treaties, or anything else. A very interesting question came up some time ago when we were asked to pay something over \$100,000,000 to Great Britain. The question was raised that Great Britain owed us more than that amount of interest on the loan to that country. This was a question of expense for the transportation of our troops that fought in battles of the late war. We paid over the cash to Britain and were not even given permission to give credit for \$168,000,000 against the interest due us of \$400,000,000. So that is something of the same sentiment and conditions that prevail here by which we are asked continually, after months of trial, to relax our law on immigration.

This editorial is entitled "America Last." I will read a few extracts from it. It says:

The mob mind, without which there can be no war, has reached its fullest development in Europe; but the mush mind is peculiar to America. Every other nation, both in its foreign and in its domestic affairs, has its eye on its number all the time, and that number is invariably number one.

The writer goes on to discuss this question of picking up every European habit and yielding to European sentiment, and states, for reasons he does not give and which I do not know, that there is beginning to be a departure from that custom in America; that we are beginning to get away from that. And he goes on, after saying that, with this very interesting and encouraging observation, speaking of this yielding to other nations and the relaxing of our laws, giving up our money without contention, joining in any kind of an agreement so as to protect the rest of the world, without regard to America:

All this is not native to America. There is a dash of Puritanism in the American character, and even at its broadest and roughest a saving remnant of decency that instinctively revolts against this lowering of our old standards.

Further—

Wherever we turn our immigration problem confronts us, and we see the results of our policy of putting the alien and his interests first and America last. For we have done just that. We have babbled in our political platforms of the full dinner pail and the necessity for tariffs to keep it full, and then we have let down the bars to the cheap labor of every European country so that the dinner pail may not be too full. To justify the claims made by its proponents a high tariff must go hand in hand with high immigration bars or we shall have dear goods and cheap men.

Now, after that the author goes on to discuss this proposition of bringing over hordes of immigrants and putting them on American farms in order to settle up the waste places of the country—to bring them here to compete with the American farmer—and states that that is the propaganda of those who believe in unlimited immigration. Everybody who is informed on the question knows that as conditions are now it is the easiest thing in the world to produce a surplus of agricultural products, and yet the contention is to bring over immigration to reclaim land and settle up the waste places of the earth and thereby compete with the American farmer. He gives a very interesting observation, that when you have an overproduction in the steel mills production is cut down. The same is true of every other industry. But when you have it on the farm you come and ask for unlimited immigration to increase production by cheap labor with which the American farmer can not compete and maintain his standard of living.

And then later on he says:

If you will make an understanding survey of New York or Chicago or Pittsburgh, cities where the immigration problem is more apparent at a glance than in other places, though it is everywhere, you will see for yourself what is happening to America.

With it all we have not solved or even helped a single one of Europe's problems, but we have half ruined America. Yet our sentimentalists babble on of our "traditional policy" and demand that we shall "offer refuge to the poor and oppressed of Europe." There are tears for alien children, sobs for alien uncles, convulsive weeping over alien cousins, but few to consider what this bogus generosity, this asinine sentimentalism has done to Americans. Must they always be last, thrown out of their jobs, run off their land, shouldered aside in their own country to make room for this plague of pushing immigrants? Must we try to solve everybody's problems except our own, and to work out everybody's salvation except our own? Or shall we go back a ways to saner and cleaner standards and strive to make this a country worth living in?

And further:

As this is written Congress is greatly concerned over the tariff and the American valuation plan. It is trying to prevent dumping of cheap foreign goods. That is important. But it is the dumping of cheap foreign men that is of first importance to us—American values, not American valuation—that should first engage our attention.

And here is something of the first importance here:

Those who want immigration—more of it, lots of it—are active. They supply much freely, but they do not use it themselves. Their feet are on the ground and their heads are busy with the future of their races. Only the American has been so concerned with his little affairs that he has had no time to bother with larger problems—so engrossed with to-day's petty business and pleasures that he has had no time for the future of America and of his children.

Now, Mr. Chairman, nothing truer was ever said than that the proponents of unlimited, unrestricted mass organization are always busy in this country. With this 3 per cent immigration restriction, which I rather predict will be on the statute books for a number of years, not over 350,000 would come annually. Yet this resolution is proposing to admit those who have come, in violation of the law, after the quotas from their countries had been exhausted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. And would it not encourage the very same thing in the future?

Mr. WILSON. That is what I am trying to impress upon the Members of the House. The disposition here to relax our laws, relax our customs, sacrifice our principles, for European people and European causes has become a dangerous practice in this country, and the only way we can get away from it is to stand by the laws we pass—see that they are enforced not only in this country but as against those from other countries.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I am in general hearty accord with the gentleman, as he knows, and in accord with what he has stated to be the purpose of the bill—in other words, to permit the 350,000 aliens to come here in a fiscal year. If we pass this resolution admitting 2,400, does that mean an excess of the 350,000 in the year?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; that will be in excess of the quota for the countries from which they come.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. These are in excess of the 3 per cent quota list?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I want to be sure that it is in excess over the year's quota.

Mr. WILSON. The report says that. It says that if they come in at all we do not permit it for any reason except as an act of grace on the part of the United States.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. It is not an act of grace or mercy if there is no excess of quota above the amount we allowed of 350,000 from all countries.

Mr. WILSON. I stick to my statement, that these are landed here and admitted, and if the quotas from those countries are exhausted—

Mr. VAILE. From those countries?

Mr. WILSON. Those countries; yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I am talking about the quotas.

Mr. WILSON. I say the quotas from those countries, and it involves the same principle exactly. Who are these people that are seeking to come in here?

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

Mr. WILSON. I first want to explain to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY]. These are here in excess of the quotas allowed from their countries. Who are they about whom all these tears are being shed, and about whom all this talk is being made about grace and mercy on the part of the United States? Read the report. Three hundred and forty-three Turks we are asked here to shed tears about and relax our laws for; also some 70 Africans.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I was in accord with the gentleman, and I believe that we could perhaps assimilate 350,000 a year. Now, if we admit these 2,400, that does not mean that we admit those in excess of the 350,000?

Mr. WILSON. These are here in excess of the quotas of those countries.

Mr. VAILE. But the gentleman knows that immigration now has diminished to less than 900 a week.

Mr. WILSON. I do not know what it will be for the rest of the year. That is uncertain. Here are 379 from Hungary that the gentleman is here quoting his mournful poetry about, for whose benefit we shall pull down our statutes and waive our right to enforce the law and tell those people who are here unlawfully on our soil, "You can stay."

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Where are these people?

Mr. WILSON. I do not know where they are. They are here under bond. They have been admitted temporarily, and unless this law is passed I suppose they will be subject to deportation.

Mr. BROOKS. They are scattered all over the United States and it will be impossible to find them.

Mr. WILSON. That would be a fine excuse for the violation of the law—to say we have admitted them and they are now scattered all over the country and we can not find them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. That is a reflection on our action in allowing them to come in, is it not?

Mr. WILSON. Exactly.

Mr. LONDON. They are all under bond. They must appear when summoned.

Mr. WILSON. Yes; but they are not likely to be summoned. Now, as previously stated, the record does not show anything as to the class or condition of the people constituting the 2,443 aliens sought to be admitted by this resolution. If there are unfortunate and distressing cases of women and children, why not deal with those alone and independently? Then your appeal for sympathy might be entitled to consideration.

Mr. Chairman, when I appeal here for the proper consideration of America; American customs, ideals, and institutions; and respect for and obedience to our Constitution and the statutes we solemnly enact, I have in mind as part of this Nation our immigrant citizens as well as the native born. Those who have come here and assumed the responsibilities of American citizenship and have become a part of the social, commercial, and industrial life of our country are entitled to equal protection of its laws and the full enjoyment of all its privileges. I stand for that. But in the interest of all and for the good of all we must adhere to the policy of restricted immigration, whatever the results may be to foreign countries or their inhabitants. This question is beyond the field of politics, and about which there should be no room for division and partisanship.

There are to-day 700,000 veterans of the late war out of employment and in distress. There are 5,000,000 American citizens without work. Upon these many American women and children are dependent for their daily bread and sustenance. Should these not be first in our sympathy? And are they not entitled to our first consideration? Actuated by the belief and conviction that these Americans should come first, I believe that in the proper discharge of our obligations to our country we should oppose the passage of this resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSSDALE] four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Mr. Chairman, the question under discussion here to-day is not that of immigration restriction. The only issue involved in this resolution before the House is the question of the resolution itself to make permanent the right of admittance of the 2,443 immigrants whom the immigration authorities for humanitarian reasons had temporarily permitted to enter the United States under bond in excess of the quota limit. This resolution is to remedy some of the defects of the 3 per cent immigration restriction act of last year and lessen some of the inequalities, injustices, and unusual hardships entailed to these immigrants in the administration of that law.

It is not an attempt to break down or nullify the present 3 per cent restriction act, because all of the 2,443 cases mentioned are unusual cases, resulting from the enactment of a law that suddenly changed the accepted and traditional policy of the United States from a haven and a refuge to all of the oppressed peoples of the world to a land of very limited entry, bordering on close restriction.

The administration of this new law, so different from the old law, very naturally brought about such complications which any new law brings about, for it is inevitable when a new law

is passed, especially a radically changed law, such as the 3 per cent quota act, that many inequalities would exist and that it would entail many injustices, and it is to correct these things that this resolution is presented here to-day.

Now, how unfair and unjust and how cruel some of these things may be is known only by the victims themselves, their relatives, the immigration authorities, and those Members of Congress who have interested themselves in the fate of these unfortunate people.

I want to bring before the House the case of a mother and a daughter who, if this resolution is not passed, will be subject to deportation. They are admitted under bond at present. It is the case of a poor Polish woman and her daughter. The mother had a son living in my congressional district. The boy enlisted in Company D of the Three hundred and twenty-eighth United States Infantry. He was a runner, a dangerous assignment as you know, and he was killed in action in France. Some time in the month of December my home paper, the Bronx Home News, called my attention to this case, and I went down to Ellis Island and saw this old lady and her daughter, and through an interpreter I got her story. She handed me this telegram. It had been forwarded to her in Poland by another son, who is also a citizen of the United States, and it was from The Adjutant General of the United States Army. I am going to read it to you. I read:

MEYER GOSTIN,
1037 Bryant Avenue, New York:

Deeply regret to inform you that Pvt. Harry Gostin, of Three hundred and twenty-eighth Infantry, is officially reported as killed in action between October 8 and October 15.

(Signed) HARRIS,
The Adjutant General.

The record there is wrong. The name is Gostinska. The mother's name is Rela Gostinska and her daughter Perl Gostinska.

No one will deny that this poor woman and her daughter have a just claim to enter the United States. This mother gave all that any mother can give to our country. She gave it her boy. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it is unthinkable to insist upon deportation and send this boy's mother and sister back to Poland. I do not think harsh action in such a case would meet with the wishes of the American people, for deportation is generally a tragedy since they have nowhere to go, once they leave their homes in their native land. We owe a great debt to some of these soldier boys. Among that 2,443 aliens are numerous blood relatives of foreign-born American soldiers. I could bring a number of such cases before this House had I the time.

I have here a poster or billboard that was posted in 1917 and 1918 in my district and elsewhere throughout the country, and on it in blood-red letters are the words "Americans all." "Enlist." It mentions all of these names: Du Bois, Smith, O'Brien, Cejka, Haucke, Turovich, Kowalski, Pappandrikopoulos, Andrassi, Villotto, Levy, Chirczanevicz, Knutson, Gonzales. I find here two Polish names. I can understand why Harry Gostinska enlisted and fought and died for this country, but I can not understand why gentlemen will stand up in this House and deny to this woman, this mother of an American hero, an asylum here. [Applause.]

The case I have cited is of two of these 2,443 immigrants who face deportation unless this resolution is passed. I could recite the heart-rending stories of a number of the others, for their cases have been called to my attention by their relatives, and I have aided in bringing their appeals before the department whenever the extenuating circumstances warranted it. Each of these cases is gripping in its human-interest story and tells of sufferings and hardships almost beyond belief. This resolution affects 2,443 immigrants, very few of whom have a place to go if we were to deport them.

I have stressed the case of the mother and sister of an enlisted foreign-born soldier, who gave his life for his adopted country, and which country now challenges the right of his mother and sister to enter that land of adoption, because, unfortunately for them and for all the others who have no ex-soldier relatives here, a certain stipulated number of persons—we call it a quota—preceded them here by possibly a number of weeks or days.

The 3 per cent immigration restriction act of last year made no exception and gave no preference to the blood relatives of our foreign-born soldiers who served this country in the late World War, and among these 2,443 immigrants are many parents, brothers, and sisters and fiancés of foreign-born American soldiers. It is too late now for us to discuss the merits or demerits of that act, for it is the law; but we can at least remedy some of its defects, and I believe no quota restriction should prevent the father, mother, sister or brother, or fiancée

of any honorably discharged American soldier from coming to our shores.

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

Mr. ROSSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a few minutes more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Under the provisions of the act of last year the total number of immigrants eligible to enter the United States from everywhere in the world was about 300,000. Of this total quota from all countries, 198,000 have been admitted to date. From a number of countries the quotas were filled in a five-month period and some shortly thereafter. From the countries with large quotas only a portion of those eligible came; hence it is that the countries with the smaller quotas were soon filled, and there came a surplus. It could not be avoided, for we had no way of properly allotting the consular visas to check it. About 1,700 were actually deported because of excess of quotas; an additional 2,443 cases were of such unusual circumstances that they were permitted to enter temporarily under bond, and I am certain this small number of persons added to our population will not alter the industrial, political, or economic conditions of the United States, and we ought to permit them to enter, and I hope this resolution will be passed.

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

Mr. ROSSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 17 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. RAKER. And I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California yields two minutes, making seven minutes in all.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, if the House had given any consideration originally to the law, and had given a little more time so as to make it possible for those who were already on their way to enter our ports, this resolution would not be necessary. But unfortunately the majority of the 2,400 immigrants in question were on their way before the 3 per cent law went into effect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman means that they were either on their way or that they had visas on their passports.

Mr. SABATH. Or that they were in different ports. I do not mean that they were already on shipboard.

Now, in some way or other gentlemen are under the impression that this amendment to the law will let in a great number of people, and even the chairman tells how many will arrive. Do gentlemen know that during the period in which the 3 per cent law has been in effect, and I quote from statistics which were just handed to me, that since July 1, 1921, only 226,661 immigrants were admitted and that 251,461 departed, or 27,600 more immigrants departed than arrived; and I venture to say that when the fiscal year is over we will not have admitted more than 275,000, most of whom are the wives, children, and parents of American citizens and declarants, and that at least 350,000 will have departed from the United States?

And still there is great hue and cry about the 2,400 people who have been admitted, a majority of whom are the wives, mothers, and fathers of American citizens and declarants who have done a great deal for the country during the war. I am amazed that there are some people who are ready and willing to say that these mothers and fathers, these wives, and these little children should be taken from here and sent back where they have no one to take care of them. I think it would be not only unjust but the most inhumane act of which this House could be guilty to send them back. I appeal to the membership on this side not to be carried away by prejudice, but to demonstrate that we are big enough, that we possess hearts, that we do sympathize with unfortunate people, especially women and children, and that the membership of this House will say to them, "You are here; you have been admitted; you are not taking any jobs from anyone else; you are being taken care of; you are living with your friends and relatives; and here you

may remain." The majority of these people do not deprive anyone else of a job.

Mr. BURROUGHS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I can not yield. I am sorry I can not; I have not the time. The unemployment in this country last year was not due to immigration. It was due to other causes. Do not blame it on immigration, because since 1915 we really have had no increase in immigration. So do not charge it to that. If you think these people are undesirable, I wish you would come out into the interior of the country and see what good citizens they are getting to be, instead of reading prejudiced articles that have been paid for and instigated by narrow-minded, prejudiced men. Come out to Chicago and I will show you some of these people. I had the case of a mother and two daughters for whom I appealed. A mother lost her two boys fighting for the cause of the Allies. These daughters have been admitted temporarily, and they have been here seven or eight months. In that time they have saved \$450. They will not become a public charge. They have already deposited \$300 on a little home which they have purchased and in which they now live. By refusing to vote favorably for this resolution you say to that happy mother and two daughters, notwithstanding that she gave to the cause her only two sons, that they must be taken into custody and deported to a country where nothing but starvation awaits them.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON], who preceded me, has read from an article from the Saturday Evening Post, wherein the writer points out the great dangers our Nation faces because of our broad and liberal immigration policies in the past. To him and all others who are engaged, as well as those who employ them to write these articles, I will say that the actual facts completely belie their charges and assertions. If they were desirous of giving the actual truth as to the effect that immigration had upon our Nation, they would be obliged to say that the real increase in immigration commenced in 1880, and since that time the country has increased its wealth from \$43,000,000,000 to \$290,000,000,000 in 1921; our exports have increased from \$835,000,000 in 1880 to \$6,516,000,000 in 1921; in 1880 money in circulation amounted to \$973,382,228, while in 1921 it reached the sum of \$5,774,065,654; in 1880 bank clearings totaled \$84,000,000,000 and the amount reached in 1921 was \$462,920,000,000; deposits in savings banks in 1880 was \$819,000,000; in 1921 they were \$6,018,000,000; the number of depositors in 1880 numbered 2,335,582; in 1921 they numbered 10,737,843. The value of farms and farm property in 1880 was \$12,180,501,508; in 1921 the value was \$40,991,449,090; farm products value in 1880 were \$2,212,000,000 as compared to \$8,498,000,000 in 1921; the farm animal value in 1880 was \$1,576,000,000; in 1921, \$6,235,000,000. Cattle horses, and swine actually doubled since 1880. In 1880 we exported \$835,000,000 worth of merchandise, and in 1921, \$6,516,000,000; in 1880 the value of our mine and quarry products amounted to \$367,000,000; in 1920, \$6,707,000,000. In 1899 we built vessels amounting to 300,000 tons; in 1920, 3,880,629,000; and in 1921, 2,665,000,000 tons; in 1920 we had 12,601,935 telephones in the United States.

In 1880 we had 8,955,000 dwellings and in 1920, 20,697,000, and notwithstanding that within the last 10 to 15 years we have constructed thousands of up-to-date, tremendous apartment buildings, in 1920 there was only 5.1 per cent persons to a dwelling as against 5.6 in 1880, clearly showing that more people own their homes and live better. In 1880 the average daily school attendance was 6,144,000; in 1918 it was 15,548,000. The university attendance for 1880 was 286,000 students and in 1918 it had increased to 650,000. For common-school education the sum of \$78,000,000 was expended in 1880; in 1918, \$763,000,000. The number of collegiate resident graduate students in universities, colleges, and technical schools in 1880 was 68,256; in 1918 they numbered 375,000.

There is no one who has the courage or nerve to say, notwithstanding the immigration for the last 40 years, that America and the American citizen has not progressed, not only in wealth but in education and knowledge, so that he is head and shoulders above any other people on the face of the globe. It must be admitted by all and everyone that the five millions of boys who formed our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps in the late war, beyond any doubt, surpassed men that composed the armies of any other nation, not only in vigor, loyalty, courage, and bravery, but physically, mentally, and intellectually, and that notwithstanding the fact that nearly 50 per cent of them were the boys of immigrants or immigrants themselves.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the article which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON] read must have been written by the same individual who just completed a book which has just reached me, and undoubtedly sent to every other

Member for the purpose of prejudicing them on this question. This book, to my mind, contains more unjustifiable, unwarranted charges, and more libel than any other "thing" ever written by anyone who had the courage (?) to publish it under his own name.

Mr. Chairman, during the war immigrants demonstrated beyond any doubt that they were loyal and patriotic and ready to give even their lives for this country of ours. Why should we not be fair and liberal and humane to these few people who will not affect anyone. I venture to say that not one of these 2,400 people live in the districts of the gentlemen who are opposed to this joint resolution. Still, these gentlemen take great pains to oppose this humane measure that has been brought in by the chairman of this committee. I congratulate the chairman [Mr. JOHNSON of Washington] upon his action, and I congratulate the majority of the committee, and I hope that when you gentlemen vote you will not be carried away by the remarks and statements that have been printed in some of the papers, statements which are not true, written by people who do not know anything about conditions or who willfully and deliberately falsify. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON].

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, during the last fiscal year nearly 1,000,000 immigrants were permitted to enter our country. Thousands upon thousands of others would have come over if it had not been for the restrictions of the visé law. This Congress felt that for the present at least immigration to the extent of 1,000,000 per year was far too much, and passed the 3 per cent law which provided for a maximum of 355,000, providing every country filled its quota. Up to the present time about 200,000 have been admitted, and as many countries have already exhausted their quotas, probably not to exceed 250,000 will enter this fiscal year. This 3 per cent law was not a substitute for existing restrictive laws but an addition. It was a further restriction. It said in effect that regardless of qualifications under existing law not more than the 3 per cent shall enter.

It was a distinct departure from existing law. It was passed as an emergency measure, and was placed in operation without adequate time to work out proper methods for administering it. Quotas had to be established for each country. European boundaries have been changing, making it difficult to apply quotas to individual cases. But with all its faults and difficulties it has one real virtue. It restricts, and that is what this country needs.

Some of these quotas were necessarily small and were exhausted almost immediately following the passage of the act.

It appears that in one way or another 2,443 persons have been admitted by the Immigration Service who are in excess of the quota. The list is as follows:

EXCESS OF QUOTAS.

A table showing the excess of quotas by countries from July 1, 1921, to February 28, 1922, follows:

Number of persons admitted in excess of quotas to Feb. 28, 1922, during eight months of operation of 3 per cent act.

Belgium	5
Greece	152
Hungary	379
Yugoslavia	228
Poland (including eastern Galicia)	251
Portugal (including Azores and Madeira Islands)	78
Spain	97
Other European (including Andorra, Gibraltar, Lichtenstein, Malta, Memel, Monaco, San Marino, and Iceland)	25
Palestine	151
Syria	87
Turkey (Europe and Asia, including Smyrna district)	431
Other Asia (including Persia, Rhodes, Cyprus, and territory other than Siberia, which is not included in the Asiatic barred zone; persons born in Siberia are included in the Russia quota)	444
Africa	63
Australia	7
New Zealand	24
Atlantic Islands (other than Azores, Madeira, and islands adjacent to the American continents)	21
Total	2,443

These people are not defectives. All are admissible under our immigration laws. All have a visé from an American consul. They have not been admitted because they come from countries whose quota has been exhausted.

How did they happen to come? Why did they leave their own country before learning whether they would be permitted to enter here?

Among this number are orphan children whose friends were assured by the Government that the quota was not exhausted and who then cabled for the children to come. Upon arrival here the quota was found to be exhausted.

Others of these people left their homes in far-away parts of Asia before we passed this law. The journey here has cost them thousands of dollars.

There is a group of people from Assyria, who fought against the Turks in Mesopotamia and who, after untold hardships, finally reached civilization. Throughout their overland march of hundreds of miles they carried at the head of their column the Stars and Stripes. American consular officers furnished them with visés. This was long before the 3 per cent law was enacted. The quota from Assyria was small, and when they arrived at our Pacific port the quota had been exhausted.

What shall we do with them? We can not send them back to Assyria. They have no way of getting there. Furthermore, the Turk would be there to exterminate those who arrived.

In this group of 2,400 are 200 Armenian refugee children. They were gathered together by American citizens, who brought them here in good faith, with no knowledge of the fact that coming from the Armenians of Turkey they were properly chargeable to Turkey, whose quota was exhausted.

You who are opposing this law, what do you advise doing with them? American citizens in the best of faith brought them here after they had rescued them from the Turk. Shall we turn them back? You who oppose this law must either answer in the affirmative or propose another remedy.

The hearings before the committee show that the Turks massacred one group that were denied visés because the quota had been exhausted. Three American citizens were among those slain.

Surely we can not turn these people back under such circumstances. American citizens in good faith have brought them here, and I am not willing to lend my aid to their deportation to certain death.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I am sorry, but I can not yield.

Mr. Chairman, there is but a choice between admission or deportation.

It is the business of the State Department to establish a proper liaison between its visé officers and the Immigration Service so as to prevent issuance of visés where quotas are exhausted or nearly exhausted.

The Immigration Service should not permit quotas to be exhausted, but should keep a sort of reserve list for cases of great emergencies.

The steamship companies should be required to observe even more care in selling passage to citizens of countries whose quota is nearly exhausted.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that this is being done, or is being worked out. In my judgment there should be no occasion for any similar request for the next year if there is this cooperation between State Department, Immigration Bureau, and steamship companies. Mr. Chairman, this bill in the interests of humanity and for the good name of America should pass. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I will occupy the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 20 minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I request, for the first time I have ever done it, that I may be permitted to conclude my remarks without interruption.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for one general question?

Mr. RAKER. For one question.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It does not pertain directly to this measure. At least three years ago the promise was held out that a permanent law would be enacted fixing a definite immigration policy. When the bill was brought in that was passed about a year ago that promise was renewed. Nevertheless since that bill was enacted there has been another merely temporary extension measure passed by the House. Can the gentleman tell us—and I know if he can he will do it very frankly—why it is that the committee has failed to evolve permanent legislation dealing with the immigration problem, which is admitted to be of prime importance, and with all its features, and including the matter of examining immigrants on the other side of the ocean, so as to avoid having those who are disqualified from being landed in this country?

Mr. RAKER. I wish I could do so now, but I will get to that before I get through. Now, gentlemen, I shall be frank and as near to the point as I can on what I am going to say. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], on the 2d of March, made a speech on what had been accomplished in the present administration, and included in that as one great constructive piece of legislation the act of May 19, 1921. Now, that act provides that when the 3 per cent has been exhausted no more can be admitted. It is not a provision that allows any discretion in the Secretary of Labor; it is a plain mandatory provision:

When the maximum number of aliens of any particular nationality who may be admitted in any fiscal year under this act shall have been admitted, all other aliens of such nationality, except as otherwise provided in the act, who may apply for admission during the same fiscal year shall be excluded.

There is no discretion. The question of mercy is not involved in this case. The minority would go as far as anyone if it was.

Now, gentlemen I want to say to you that there was not a word of hearings or testimony had on this resolution. There was nothing before the committee in regard to these 2,400—who they are, where they came from, what is their nationality—except a written statement left with the chairman of the committee, which I hold in my hand, and which is referred to and made a part of this report. There is nothing to show when they left their own country, and I say without successful contradiction that the chairman of this committee made a statement to this House when the matter was up on June 20, 1921, when we allowed the 11,000 during that time to come in under the resolution, that "that would clear the seas." Turn, gentlemen, to the RECORD, page 2778, and you will see that he said that would clear the seas of all the men that had started entitled to enter, and they allowed the 11,000 to enter.

Mr. BOX. And were not a lot of them landed in advance while that was being considered?

Mr. RAKER. That is true. The order made does not show any question of hardship. I want to impress on your mind, if I can, that when we made a request that the committee have hearings to show where these people came from, when they left, and how they were admitted, and whether there was any question of mercy or sympathy, it was defeated and turned down and the committee of this House was denied an opportunity to be heard. All these statements about sympathy, all these statements about mercy, are not involved in this case, because there is not a word of testimony before the committee on any such basis.

Let me tell you what is the matter. The Immigration Service, by virtue of the enormous pressure that is being brought to bear by certain Members high in official authority, many groups of people interested because they want the work, many people who desire to bring them here, organizations, have been doing everything in their power to break down this law and get their people in. I believe that we would have been able to show if we had gone into testimony in the hearings that some of these men had been sent for and notified four or five months before they came over believing they would be entitled to be admitted. They have broken down the Immigration Service at Ellis Island ruthlessly, improperly, and I just want to call your attention without reading any names, as I think it ought to be, what was done:

Report that certain officials under Immigration Service at Ellis Island and New York have been charged with criminal violation of the law in regard to admitting immigrants. How many and what is the situation? Kindly advise me. I want it as a member of the Committee on Immigration of the House.

That was the only chance I had to get any information. What do I get?

March 13, 1922—this is from a public official, who has charge and knows:

The matter about which you have telegraphed me is in the hands of the district attorney. I can not, therefore, divulge any names at the present time.

Money being used; desire to bring these people in against the law; desire to break the law down? Gentlemen, there was never such a saturnalia of effort to break down a law as there is at this time, and we would have been able to demonstrate it if we had had the hearings. I am not going to criticize my colleagues, but I think they were mistaken. They are overburdened with telegrams to break down the law and put people in. That is the trouble.

Now, in addition to that, here is the crux of the situation, and I want you to think about this: There are 2,400 and over who are here. Nobody knows whether they are men, women, or children; nobody knows whether they are all laboring men; nobody knows—

Mr. ROSSDALE. The department knows.

Mr. RAKER. We do not get the information. Their agents are charged with a criminal offense in letting them in.

Mr. ROSSDALE. They are not admissible under this act.

Mr. RAKER. Twenty-four hundred. Let us see what that means to the steamship companies. According to my colleague and lovable chairman, when he made his speech, which I have before me, on June 20, 1921, that bill cleared the seas. That is what he said, and it did. We extended it four or five days. None of these people that are admitted started without knowledge, and everybody knows it. This notice is given every week to the steamship companies and to everyone else. The steamship companies, under the law, must pay the expense of keeping these people; they must pay the expense of gathering them up. They must pay the expense of returning it, and they have been active, energetic, persistent, domineering, and have almost tried to override the Congress. They have appealed to the President; they have gone to the Secretary of Labor; they have gone to the Commissioner General of Immigration. They have done everything on earth they could in every way in New York. This bill alone means to them in the neighborhood of \$500,000, from the payment of which they will be relieved, if the bill is passed.

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

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand that these persons who have been admitted under bond, if they are returned, are returned at the expense of the steamship companies?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That statement is directly opposite to one made to me by the Immigration Service.

Mr. RAKER. It could not be.

Mr. MANN. It was so made.

Mr. RAKER. What I mean is this: It could not be the law, because the law says that they can not be admitted. There is no provision that gives the Secretary of Labor or the Commissioner General of Immigration the right to admit these people. Therefore he has allowed them to enter temporarily, with an understanding, and the order is made now for deportation in every case, because they are here contrary to law, and the steamship companies must pay their expense while at Ellis Island and must assist in gathering them up and must return them, and it will amount to in the neighborhood of \$500,000, and the steamship companies are personally involved here. They are the ones for whom we are shedding tears and not for any pretended or assumed orphans. To make my answer plain to the gentleman from Illinois—

Mr. MANN. Oh, I think the gentleman makes the answer plain, but it is contrary to what the Immigration Service told me was the case.

Mr. RAKER. I say this, and I stand by it, and there is no getting away from it. If they had not been admitted, if they are admitted temporarily, legally, the steamship company is responsible, and if the Secretary of Labor has admitted them illegally, then the question of whether the steamship companies would be compelled to return these people and pay their expenses is doubtful.

Mr. MANN. It is easy to split hairs about the theory, but the fact is another thing. The fact is that the steamship companies do not return them at their expense.

Mr. RAKER. It is a dead, open, moral certainty that if they had been detained as directed by law, had been kept at Ellis Island, the steamship companies under the law would have been compelled to return them at the expense of the steamship companies.

Mr. MANN. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. RAKER. There is no doubt about that. It is only a question of the violation of the law.

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

Mr. RAKER. I can not yield. Except for a voluntary, ex parte statement, there is not a word before you upon which you can base your judgment or sympathy upon the question of even humanity, if you please. The committee were denied that right. We were unable to get that testimony to bring it before you, and there is brought in here the bold statement, and they rely on hearsay or outside testimony in regard to this matter, and they are now appealing to you on the question of sympathy to break down the Immigration Service to permit these people to come in here contrary to law, to the end and for the reason that many people or a number in these large cities are interested and always have been against the immigration law in the first place, and in the second place as a finality and as a fact the steamship companies are the people involved, and they are the ones who want this law repealed if they can get it repealed. They are the ones who are the strong sponsors for the particular legislation to allow these people in here. Talk about sympathy,

talk about mercy, talk about humanity! Then my friend from New York comes in here with a folder that he has had rolled up for three or four years, with nothing to show who these people are. We could have gotten at the testimony and have presented it to the House if we had had the opportunity. We would have been able to show how the Immigration Service at Ellis Island is being broken down, when it has been suggested on the outside that some men went in and rubbed at least 20 names off the manifest, and then had gotten \$100 apiece for these men that were over the quota. This is thus reported. The facts should have been adduced. We could have proven those facts I am convinced, but we were denied the opportunity, and you are denied it. The Secretary of Labor, the Commissioner General of Immigration, each in his heart and in his mind wants to enforce the law. They told us that they are in favor of it, but there is a constant appeal and demand that they do not enforce it. We should uphold them in enforcing the law.

Then they promised him they would possibly get this piece of legislation through in this body if he would let them in temporarily, and then he told them that these people ought to be deported. That they were here illegally, and this Congress breaks the law down. That was his statement to the committee some time before on another matter. If we are going to enforce the law, it is up to you, it is up to the people. Now, what are you going to do about it? We said, enforce the law, of course; there is nothing else to do. You break it down in this instance; break it down in matters that are somewhat important; and every steamship company gets notice every week, and everybody knows the quota, full information has been given to these people, and notwithstanding that they said that they secured the passage of one resolution leaving in over 11,000 who were illegally here at that time, and we will run the risk, we can even send over for our friends, our relatives, or anyone we want, because we know by the time they get here they will be held at Ellis Island for a week or two or maybe 10 days, great complaint will come up on the ground of sympathy; we will give no facts; we will submit no testimony to be presented; and the House will have no opportunity to know the facts, and we will make a grandstand play on the ground of mercy and humanity, and we will get the resolution through, notwithstanding the appeal of my distinguished colleague from Ohio, who got up here the other day and said that this was one of the great pieces of legislation enacted by the present administration, that he believed in the enforcement of the law, that if we passed a law and if we find men violating the law we ought to punish them, and that we ought to stand by the law, we ought to stand for the enforcing of the law. Here you come, because there are a lot of appeals, because there is organization, as Judge Box said, because he watched them; the steamship companies stayed up until 11 o'clock at night with the committee on December 19, and the next day, when they thought they were going to get the resolution through, the whole bunch of them were in the gallery looking down here weeping for the little girl or the little boy, claiming mercy for them because of the women and children and the wives and mothers of the ex-service men. My God, they never thought about it. They were thinking about the \$500,000 that was coming into their pockets if such a resolution was passed.

Mr. ROSSDALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I can not. That is what there is in this business. Gentlemen, I do not know in 10 years when there was a matter of this importance that has come before the House that the committee having charge of it was denied the opportunity to go into the facts and get an opportunity so we might present it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman deny the facts are not strung all along the 500 pages of the hearings?

Mr. RAKER. I am not criticizing the gentleman; I do not intend to; but am stating my idea of this resolution. We had no testimony on it. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, I made a motion to have a hearing, and I was voted down.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I remember—

Mr. RAKER. We started out—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will ask the gentleman if he denies the testimony, and I make the charge that the gentleman in order to delay this piece of legislation wanted to run through and have an individual investigation of the 2,400 and more immigrants, which would have been an impossible thing to do.

Mr. RAKER. I did not intend to delay, and I never have. I wanted to get the facts. I made the charge then, and I make the charge now, that if the facts were presented to this House there would not be 5 votes in favor of this resolution. You could not afford to stand for such a bad piece of legislation, breaking down the laws of the country in favor of the steamship companies. This testimony which the gentleman refers to

related to another proposition altogether, not to these 2,400 and over here desired to be admitted by this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, in all the declamation to which we have listened, full of sound and fury, not one single opponent of this resolution has said "send them back, deport them"—not one; not one has suggested it. Mr. Chairman, in inaugurating a new and untried policy after 135 years' experience under the Constitution the only wonder is that this law has been as successfully administered as it has. [Applause.] Not a man has said "send them back." The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON], for whose veracity I have a very high regard, I think unintentionally misled some members of this committee when he stated or carried the idea that the admissions proposed by this resolution exceeded the aggregate provided for under the law. He should have said definitely that it exceeded the quota from the certain countries involved. The operation of this law has reduced immigration from 750,000 to 195,000 up to date, and the well-authenticated statement by men particularly close to this subject, with every opportunity to speak by the book, is that the immigration will not exceed 250,000 for the current year.

Gentlemen speaking on this resolution did not state the issue. They avoided it; they side-stepped it. They did not attack the law. They stated that some mysterious, unlocated influence is and has been at work to break down the law, and yet did not even cite a single instance where any officer charged with its enforcement had connived at its violation.

In most pathetic terms we have been presented with the catalogue of the deportation or rejection of 37,719 inadmissible aliens through a period of 20 years preceding this restriction because of idiocy, imbecility, epilepsy, constitutional, mental, or nervous inferiority, insanity, and so forth. Does the gentleman find any justification in these citations for his opposition to this resolution? Certainly the gentleman would not have admitted any of the 37,719 who were rejected or deported in conformity to law. The gentleman does not complain that the same provision of law is now being rigidly enforced. Does the gentleman mean since we have turned back so many thousand undesirables, we should now turn back a few hundred immigrants who are admissible except for the reason that they are in excess of the quota from their respective countries? The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box] is painfully exercised because an immigrant is seeking admission among the list covered by this resolution, because it is shown she is coming to her uncle, who is well able to care for her, so that she will not become a public charge, and complains that there are many other similar instances. Well, what does the gentleman want? Would he prefer we should admit a pauper or one who is liable to become a public charge? The gentleman is a good lawyer and knows well that the requirements in this particular are rigidly enforced.

Mr. Chairman, there is but one question involved, and it has been clearly stated by the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Shall we do what we have the unquestioned power to do, pass this resolution and admit a few here and there in excess of the inflexible number fixed by law, or shall we say, with what seems to me an almost brutal and certainly a cruel disregard of the finer instincts of humanity, we will enforce the law and make no exception? We will not mitigate its harshness; no, not if it separates the mother from her baby, the husband from the wife, the little boy or girl from his citizen father and mother in a good American home. Gentlemen, I will not so vote. In answer to my name my lips would refuse to pronounce the word "no." And so long as the kindlier instincts of humanity shall stir my soul, when no national interest is jeopardized, my sympathy and my vote will never be cast to separate a mother from her baby.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for six minutes.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee for over seven years. Never before in the history of this House and of this committee have I seen any gentleman rise here and make remarks along the lines which have been made by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] as to what occurred in the committee room on the evening when one of the steamship representatives appeared before the committee. I say to you that the steamship representative came before the committee at

the particular request of the committee, because we were seeking information.

At page 230 of the hearings we find the following testimony: STATEMENT OF MR. R. H. FARLEY, ASSISTANT PASSENGER TRAFFIC MANAGER, PANAMA PACIFIC LINE, INTERNATIONAL MERCANTILE MARINE CO., 9 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY.

Mr. FARLEY. I represent the International Mercantile Co. Our president was here this morning, and there is very little I can add to what he so ably presented.

Mr. BOX. That was Mr. Franklin?

Mr. FARLEY. Yes, Mr. Franklin. I simply came here at the suggestion of Congressman SIEGEL.

Mr. SIEGEL. We all had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Farley, if you will recollect, when we were on the *Adriatic*.

Mr. FARLEY. I want to assure you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that I appreciate the fact that the chairman and yourselves recognize that the steamship companies had a problem to deal with in carrying out the execution of the law. That we have done so well to me is remarkable. I recall that when the law went into effect we asked the authorities, the commissioner general—we pointed out to him that, in our opinion, the best way would be to govern quotas by departures from Europe, pointing out the difficulty otherwise to properly enforce it on basis of arrivals. However, it was not found possible to put that into effect; but, to my mind, to regulate the movement by departures rather than arrivals is the solution, and in any legislation contemplated I think that should be arranged.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a single man, woman, or child of these 2,453 whom they want to be returned to the other side who would be shipped back at the expense of the steamship companies. The law is plain in regard to that. And why all this hairsplitting? Who are these 2,453 immigrants? Ninety per cent of them are women and children—many of them are mothers of men who gave their lives on the other side during the World War fighting under our flag. I hold here a picture of one of the boys whose life was given up on the other side on October 8, 1918, and among his papers was found a request that his mother come to this side. She got her visé in May, arrived in December, and was ordered excluded because the quota was exhausted. Secretary of Labor Davis, under the power vested in him under the immigration act of 1917, permitted her to enter America. I want to say that all these cases are somewhat along that line. When the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] attempts to tell you that these steamship companies are appealing to keep these men and women and children here in order to save money, he is telling you something which, to use charitable words, is not a fact. I might use stronger language to emphasize what I mean, but the House understands.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. I will.

Mr. VAILE. If they were deported they would be deported at the expense of the United States, would they not?

Mr. SIEGEL. Either at the expense of the Government or of their relatives if they would volunteer to pay for their return transportation. The law is plain in regard to that particular subject. These people came to America of their own accord originally, and the United States consul in each case received \$10 to visé their passports. These visés were granted by our own officials abroad, who apparently were not informed of the exhaustion of the quota. If our consuls did not know, how could these immigrants know?

Mr. VAILE. The steamship companies would profit by the deportation because they would be paid by the United States.

Mr. SIEGEL. There is no doubt about that, because we have a contingent fund for the return of aliens.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman deny that Mr. Sanford, Mr. Farley, and Mr. Franklin insisted before the committee on the night of December 19 that they should be admitted in accordance with this resolution?

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Franklin appeared in the daytime. The only witness appearing in the evening was Mr. Farley, because he returned at my particular request.

The 500 pages of testimony were taken, not only in the daytime but at nighttime as well. This committee has worked day and night for months for the purpose of gathering testimony. No person can understand the immigration problem with its numerous ramifications affecting life and death of individuals unless he will read this testimony. And I say right now and once more, and I defy the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] or anyone else to prove to the contrary, that these 2,453 people are not women and children mainly who are coming here. To whom? Their own next of kin. We all know what the situation was when the law went into effect. We know that the testimony establishes that these couple of hundred children and others had gotten their visés in May, before the law went into effect, and it took a long time for them to come here. The stories of the hardships, sufferings, and cruelties many of them had undergone were bound to move the hearts of fair-minded men and women, in whose hearts there

is no hate. I appealed to the President when some of the cases arose and told him what the situation was, and I say that the Secretary of Labor had the right to admit them temporarily under the act of 1917. The United States District Court in the Southern District of New York only a few days ago took the same view as I did and held that the act of 1917 is still in existence, and that the act of 1921 was simply an addition, because if you took a contrary view, then the entire law of 1917 might be deemed to have been wiped off the statute books. All that we did in 1921 was to put in the 3 per cent quota law as an amendment to the act of 1917.

What are you going to do with these women and children? Where are you going to send them? Are you going to say to the American people that this Congress is not going to exercise the power which it possesses, a power of mercy, fair dealing, and humanity? [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, some gentlemen who have spoken here in opposition to the resolution probably forgot the testimony given before the committee that orphan children returned to Constantinople were murdered. The following poem may remind them of what they would see repeated if this resolution should fail. It is entitled—

ARMENIANS AT ELLIS ISLAND.
(By Isabel Fiske Conant.)

"We will go to America," said one,
"It is a land of kindness and of plenty.
There'll be a place there for us, in its sun;
Some one will hear of us; some sweet-and-twenty,
Told of war's aftermath, touched by its welter,
Instead of giving one more evening ball
Will give us somewhere shelter;
Some lonely woman, who has lost her all
Except her wealth. . . . " "Some church will," said another;
"Yes, we must go; there's no hope else," they said.
"It's brotherhood. . . . Would that our elder brother
Once more were risen radiant from the dead!"

Twixt doubt and hope they left Armenia—
"At least it will put off the evil day,"
One, grimly, said. They hailed America,
After a storm-tossed and imprisoned way. . . .
They were beyond the quota for September.
A group of seventeen—fair-looking folk—
(Recording Angel! may you not remember
'Gainst us those unheard prayers they spoke!)
Pictured one Sunday in the supplement,
Souls in their faces begged us not to shirk.
For all that, nothing happened. . . . They were sent,
Women and children all, back to the Turk. . . .
They all were murdered, but were outraged first
(Multiple Calvary, watched by Christian States).

It's since the war that war has done its worst.
And stricken is the sentry at our gates;
Torch-bearing Liberty. . . . And now again
Another group is here! This time we know
What waits for them, deported . . . with what pain
Must Christ's old wounds reopen, if they go!
Spare His torn feet and hands. . . .
(The heart of evil in the world is wild.)
Make known love's succor to the pleading lands,
His day, the birthday of a little Child.

—(From the New York Times.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the resolution.
The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution (No. 279) to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens admitted temporarily under bond in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921.

Resolved, etc., That aliens who entered the United States before March 7, 1922, in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved May 19, 1921, and were temporarily admitted under bond may, if otherwise admissible, and if not subject to deportation for other causes, be permitted by the Secretary of Labor to remain in the United States without regard to the provisions of such act of May 19, 1921. In the case of any alien so permitted to remain the bond shall be canceled.

The following committee amendment was also read:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 3, strike out the figure "1" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "7."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, this committee amendment is typical of the whole thing. It was put in there to accommodate a certain group. That is what put it in.

Mr. SABATH. What group, may I ask?

Mr. BOX. They were people in whom the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] was especially interested.

Mr. SIEGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. I will.

Mr. SIEGEL. I will state that the amendment was reported because a child happened to be born in Poland and the father was in Russia, and they applied for citizenship papers in New

York and could not get them because of the fact that his wife was not there.

Mr. BOX. I call your attention to the statement in the committee report that these cases had been passed on individually, so as to find out whether or not they were cases of special hardship, which is the excuse for this resolution. I read from the committee report:

To avoid great hardships, the Secretary of Labor ordered releases under conditions as above.

Above that is the following:

All of these temporary admissions were made on individual showings.

Now, gentlemen, read the order as I presented it in my remarks a few moments ago. That order was made on the 24th of December. It ordered the admission of all who were at the New York and Boston immigration stations, then numbering 1,200, more or less, all who were in ships out in the harbor or on the seas, or in any port of the United States, or who might arrive at any port of the United States on or before January 25. And we have this statement that each case had been passed on individually for you to act on, that these cases were passed on individually. There are things involved, gentlemen, I say to you—and I hope with proper moderation—in this course that are utterly ruinous in their tendency. These people were admitted while they were on the seas. There were 2,300 on shipboard in the harbor and 380 coming up the bay at New York. I do not know how many were coming in or coming to all other ports. Besides there were 1,200 then at the two ports of New York and Boston at that very time, and yet they tell you that those people out there on the seas had been investigated, every case had been tried, and that each had been found to be a special case of distress, and that as a matter of humanity they must let them in.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 9235) providing for a grant of land to the State of Washington for public park purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 9606) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for payment of charges due on reclamation projects, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. McNARY, Mr. JONES of Washington, and Mr. SHEPPARD as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

IMMIGRATION.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What does the gentleman desire?

Mr. RAKER. I want five minutes on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from California for or against the amendment?

Mr. RAKER. I am against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington rises in opposition to it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; I am not in opposition to it.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Washington is in favor of the amendment, and the gentleman from California is against it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, of which the gentleman from California shall have 5 minutes and 1 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be closed in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I suppose the gentleman would give the House or some of these Members a chance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not want to use unnecessary time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. RAKER. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in support of my statement to the Members of the House, I want to call your attention to section 18 of the immigration act of February 5, 1917, which says:

That all aliens brought to this country in violation of law shall be immediately sent back in accommodations of the same class as those in which they arrived—

And it then goes on to provide that the steamship companies shall pay all expenses. The Commissioner of Immigration and his assistants all concede that the steamship companies must pay the expenses of these people while in the United States if they are brought here unlawfully.

Mr. MANN. Does not that say they must be immediately deported?

Mr. RAKER. That is what this law requires.

Mr. MANN. I know; but when they are admitted in bond they can not be immediately deported.

Mr. RAKER. What I am trying to convey to the House—

Mr. MANN. What I am trying to convey to the House is the fact, not an interpretation.

Mr. RAKER. This is the fact. The record shows that 2,400 and some odd people were illegally brought into the United States in violation of the law. The duty of the Secretary of Labor was to order them deported. He ordered them deported. Then, by virtue of widely extended requests, he temporarily admitted them, without any law to permit him to do it. I say that you can not find a scrap or a sentence in the law anywhere to the effect that the Secretary of Labor or the Commissioner General of Immigration has the right or the power to admit anyone illegally or unlawfully brought to the United States.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman still claim that the steamship companies shall be compelled to take them back at their own expense now?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, of course, it is all wrong to enforce the law. In that case the steamship companies and their friends have worked a ruse on the department, and they are going to save themselves, by the failure of our authorities to deport these people, something like \$500,000. That is all there is to it.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman say that under the law the department has not the power to admit them?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. But they did admit them.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; a man can commit murder if he wants to.

Mr. MANN. But they did admit them. It is like the case of the man in jail who is told by his counsel that he can not be put in jail.

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

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. CLOUSE. The gentleman has shown that under existing law the steamship company would have to pay the expense of deporting these people who were illegally admitted. Now, if the Commissioner General of Immigration permitted them to come in here, did he require the steamship company to execute a bond to the effect that they would carry out the provisions of the law in the event it should be decided to deport them?

Mr. RAKER. We did not get opportunity to require that that should be done.

Mr. CLOUSE. If he had done his duty, would he not have required such a bond as that?

Mr. RAKER. I think the bond would have been illegal and worthless, because he had no power to require the bond to be given. The law does not permit him to accept the bond. If he had required a bond or had required the execution of a bond, and he had no authority to do that, the bond would have been worthless.

Mr. CLOUSE. I concede that to be true. But he had no right in the first place to admit them.

Mr. RAKER. I want to call your attention to the first provision, the only provision that can possibly be referred to. That is in section 3 of the act of April 5, 1917, and it has this language:

Provided, That the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall issue rules and prescribe regulations, including the exaction of such bonds necessary to control and regulate the admission and return of otherwise inadmissible aliens applying—

Applying for what? "For temporary admission." All of these people were seeking to come here permanently and seeking to stay here. It is conceded by the department that they have no right to admit a man here who comes to the United States to remain permanently. This is only to apply to the admissions

provided for, and it was only done by the extreme solicitation, by the almost overwhelming power brought to bear, that the Secretary made these orders to let these people in here, even before they arrived in the United States.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to correct some misstatements and set my colleagues right, if I can, as to some misinformation that they seem to possess. The House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization sat week in and week out, with many night sessions, trying to perfect amendments to the 3 per cent act. Some of these amendments, designed to make the law more workable, will be offered to you at an early date.

If these are not attached in the Senate to the House resolution extending the time of the 3 per cent act, which was recently passed by a vote of 281 to 36, they will be offered here by special resolution. One of these amendments deals with the boundary situation. European immigrants who are piling up in Canada, Mexico, and Cuba, hoping to beat our present restrictive act, will not be permitted to do so. Other amendments, we hope, will take care of some of the situations which made necessary the resolution which is now before you.

We have the temporary 3 per cent restriction act. We are not going to lose that act. We are not going to break it down. We are going to strengthen it. In my opinion, the United States, having ceased to be an asylum for the oppressed, can afford to be the least bit humane in getting its new law under way. Because we are ending the melting-pot fallacy and we know now our grievous blunder of unrestricted immigration, and are now changing front, we need not send back to the bloody Turks a hundred or so Armenian babes.

Let me repeat, extensive hearings, running for weeks and months, were held by the committee, including numerous night sessions. They were wide open to all. Everybody came, and those that did not, like the Labor Department and Immigration Bureau officials, we invited. Among those present and entitled to be heard were, as has been said, steamship officials, but there is nothing to the innuendo that there was any undue influence anywhere by anyone.

Of the 2,443 in excess of quota which this resolution proposes to admit, let me call attention to the fact that 1,000 or more of them could not be deported to any country—to any place in the world—resolution or no resolution! You can not send back certain people who fled from Syria, Assyria, and Turkish Armenia months before there was a quota law. You can not send certain Spaniards back to Spain when they left the United States in fishing vessels before there was a quota and got back from their fishing trips to find the quota law in existence and the quota from Spain exhausted in the first two months of the law. The immigration from Spain numbered 18,821 in 1920 and 23,818 in 1921, so that the excess of 97 during the time under consideration, it seems to me, represents a very small surplus in view of the fact that Spain's quota was only 663 for the present fiscal year. We have an excess quota from Spain of 97! Is not that remarkable in the working of a new law when Spanish immigration dropped from 23,818 to almost nothing in a year?

The excess of 432 from Turkey is due principally to Armenians and to some extent to Greeks, who were admitted in order to avoid grave and unusual hardship. They have been referred to in this debate as Turks, and they are, but only because Turkey was their birthplace and in complete disregard of their adopted country.

The excess of 444 from "other Asia" is probably almost entirely made up of the so-called Assyrians, who were natives of Persia. These people, for the most part, left their temporary homes in Mesopotamia for the United States before the act of May 19, 1921, passed Congress, and the strongest kinds of appeals from various religious and philanthropic organizations were made in their behalf. They are remnants of massacred families.

I am accused of writing several relief resolutions, one as far back as December 19. I did, and the steamship men had nothing whatever to do with it. I was thinking of those unfortunates and the law itself.

Further, in this House on December 22 last, I made some remarks on the workings of the 3 per cent act, and I announced then that I would offer to the House the very resolution you have before you to-day. I said then that the 3 per cent act, in its first try out, had developed some weak spots which could and should be corrected by Congress itself. I said then:

Some of those people, under a strict reading of the law, must be returned to the stricken regions in Asia Minor where constant war rages between the Bolshevik on the north and the followers of Mohammed on the south, who preach death on the edge of the sword

of Islam, and who kill Christian and Jew alike; and so help me God, I will not stand idly by and let the United States send back these people if we can save them.

I said that then. I say it now.

During the six months ended December 31, 1921, a total of 985 aliens were actually debarred at United States ports because coming in in excess of the quotas prescribed by the act of May 19. This number has been increased somewhat since January 1 by very small numbers, as follows:

January 72
February 96
or a total of 1,153.

You heard read here a telegram from a Hungarian newspaper, a telegram sent to me. The inquiry developed that a mistake had been made in the Hungarian quota figures and some 200 Hungarians who supposed they were admissible were held up as a result of the clerical error over Christmas. That is all there is to that.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. One minute. That mistake was not corrected until the middle of February. I want to be fair. 'Tis human to err.

I have brought in this joint resolution in good faith. I think the step is a right and proper thing for Congress to do. Congress makes laws. This is to be a law.

I am afraid gentlemen who have signed the minority report, at last after years and years of no politics in our committee, appear to be injecting politics into the consideration of this question. They seem to charge that the Secretary of Labor did what he should not have done. But they do not say one word about the last Secretary of Labor, who, among other similar things, finally before he went out of office admitted under bond some 200 insane persons, probably one-half of them now married to American citizens in the country, who can not now be deported and here to breed long lines of insane people. They admitted them without coming to Congress. They admitted hundreds and hundreds of people who should not have been admitted, 10,000 sick, insane, and diseased in one year. Those objectionable aliens are in this country now by edict of that Secretary, who did not ask Congress for one word of authority.

We in one year's time have enacted a law which has reduced immigration in eight months from a probable million to 200,000. In that gigantic transformation from an asylum for the oppressed of all lands to a country of real restriction, we have on hand 2,443 exemptions, excesses, the slips, mistakes, and excusable cases of a new and drastic law, and a war-torn world whose changes could not be foreseen. The asylum idea is over forever, and so is the myth of the melting pot, I hope. Gentlemen may charge what they please. We have come to Congress in all fairness to give Congress its chance to pass a new law that gives a measure of grace, a mode of relief, an act of fairness or of necessity, or whatever you care to call it, and in order that the new law may be made practical and more popular.

I ask for a vote. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I move that the committee do now rise and report the joint resolution favorably with the amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the joint resolution as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. WALSH having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration H. J. Res. 279, to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens admitted temporarily under bond in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the joint resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution and amendment to the final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. May the amendment be read?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the joint resolution and the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That aliens who entered the United States before March 1, 1922, in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States,"

approved May 19, 1921, and were temporarily admitted under bond, may, if otherwise admissible and if not subject to deportation for other causes, be permitted by the Secretary of Labor to remain in the United States without regard to the provisions of such act of May 19, 1921. In the case of any alien so permitted to remain the bond shall be canceled.

With the following amendment:

On page 1, line 3, after the word "March," strike out the figure "1" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "7."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question being taken; on a division (demanded by Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee) there were—ayes 105, noes 35.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-one Members present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution. Those in favor will, as their names are called, vote yea, those opposed nay, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 243, nays 91, answered "present" 2, not voting 92, as follows:

YEAS—243.

Ackerman	Echols	Kline, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.
Andrew, Mass.	Edmonds	Knight	Reed, W. Va.
Andrews, Nebr.	Evans	Knutson	Rhodes
Anthony	Fairfield	Kopp	Ricketts
Appleby	Faust	Larson, Minn.	Robertson
Arentz	Favrot	Lawrence	Rogers
Atkeson	Fenn	Layton	Rose
Bacharach	Fess	Lea, Calif.	Rosenbloom
Barbour	Fitzgerald	Leatherwood	Rossdale
Beck	Focht	Lee, N. Y.	Sabath
Begg	Fordney	Lehlbach	Sanders, Ind.
Benham	Foster	Lineberger	Sanders, N. Y.
Bird	Frear	Little	Schall
Bixler	Free	Logan	Shaw
Bland, Ind.	French	London	Shelton
Bland, Va.	Frothingham	Longworth	Shreve
Bond	Fuller	Luce	Siegei
Brennan	Funk	McArthur	Sinclair
Brooks, Ill.	Gahn	McCormick	Sinnott
Brooks, Pa.	Gensman	McFadden	Smith, Idaho
Brown, Tenn.	Gernerd	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Mich.
Browne, Wis.	Glynn	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Snyder
Burdick	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sproul
Burroughs	Gorman	MacGregor	Stafford
Burtness	Graham, Ill.	Madden	Stephens
Burton	Green, Iowa	Magee	Stiness
Butler	Greene, Vt.	Maloney	Strong, Kans.
Cable	Griest	Mann	Summers, Wash.
Campbell, Kans.	Hadley	Mapes	Sweet
Campbell, Pa.	Hardy, Colo.	Merritt	Swing
Cannon	Hardy, Tex.	Michaelson	Taylor, N. J.
Carew	Harrison	Michener	Temple, Tenn.
Chalmers	Haugen	Mills	Ten Eyck
Chandler, N. Y.	Hawes	Millspaugh	Thompson
Chindblom	Hawley	Mondell	Timberlake
Christopherson	Hays	Montoya	Tinker
Clague	Hersey	Moore, Ohio	Tinkham
Clarke, N. Y.	Hickey	Moores, Ind.	Towner
Cockran	Hicks	Morin	Treadway
Cole, Iowa	Hill	Mott	Vaile
Cole, Ohio	Hoch	Murphy	Walters
Collins	Hogan	Nelson, A. P.	Ward, N. C.
Colton	Huddleston	Nelson, J. M.	Wason
Cooper, Ohio	Hukriede	Newton, Minn.	Watson
Cooper, Wis.	Hull	Newton, Mo.	Voigt
Copley	Husted	Nolan	Volk
Crago	Hutchinson	Norton	Volstead
Cramton	Ireland	O'Connor	Walters
Cullen	Jeffers, Nebr.	Osborne	Ward, N. C.
Curry	Jones, Wash.	Paige	Watson
Dale	Jones, Pa.	Parker, N. J.	White, Kans.
Dallinger	Kearns	Parker, N. Y.	White, Me.
Darrow	Koller	Patterson, Mo.	Williamson
Davis, Minn.	Kelly, Pa.	Patterson, N. J.	Woodruff
Denison	Ketcham	Perlman	Woodyard
Dickinson	Kindred	Porter	Wurzbach
Dowell	King	Purnell	Wyant
Dunbar	Kinkaid	Radcliffe	Yates
Dunn	Kirkpatrick	Ramseyer	Young
Dupré	Kissel	Ransley	Zihlman
Dyer	Kleczka	Reece	

NAYS—91.

Almon	Byrns, Tenn.	Fisher	Johnson, Ky.
Aswell	Cantrill	Fulmer	Johnson, Miss.
Bankhead	Carter	Garner	Jones, Tex.
Barkley	Clouse	Garrett, Tenn.	Kiess
Black	Collier	Garrett, Tex.	Kincheloe
Bowling	Connally, Tex.	Gilbert	Lanham
Box	Crisp	Goldsborough	Lankford
Brand	Dominick	Hammer	Larsen, Ga.
Briggs	Doughton	Hayden	Lazaro
Buchanan	Drane	Hooker	Lee, Ga.
Bulwinkle	Drewry	Hudspeth	Linthicum
Byrnes, S. C.	Driver	Jeffers, Ala.	Lowrey

Lyon	Padgett	Sanders, Tex.	Swank
McClintic	Park, Ga.	Sandlin	Thomas
McDuffie	Parks, Ark.	Scott, Tenn.	Tillman
McPherson	Pou	Sears	Tyson
MeSwain	Quin	Sisson	Upshaw
Miller	Raker	Smithwick	Vinson
Montague	Rankin	Steagall	Weaver
Moore, Va.	Rayburn	Stedman	Wilson
Oldfield	Roach	Stevenson	Woods, Va.
Oliver	Robson	Stoll	Wright
Overstreet	Rouse	Summers, Tex.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Herrick Humphreys

NOT VOTING—92.

Anderson	Ellis	Lampert	Rodenberg
Ansorge	Fairchild	Langley	Rucker
Beedy	Fields	Luhring	Ryan
Bell	Fish	McKenzie	Scott, Mich.
Blakeney	Freeman	Mansfield	Slemp
Blanton	Gallivan	Martin	Snell
Boies	Gould	Mead	Speaks
Bowers	Graham, Pa.	Moore, III.	Steenerson
Brinson	Greene, Mass.	Morgan	Strong, Pa.
Britten	Griffin	Mudd	Sullivan
Burke	Himes	O'Brien	Tague
Chandler, Okla.	Jacoway	Ogden	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Fla.	James	Olpp	Taylor, Colo.
Classon	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parrish	Tilson
Codd	Kahn	Perkins	Underhill
Connell	Kelley, Mich.	Petersen	Vare
Connolly, Pa.	Kendall	Pringey	Ward, N. Y.
Coughlin	Kennedy	Rainey, Ala.	Webster
Crowther	Kitchin	Rainey, Ill.	Williams
Davis, Tenn.	Kline, N. Y.	Reavis	Wingo
Deal	Kraus	Reber	Winslow
Dempsey	Kreider	Riddick	Wise
Elliott	Kunz	Riordan	Wood, Ind.

So the House joint resolution was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

Mr. SULLIVAN (for) with Mr. MARTIN (against).

Mr. GALLIVAN (for) with Mr. JACOWAY (against).

Mr. RAINY of Illinois (for) with Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee (against).

Mr. GRIFFIN (for) with Mr. FIELDS (against).

Mr. O'BRIEN (for) with Mr. WINGO (against).

Mr. TAGUE (for) with Mr. WISE (against).

Mr. LUHRING (for) with Mr. KITCHIN (against).

Mr. HIMES (for) with Mr. MANSFIELD (against).

Mr. SNELL (for) with Mr. BLANTON (against).

Mr. WINSLOW (for) with Mr. BELL (against).

Mr. OLPP (for) with Mr. RAINY of Alabama (against).

Mr. ELLIS (for) with Mr. HUMPHREYS (against).

Mr. LANGLEY (for) with Mr. CLARK of Florida (against).

General pairs:

Mr. LAMPERT with Mr. MEAD.

Mr. REBER with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.

Mr. ELLIOTT with Mr. DEAL.

Mr. CONNELL with Mr. BRINSON.

Mr. VARE with Mr. KUNZ.

Mr. KENDALL with Mr. PARRISH.

Mr. MORGAN with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELLIS] vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. He is not recorded.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I voted "no." I am paired with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELLIS] and I will withdraw that vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the House joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the joint resolution just passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business for the balance of the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to dispense for the balance of the day with the business of Calendar Wednesday. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Wyoming what will be taken up?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] desires to present a conference report on the seed bill. If that is disposed of without the use of very much time, we may go to the debate on the Army bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. May I ask whether the gentleman of the minority of the Subcommittee on Appropriations has been advised of this request?

Mr. MONDELL. I think so; the gentleman from Iowa is here, and can inform the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am not talking about the seed bill, but the Army appropriation bill. Has the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] been advised?

Mr. MONDELL. It is simply a matter of further general debate, and I understand there would only be one speech if we went to that debate.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. On that side of the Chamber?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming to dispense with further Calendar Wednesday business?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, on account of illness.

APPROPRIATION TO PURCHASE SEED GRAIN, ETC.—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 2897, to appropriate \$5,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain and of feed to be supplied to farmers in the crop-failure areas in the United States, said amount to be expended under the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Clerk read the report and statement as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2897) to appropriate \$5,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain and of feed to be supplied to farmers in the crop-failure areas of the United States, said amount to be expended under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 3, and 6, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum \$1,000,000 proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,500,000"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"An act to appropriate \$1,500,000 for the purchase of seed grain to be supplied to farmers in the crop-failure areas of the United States, said amount to be expended under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture."

And the House agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the amendment of the House numbered 4.

G. N. HAUGEN,
J. C. McLAUGHLIN,
Managers on the part of the House.E. F. LADD,
PETER NORBECK,
JOHN B. KENDRICK,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 2897) to appropriate \$5,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain and of feed to be supplied to farmers in the crop-failure areas of the United States, said amount to be expended under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

Nos. 1, 2, and 3 relate to the \$1,000,000 made available for the purchase of feed for the relief of live stock.

No. 5 authorizes an appropriation of \$1,000,000 instead of \$5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 4 inserts the word "authorize," so as to authorize the appropriation of \$1,000,000 instead of appropriating \$5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 6 strikes out the words "of which not more than \$1,000,000 may be used for the purchase of feed for relief of live stock" and inserts the words "and not more than \$20,000 may be used, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, by the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of this act."

The amendment of the House to the title authorizes an appropriation of \$1,000,000 instead of appropriating \$5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the words "and of feed," thus limiting the authority to make advances or loans to farmers, where the Secretary shall find that special need for such assistance exists, for the purchase of wheat, oats, barley, and flaxseed for seed purposes, and when necessary, to procure such seed and sell same to such farmers.

G. N. HAUGEN,
J. C. McLAUGHLIN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, amendments 1, 2, and 3 relate to the \$1,000,000 made available for the purchase of feed. If the conference report is agreed to no part of the money will be available for the purchase of feed. Amendment No. 5 authorizes an appropriation of \$1,000,000 instead of \$5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. The Senate recedes with an amendment making the amount \$1,500,000. Amendment No. 4 inserts the word "authorize" instead of making an appropriation. As proposed by the Senate, the House amendment authorizes an appropriation to be made. That amendment has not been agreed to. Amendment No. 6 strikes out the words "not more than \$1,000,000 may be used for the purchase of feed," and inserts the language "providing \$20,000 for expenses," in the District of Columbia and elsewhere. The amendment agreed to the title is to conform with the text.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Has the gentleman any idea of the amount that he will recommend for the next year?

Mr. HAUGEN. We will cross the bridge when we get to it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman has not yet made up his mind?

Mr. HAUGEN. We trust that no appropriation will be necessary.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Has the gentleman made up his mind that he will recommend an appropriation any year in which they fail to make a crop?

Mr. HAUGEN. I think that policy should be determined by the House.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Whenever there is a necessity for making an appropriation the gentleman from Iowa is in favor of it, is he?

Mr. HAUGEN. Of course, if Congress establishes that policy, yes. I am not very enthusiastic over that policy.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman from South Carolina guarantee an abundance of rainfall on this territory for the next two years?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I only wanted to know if the gentleman was in favor of making the appropriation when there was no crop.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think if these people can not make a success at farming in that area they had better try something else.

Mr. LAYTON. Will they guarantee the State against losses by frost? We have lost crops in our State from frost.

Mr. HAUGEN. We have lost in Iowa also.

Mr. LAYTON. They ought to if the Federal Treasury is to pay for all these losses.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Delaware better move to a territory where frost will not afflict him.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Nebraska mean to imply by the question he asked of the gentleman from South Carolina that if it does not rain they will try to grow wheat in that territory out there where God never intended it to grow?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I make no guaranty on the subject. I simply asked the gentleman what he would do on the subject of rainfall.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I was asking about the implication.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. We can not control the rainfall, but we can control appropriations.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Sometimes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The Republican side of the House ought to be able to do it, but it seems unable to do so.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. How did the conferees arrive at the amount of \$1,500,000? When the bill passed the Senate evidently through the advocacy of its enthusiastic admirers over there it passed with an amount of \$5,000,000. I understand it passed unanimously. When the bill was considered before our committee its advocates contended for \$2,000,000, and the committee, though not unanimously, reported the bill for \$2,000,000. Then, when it came to a suspension of the rules, the advocates of it evidently were satisfied with a million dollars, because the gentleman from Iowa himself offered the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill at \$1,000,000. That failed. Then, when a special rule was brought in to provide for its consideration, it passed the House at \$1,000,000. Evidently the advocates in the House were satisfied with that. I am wondering at the other body coming down from \$5,000,000 to a million and a half; evidently it meets the hilarious approval of the advocates of the measure in the House, who in that way have obtained \$500,000 more than they were asking in the House.

Mr. HAUGEN. As I stated before, the Senate bill carried \$5,000,000. The House cut it to \$1,000,000. I believe it was made clear in the House that the House would not stand for a large appropriation. Therefore it was the duty of the managers on the part of the House to insist on the lowest amount possible; it seems to me that when we agreed to a million and one-half, or an increase of \$500,000, and the Senate conceded seven times that amount, it is all that could be expected.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I was just a little bit surprised at the condescension of the other body.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. How many States will this be used in?

Mr. HAUGEN. So far as we know, probably three or four States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. That is, Wyoming, Montana, and North Dakota?

Mr. HAUGEN. The two Dakotas?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, if the gentleman will permit, no part of this sum is to be used in Wyoming. There was no suggestion of that sort until the gentleman from Mississippi made it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I wanted to make an observation, Mr. Speaker. I believe the gentleman from Iowa yielded to me.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. As I understand it, the effect of the conference report is to leave the bill just as it passed the House, except that the amount to be loaned is increased from \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; except so far as the authorization is concerned, that has not been agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. That would leave \$500,000 each for the three States. Does the gentleman think that will be sufficient to elect the three Senators in those States next fall?

Mr. HAUGEN. I am not advised as to politics in the various States, and I can not answer that question.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa please inform me why it is that it gets dryer out there as we approach the Canadian border. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAUGEN. It is very dry out there.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Speaker, I want the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS]. In regard to the appropriation, I was opposed to the \$2,000,000. I was willing to accept the \$1,000,000, and I believe I am now willing to accept the million and one-half; but so far as guaranteeing the rainfall is concerned, I merely wanted to say that we Democrats expect to be in power very soon, but not in power to that extent.

Mr. ROSENBOOM. You will promise that, anyway. [Laughter.]

Mr. LOWREY. And when we get into power a lot of us are going to do all we can to make the country dry instead of wet.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. In reply to the gentleman from Mississippi, I am glad to say that Nebraska will have none of this fund, but out in Nebraska we will have the full vote cast, and we will not rely upon a fraction of the vote of the State to make the State dry.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Oh, a fraction of Nebraska has gone down to Florida, however. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. DOMINICK) there were—ayes 91, noes 54.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment still in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 4: Page 2, line 11, after the word "hereby," insert the words "authorized to be."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 4.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do not see the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the room at the moment. I see other members of the committee here. Of course the effect of this amendment—

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will yield, I will state that I conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations about this proposition.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And it is satisfactory to the chairman, is it?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course if the Committee on Appropriations chooses to abdicate its functions I suppose we can not help it.

Mr. MANN. It is not a matter of abdicating any functions. This is a practical matter, as the gentleman understands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recede from the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment No. 4.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

CONFERENCE REPORT—DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. SHREVE. To present a conference report from the Appropriations Committee covering the Department of Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania presents a conference report on the bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10559) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ordered printed under the rule.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10871, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10871, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10871) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman begins I would like to ask what the record shows as to time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] has 146 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] has 120 minutes remaining.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss that item of this bill which undertakes to appropriate funds for the improvement and maintenance of all the navigable rivers and harbors of the United States and its Territories. I desire also to discuss transportation and rates as affected by waterways.

Our chief difficulty in procuring adequate appropriations for river and harbor improvement in this country results from the fact that there are few among us who have any conception as to the enormity or importance of our river and harbor projects. If the possibilities of water transportation and its benefits to commerce were more generally understood, our appropriations would be tremendously increased. At any rate, I think I can convince you that the amount provided in this bill, \$27,635,260, is totally inadequate to meet the country's needs.

Some months ago the Chief of Engineers of the War Department requested the district engineers, in charge of the various districts of the United States, to report estimates of the money needed during the next fiscal year to do the absolutely urgent river and harbor work in their respective districts. When the reports were all in the Chief of Engineers added the estimates and found that they made a total of \$61,337,911.

At the urgent request of the leaders of this House the Chief of Engineers went over the estimates prepared by the district engineers, and in the interest of strict economy cut them to the bone, reporting only such amounts and upon such projects as, in his judgment, the commerce of the country absolutely demanded. The total of his estimates prepared upon this basis amounted to \$42,815,661. These estimates applied only to projects heretofore adopted by Congress. In addition to these adopted projects, however, the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House has reported a bill authorizing new projects which will cost in excess of \$31,000,000, and the Chief of Engineers recommends that certain of these new projects are so important that \$14,922,220 of this amount should be expended upon them as speedily as possible. Thus it will be observed that the amounts necessary for the continuation of work on the projects heretofore adopted, together with amounts for new projects, will make a sum total necessary for river and harbor work next year amounting to \$57,737,881.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will yield, is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Subcommittee on Appropriations considering the river and harbor appropriations for the next year did not take into consideration the needs of appropriations for projects that have been recommended by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors? That item of expenditure has not been considered at all by the Committee on Appropriations. We did consider the amount needed in aid of existing authorized projects. Later on I shall try to state to the House the reasons for our favoring \$27,000,000 to carry on the work of all worthy projects recommended by the Secretary of War.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I know as a matter of fact that some of these new projects are very urgent, and the Chief of Engineers recommended that approximately \$15,000,000 be made available for their improvement at once, and I know furthermore that the people who are sponsoring these new projects are expecting a part of the \$27,000,000 to be allotted for work upon them.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have one in my own State, which the Chief of Engineers says is most worthy, and yet no part of this \$27,000,000 will be utilized for that purpose. If the bill goes through authorizing these new additional projects, undoubtedly the committee will recommend additional appropriations for them.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. I do not understand that the report of the Chief of Engineers comprehended any new projects whatever.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. It did not.

Mr. LAYTON. It was a minimum amount which he set, based upon the reports of the engineers of the whole country, as being the minimum amount absolutely necessary for existing and authorized projects.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. That is true. And then in addition to that the Chief of Engineers in a supplemental report says that \$14,922,220 of the amount provided for in the new bill should be made available at once, and I know that the advocates of the new projects are expecting that this lump-sum appropriation shall be available for their projects.

Mr. KINDRED. Does the gentleman make any distinction between the projects which have been authorized and on which money has been spent and the projects which have been authorized and upon which no money has been spent?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I presume there are some projects authorized in the past upon which no money has been spent.

Mr. KINDRED. And which may be very urgent?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I think that is probably true. And in reply to the gentleman I will say that I think that some of these new projects are very urgent.

Mr. KINDRED. Just as urgent as those on which money has been spent?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. From the information I have, I think that statement is true.

The Appropriations Committee of the House, upon whose shoulders has devolved the enormous task of making adequate and economical appropriations for all the departments and activities of this Government, has adopted the estimates allotted in the Budget for river and harbor improvement amounting to \$27,635,260. The great difficulty results from the fact that the officers who made up the budget had little knowledge of the river and harbor needs of the country and with the mass of work before them they had no time to investigate this subject.

It has been declared to be the purpose of the Appropriations Committee and of the leaders of this House to deal with river and harbor improvements upon the same basis as we have dealt with them during the past two fiscal years. I have faith that I can convince you, however, that in this purpose they have failed.

For the fiscal year 1920 we appropriated \$12,000,000 for river and harbor improvement. But at the time we made that appropriation we had in the Treasury theretofore appropriated for river and harbor work a sum total of \$58,800,000, thus making available for river and harbor improvement during that year a sum total of \$70,800,000. And we appropriated for the year 1921 the sum of \$15,000,000, but at the time we made that appropriation we had available in the Treasury, already appropriated for river and harbor work, the sum of \$37,500,000, thus making available for the year 1921, for river and harbor improvement, the sum of \$52,500,000.

The testimony of the engineers recently given before the Rivers and Harbors Committee shows that by the end of the present fiscal year practically all moneys available in the Treasury for river and harbor improvement will have been exhausted. As a matter of fact, since the war and until recently, the cost of river improvement has been so excessive that the engineers, in the interest of economy, have done little work except that which they felt to be absolutely necessary for maintenance. But the engineers in their testimony state that prewar conditions have been sufficiently restored in the cost of river and harbor work that such improvements now cost little more than they did before we entered the war, and, as a result, during the last few months they have been making progress, but now they are handicapped for want of funds, and this condition will grow steadily worse until June, when substantially all the funds will be exhausted.

As stated before, in 1920 we had \$58,800,000 available in the Treasury. We appropriated that year an additional sum of \$12,000,000, and last year we appropriated \$15,000,000, making a total of \$85,800,000, which we made available and which has been expended in maintenance and improvement of meritorious existing projects during the last two fiscal years. In other words, the engineers have actually expended in necessary river and harbor work the sum of \$42,900,000 during each of the past two fiscal years, and they tell us that the absolute needs of the country for next year amount to \$42,815,661.

Mr. ROACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. ROACH. Is it not true that if the appropriation is cut any considerable amount below \$42,000,000 the large harbors, where commerce already exists, will have the strong claim for the available funds, and that our inland rivers will be the ones to suffer as a result of such cut?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. The gentleman is quite correct. We who are interested in the inland rivers have learned by experience that when inadequate lump-sum appropriations are made the pressure from large seaports upon the War Department is so strong that under the law, which provides that the money shall be expended in the interest of commerce, the department finds itself unable to allow sufficient funds to the inland rivers to make effective improvements thereon, and after this kind of experience during the past three years we are no longer fooled about the results of inadequate lump-sum appropriations, and that is why we Representatives from the valley are here stubbornly insisting upon appropriations sufficient to enable the engineers to take care of the harbors and still make reasonable allotments to our inland rivers.

Those of us who know the Chief of Engineers, Gen. Lansing H. Beach, and his assistant, Gen. Harry Taylor, and know their records for fairness and economy, and who have taken the time to go over the needs and merits of the projects upon which this

money is to be expended, know that their estimates are reasonable and that it is not in the interest of economy to appropriate less than they have recommended.

From these facts and figures I am persuaded that any fair-minded man must concede that an appropriation of \$27,635,260 is totally inadequate to meet our river and harbor needs and that the amount reported in the bill should be increased to at least \$42,000,000.

Mr. ROACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. ROACH. As I understand, the Chief of Engineers at first recommended that \$61,000,000 could be profitably expended, but that, at the request of the leaders of the House, the engineers revised their estimates to a minimum—in other words, cut them to the bone—and that such revised estimates called for an appropriation of \$42,000,000 as being absolutely necessary to carry on river and harbor work, and that with the urgent projects which are being provided for in the new bill \$42,000,000 will not be enough by \$15,000,000 to carry on the urgent and necessary work of the country.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. The gentleman is entirely correct. It will require \$57,737,881 to do the work which is urgent during the next fiscal year. But, of course, the engineers can do infinitely better with \$42,000,000 than they can with \$27,000,000.

Those responsible for this item in the bill contend that the cut was made in the interest of economy, and I will concede that in this hour of national stress economy is essential; but if we are to meet our national obligations we must develop our resources, and if we are to develop our resources we must have more adequate and cheaper forms of transportation, and we can not have this without the development and use of our inland waterways, and we can not develop our waterways without adequate funds with which to improve them.

The first essential to river navigation is an adequate channel, just as the first essential to rail transportation is a proper and safe roadway. A river for navigation is no better than its shallowest and narrowest section and can not be used any more than a railroad can be used between two given points until the last tie has been laid and the last rail nailed down, and so our great misfortune in river improvement has been due to the fact that while Congress has appropriated millions of dollars it has doled it out in such inadequate amounts that none of the projects have been completed. I will now give you the proof of this assertion.

On June 25, 1910, Congress undertook the improvement of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio to the mouth of the Missouri with a view to establishing an 8-foot channel from Cairo to St. Louis, and a 6-foot channel from St. Louis to the mouth of the Missouri, the work to be completed within a period of 12 years at a cost of \$21,000,000.

On June 25 next that 12-year period will have elapsed and yet Congress in its effort to carry out its plan to improve this project during the time allotted has appropriated only \$1,970,000, and still our river critics are demanding to know why the Mississippi River between Cairo and St. Louis is not in more general use. If a railroad company had undertaken to build a railroad from Cairo to St. Louis in 1910 and had pursued a course such as Congress has pursued, how much freight do you think would have been hauled over such railroad between the points named? And to what extent do you think such railroad would now be in use?

On June 25, 1910, Congress undertook the improvement of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Missouri to Minneapolis with a view to establishing a permanent 6-foot channel within a period of 12 years and at a cost of \$27,000,000. On June 25 next the 12-year period within which these improvements were to have been made will have expired. Upon that project Congress has expended \$12,250,000, and yet that enormous expenditure can not be utilized because the project has not been completed. There are still shallow places unimproved. In other words, the last tie has not been laid and the last rail nailed down, and, consequently, the vehicles of commerce can not move.

On July 25, 1912, Congress undertook the improvement of the Missouri River between Kansas City and its mouth with a view to establishing a permanent 6-foot channel within a period of 10 years, and at a cost of \$20,000,000. Like the other projects just named, this project was adopted by a solemn act of Congress. The people of Kansas City, inspired by their faith in Congress and with a hope and realizing the need for cheap water transportation, raised by private subscription more than \$1,000,000, and out of these funds they built docks, barges, and tow boats and undertook the navigation of the Missouri River and the establishment of commerce thereon.

In vain did they labor, for on July 25 next the 10-year period will have expired, and while Congress has appropriated during that time the sum of \$7,500,000 the project is only one-third completed, and the river can not be used except in high water, because its sand bars have not been removed and its channel fixed. It has 350 miles of permanent 6-foot channel the year round, but for 50 miles there are sand bars, and as a result this large expenditure is not being utilized. And the people of Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, and the adjoining States are still deprived of the blessings which cheap water transportation would bring in carrying to the market their wheat, corn, hay, and manufactured products.

On June 25, 1910, Congress undertook the improvement of the Ohio River from Pittsburgh to the mouth, with a view to establishing a permanent 9-foot channel within a period of 12 years, at the cost of \$63,731,000. On June 25 next that 12-year period will have expired. Congress in its efforts to carry out its plan has appropriated \$43,624,000 upon this project. And yet this vast expenditure of money can not be utilized to any considerable extent, because the project is only two-thirds completed. The commerce from Pittsburgh and that great territory adjacent to the Ohio River is deprived of the benefits of cheap water transportation out to the sea and to the markets of the world because Congress, although spending millions of dollars upon this project, has failed to carry out its program as planned.

What we need in this country to-day, and what we have needed in this country during the last 12 years, is more business in Government, less pork-barrel appropriations, and more projects completed.

As every Member of this House is doubtless aware, the War Department has been operating a Barge Line upon the Mississippi River between St. Louis and New Orleans during the past year. St. Louis has expended \$1,000,000 building a 900-foot concrete dock with modern loading and unloading equipment. When it was constructed it was thought to be adequate for years, but it has been outgrown by the commerce developed in one year's time and extensions will have to be constructed. From New Orleans to Cairo the river has been improved. Between these points full cargoes are moving the year round, but because Congress has failed to carry out its program for the improvement of that stretch of 120 miles between Cairo and St. Louis full cargoes can go from St. Louis through to New Orleans only when the water is high. At other seasons the cargoes have to be broken up at Cairo and the barges towed separately from Cairo to St. Louis by tugs, which is a wasteful interference with a successful operation.

It is asserted that we have an 8-foot channel the year round between Cairo and St. Louis. This is true, but the channel as now improved during the low-water season is wide enough only for single barges and packet boats. I doubt if the average Member of this House comprehends either the size or potentiality of a modern towboat with its cargo of barges making its way along the Mississippi River. When the water was high last season it occurred upon numerous occasions that one towboat would make the trip in six days from St. Louis to New Orleans with eight barges, carrying enough freight to load 12 full freight trains, each train carrying 50 loaded cars, with 50,000 pounds of merchandise to the car.

But a tow of barges, such as I have described, is 900 feet long and 150 feet wide, and while it can navigate upon an 8-foot channel, yet, with the river between Cairo and St. Louis in its present unimproved condition, its navigable channel being narrow in places, such a cargo in low water can not navigate the bends in the swift current without danger of its barges colliding with sand bars. If Congress had carried out its project and had appropriated the funds as planned, that stretch of the Mississippi between Cairo and St. Louis would now be improved, and cargoes, such as I have described, would be moving without interference practically 10 months in each year from St. Louis straight through to New Orleans.

One of the difficulties with which the barge line has had to contend and which has done much to prevent river navigation in this country has been the unfair and unreasonable rates which the Interstate Commerce Commission has permitted the railroads to charge upon their lines which parallel the rivers, and this likewise applies between coast points as well as between river points throughout the United States. Congress has given to the Interstate Commerce Commission full power to correct these abuses, but it has not done so. In order to illustrate and demonstrate the contention that unfair and unreasonable rates have been made upon rail lines which parallel the river, permit me to call your attention to a few specific instances of rates now in force, as I found them to be within the past 30 days, from the records of the Interstate Commerce Commission. For instance, the railroads haul to-day from New Orleans

to St. Louis, a distance of 718 miles, 100 pounds of second-class freight for \$1.73, while they charge for hauling the same amount of the same kind of freight from New Orleans to Fort Smith, Ark., a distance of 494 miles, but where no water competition exists, the sum of \$1.84 $\frac{1}{2}$. The railroads to-day haul 100 pounds of first-class freight from Portland, Me., to New Orleans, a distance of 1,685 miles, for the sum of \$2.51, because water competition exists between these points, while they charge from Kansas City to New Orleans, a distance of 879 miles, but where no water competition exists, because the river has not been improved, the sum of \$2.48 $\frac{1}{2}$; while they charge from Omaha to New Orleans, a distance of 1,062 miles, \$2.79 $\frac{1}{2}$ —one-third less distance, but a greater rate. And they charge from Denver to New Orleans, a distance of 1,349 miles, 300 miles less than from Portland, Me., to New Orleans, but where water competition is not possible, the sum of \$3.04.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. The railroads make low rates for competing with water transportation and then make the inland points pay for it.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes; and Kansas has been making a very substantial contribution to this system.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. We have been making contributions for a good many years.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. No better illustration can be shown of the methods used by railroads to destroy water competition than the rate recently established between Minneapolis and St. Louis upon first-class freight. A barge line is about to begin operations upon the Mississippi between these points. The railroads went recently before the Interstate Commerce Commission and received authority to make a rate upon 100 pounds of first-class freight from Minneapolis to St. Louis, a distance of 586 miles, for \$1.06 $\frac{1}{2}$, while the same commission permits the railroad over a more level country from Minneapolis to Kansas City, 86 miles less distance, to charge for hauling the same kind and amount of freight the sum of \$1.44, because no river runs direct from Minneapolis to Kansas City.

If the railroad can afford to carry freight from Minneapolis to St. Louis for \$1.06 $\frac{1}{2}$ per 100 pounds, it ought not to be permitted to charge 38 cents more to carry 100 pounds of the same kind of freight a less distance to Kansas City, and if the rate from Minneapolis to Kansas City is a reasonable one, then the railroad ought not be permitted to establish a confiscatory rate along the river, merely for the purpose of preventing river navigation.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman would not advocate a refusal to permit the railroads to make rates to meet the competition of the actual waterway competition?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I would advocate prohibiting the railroads from collecting exorbitant rates upon inland lines to make up what they lose trying to destroy barge-line transportation upon our waterways.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. It is usually contended that when the rates were cut to enable the railways to compete with the water lines, that the rates are fixed so as to make a little more than out-of-pocket costs. The theory is that it would so destroy the system throughout the country that it would mean an increase of the rates where there was no water competition, so the real result is that we get a better service by permitting the competition of water rates.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I know they have fine-spun theories by which they seem to be rather successful in continuing the practice. I know, on the other hand, that the railroads of this country never have and never will be able to compete with water transportation successfully. There is only one way they can compete, and that is to make a rate less than cost along the water lines and recoup their losses by overcharging the shippers who live in territory where water transportation does not exist.

Another striking illustration of the influence of water competition upon railroad rates and of the discriminations which the people of the Mississippi Valley are compelled to endure because of the failure of Congress to improve our waterways, is shown by the fact that the railroads to-day will haul 100 pounds of paint from Boston to Seattle, a distance of 3,258 miles across all the mountains and prairies of this country, for \$1.83 $\frac{1}{2}$, because water competition exists around through the Panama Canal, while they charge \$1.06 $\frac{1}{2}$ for hauling the same amount of paint a distance of 916 miles across the prairies from St. Louis to Denver, but where water competition is not possible. In other words, the people of the valley are compelled to pay \$1.06 $\frac{1}{2}$ to have 100 pounds of paint hauled 916 miles across a level country, while the railroads haul the same amount of paint a distance of 2,342 miles across the mountains of this country

for the sum of 77 cents, and all of this is done under authority conferred upon the railroads by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The railroads to-day haul 100 pounds of first-class freight 3,313 miles from San Francisco to Boston for \$6.16, while they charge \$5 to haul the same amount of the same class of freight 1,986 miles from San Francisco to Kansas City. Such discriminations against the interior of the country should not be allowed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether they are violating the law, but the law provides for discriminatory rates at water points, and they are not allowed to put it below compensatory rates.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I know, but they have queer systems of bookkeeping.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. As I read the law, the railroads can not charge more than a compensatory rate to any people.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I know that is true according to law.

Mr. HOCH. Following out that line, would it not follow that if the rates in competition with water transportation are, as a matter of fact, compensatory, then rates to the interior are unquestionably high?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

If the railroads can afford to make the rates they do between Frisco and Boston and between Boston and Seattle, then they ought not be permitted to charge the rates which they impose upon the people of the Mississippi Valley. And if they can not afford to make the rates which they make between Boston and Seattle and between Frisco and Boston, then they ought not to be permitted to make such rates in competition with the merchant marine which we have expended \$3,500,000,000 to establish. And if the railroads can afford to make such rates as I have described, then why was it necessary for Congress to appropriate out of the Treasury and to pay them as a result of the deficit under governmental operation the sum of \$1,600,000,000 and to loan them \$500,000,000 more?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I do not think that follows at all. The rate may be more than the out-of-pocket cost and yet not sufficient to be compensatory in the general sense of that term. It does not follow at all.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The law says "reasonably compensatory at river points." If you cut it to reasonably compensatory rates and higher elsewhere, the elsewhere is more than reasonably compensatory.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Not at all; it is a different standard. When you take the compensatory rates with reference to water competition it is a different standard from the compensatory rate in a general way.

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I will.

Mr. ROSE. I note from the chart exhibited by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON] that there is great discrimination in the rates charged by railroad companies between certain points, as shown on the chart. It would appear that the inland districts and cities are obliged, indeed compelled, to make up losses incurred by railroads where the roads are in competition with water transportation. If that be true, why is it that all inland towns and cities are not charged proportional rates instead of being called upon to pay discriminatory rates, which makes competition in certain commodities almost prohibitive. I agree with the general proposition that inland cities and towns should pay a higher freight rate than the rate in competition with water rates. Any point other than a terminus of a railroad must of necessity pay a larger freight rate, for the reason that the breaking of trains, shifting cars to sidings, and drilling trains can only be done at increased cost, so that location has much to do with freight rates by railroad transportation only. But from information from persons in position to know, I offer the suggestion that the rates are not uniform. A number of complaints have been filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission because of unfair rates charged on lumber shipped to Pennsylvania from some of the Southern States. Our chamber of commerce, of Johnstown, Pa., has joined with other bodies in filing complaints with the commission. The unfair or discriminatory rates are not directly chargeable to the railroads entering the city of Johnstown; they have made every effort to bring relief to the business interests affected in the city of Johnstown. It so happens that Johnstown is compelled to suffer the brunt of the high freight rate. It may be that it will be found necessary to make a formal complaint to the commission, but our people are justly entitled to a revision of the rates without being compelled to expend large sums of money therefor. It may be that the southern lines will appreciate the situation and make proper adjustment of the rates to cities situated as is

Johnstown and so make possible fair competition in many lines of endeavor. This appears to me the right place and time to present this situation.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman, and I think some system ought to be worked out so that our transportation systems can be made to cooperate and not be fighting each other all the time.

A striking illustration of this country's lack of business in Government may be found in the operation by the railroad administration of the railroad and barge line between St. Louis and New Orleans. With one arm of the Government the Director General of Railroads took \$9,000,000 out of the Treasury with which to build barges and towboats in an effort to develop commerce upon the Mississippi River, while with another arm of the Government he wasted millions of dollars carrying freight upon railroads which parallel the river at less than cost trying to prevent commerce from developing upon the river. Again, I repeat, the need of our country is more business in government. And while Members of Congress from the valley States are helping to appropriate millions to improve the harbors along our seaboard and to reimburse the railroads for their losses, it would seem that a just reciprocity would demand that the Mississippi and its tributaries should be improved for navigation in order that the people who live in that great productive area of this country might be given an opportunity through the blessing of cheap transportation to develop the resources so abundant in that region.

The most deadly obstacle with which the barge line has had to contend, more destructive even than the cutthroat competition carried on by the rail lines which parallel the river, is the unfair division the barge line has to make with the railroads of the revenue collected for a joint rail-and-water haul. I know of no way to present this feature more effectively than by giving a number of concrete examples. I will quote the divisions of rates approved by Examiner Woodrow, representing the Interstate Commerce Commission in a case filed by the barge line and now pending before the commission, and I am advised that the proposed division of rates is merely a continuation of the rates prescribed by the railroad administration and still in force.

For instance, on first-class freight from St. Louis to Bayless, Ark., by a joint rail-and-water haul the rate is \$1.55 $\frac{1}{2}$ per 100 pounds. The rail line carries this freight 74 miles, while the barge line carries it 306 miles, and yet the rail line gets 88.5 cents for hauling it 74 miles, while the barge line is allowed only 67 cents for hauling the same freight 306 miles. In other words, the railroad carries the freight 15 per cent of the total haul and collects 57 per cent of the revenue.

Mr. LAYTON. Who fixed that rate?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. That rate was fixed by the railroad administration just before they went out of office. But it is an abuse that ought to be corrected.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman please tell me how and by whom?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. It can be corrected all right.

Mr. LAYTON. By the Government?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. Is not that the only solution?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes; I think it is. You can see the difficulty of operating against this kind of discrimination.

Mr. LAYTON. Has the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to fix water rates?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. The Interstate Commerce Commission has the power under the law to fix joint rail and water rates.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How many miles of that haul you referred to are by water and how many by rail?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. The railroad hauls the freight 74 miles and takes 88 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents of the freight and the barge line hauls it 306 miles and gets 67 cents of the freight.

Mr. ROACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. ROACH. Is it not a fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission has the authority to regulate and correct the unjust discriminatory rates now in force and to which the gentleman has referred?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I will answer the gentleman's question by reading an extract from subdivision 3 of section 15 of the transportation act:

The commission may, and it shall whenever deemed by it to be necessary or desirable in the public interest, after a full hearing upon complaint or upon its own initiative without a complaint, establish * * *

joint rates * * * applicable to the transportation of passengers or property * * * (or in the case of a through route where one of the carriers is a water line, the maximum rates, fares, and charges applicable thereto) and the divisions of such rates * * * as herein-after provided, * * * and this provision, except as herein otherwise provided, shall apply when one of the carriers is a water line.

In the face of this language, can there be any question about either the right or the duty of the commission to correct abuses such as I have described? And if complaint is not made, then it should correct them upon its own initiative in the public interest. Yes; and in the interest of water transportation, which Congress has by law declared should be fostered and preserved in full vigor.

The shipper pays \$1.48 per 100 pounds on first-class freight from St. Louis to Monroe, La., over a joint rail-and-water haul.

In the division of the revenue so collected the railroad takes 81 per cent for hauling the freight 37 per cent of the distance, while the barge line is allowed 19 per cent of the revenue collected for hauling the freight 63 per cent of the distance.

It costs \$1.64 to haul 100 pounds of first-class freight over a joint rail and water line from St. Louis to Smithson, Ark. The railroad performs 36 per cent of the service and takes 88 per cent of the revenue.

It costs \$1.28 to haul 100 pounds of first-class freight from St. Louis to Holly Springs, Miss. The railroad hauls the freight 10 per cent of the distance, but takes 50 per cent of the revenue collected, leaving to the barge line the other half of the revenue for performing 90 per cent of the service.

It costs \$1.74 to haul 100 pounds of first-class freight over a joint rail and water line from St. Louis to Collinston, La. The railroad hauls this freight 35 per cent of the distance and takes 81 per cent of the revenue collected.

It costs \$1.03½ to haul 100 pounds of freight over a joint rail and water line from New Orleans to Quitman, Miss. The railroad hauls this freight 40 per cent of the distance, but collects 96½ per cent of the revenue. In other words, the railroad hauls this freight 109 miles and receives \$1 therefor, while the barge line hauls the same freight 165 miles and receives 3.5 cents.

It costs \$1.32½ to haul 100 pounds of freight from New Orleans to Brownsville, Tenn., over a joint rail and water haul. The railroad hauls this freight 7 per cent of the distance and takes 41 per cent of the revenue.

It costs 87½ cents to haul 100 pounds of first-class freight over a joint rail and water haul from Mobile to Yolande, Ala. The railroad hauls this freight only 7 per cent of the distance and takes 42 per cent of the total revenue collected.

It costs \$1.54 to haul 100 pounds of first-class freight from St. Louis to Stuttgart, Ark., over a joint rail and water haul. The railroad carries this freight 20 per cent of the total distance and takes 61 per cent of the revenue collected. From these illustrations you will understand the system used by the railroads for destroying water transportation by taking the major part of the revenue, while the barge line performs the greater part of the service.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman should bear in mind the difference between the expense of maintaining and operating the water line and maintaining and operating the railroad. The railroad has to pay the expense of maintaining its right of way and it has other expenses which the water line has not.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. That is the point precisely. It costs the railroads infinitely more to transport a given amount of freight than it costs the barge line to transport an equal amount of freight, and the public has to pay the carrier the cost to it of the transportation plus a reasonable amount of profit, and if the public can get its commerce hauled by water at one-third or one-fourth the price at which the railroads can afford to haul such commerce, why should not the public avail itself of that advantage instead of continuing to pay the rate which it is now compelled to pay to the railroads? [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes; but the waterways do not extend to all parts of the country.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. That is true; but let us give the public the benefit of cheap water transportation where waterways exist and then pay the railroads a compensatory rate, a rate which will pay their expenses and will give their stockholders a dividend occasionally between points where water competition does not exist. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman realizes that there is time freight and that there is dead freight?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I do.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. There is some freight in the hauling of which time is of the essence of the contract.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. And there is other freight which may just as well be transported by the slower water route.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. That is true.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Is the public willing to pay the difference?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Certainly. For first-class freight they can afford to pay what it costs to haul it, and the waterways should be utilized to haul the heavy, bulky freight, such as lumber, coal, building materials, sisal, burlap, coffee, sugar, and so forth, and the cars which are now being utilized for this purpose should be set free to supply the ever-increasing demand for transportation facilities in those sections of the country where waterways do not exist.

The unfair division of rates which I have described has been continued for two years, while full power was vested in the Interstate Commerce Commission to correct it, and that, too, in the face of an act of Congress approved more than two years ago, which contained the following language:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote, encourage, and develop water transportation service and facilities in connection with the commerce of the United States, and to foster and preserve in full vigor both rail and water transportation.

Can it be contended with any show of color that the Interstate Commerce Commission is trying to preserve in full vigor the water transportation of this country when it permits the railroads to take 97 per cent of the total revenue collected for a joint rail and water haul when it performs only 40 per cent of the service, as is being done upon the Mississippi and Black Warrior Rivers?

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. If they paid that Black Warrior traffic manager \$16,000 or \$20,000 a year instead of \$12,000 he might be able to get more than 4 per cent of the total freight. The Government runs that Black Warrior Line and gets 4 per cent of the freight charge, and the traffic manager gets \$12,000 a year and has no traffic.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I am not advised as to the salary now being paid the manager of the Black Warrior section. I suspect that it is not exorbitant, but I do not believe that any salary which may be paid to the manager of that line would insure a successful operation with the present division of rates which the railroads demand of the barge line.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ARENTZ] is very much mistaken when he says there is no traffic there.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. There is traffic there and the barge line is hauling it; but under the present division of rates it does not pay, and these rates were undoubtedly made for the purpose of destroying water transportation.

Mr. ARENTZ. When I say there is no traffic, I mean to say there is so little that you can hardly call it anything at all.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. A suit was filed before the Interstate Commerce Commission on the 11th day of October, 1920, pointing out these abuses and appealing to the commission to correct them. That suit has been pending for one year and four months, while the barge line is compelled to struggle on, enduring this frightful discrimination, while the railroads collect as high as 97 per cent of the revenue for 40 per cent of the service.

The water critic is frequently heard to proclaim that river navigation is not practicable and that money expended in that direction is wasted. If that is true, then why do the railroads carry commerce along water lines and between ocean points at an infinitely less rate than they carry the same commerce between points where water competition does not exist, and if river navigation is not practicable then why should it become necessary for the railroads to take three-fourths of the revenue for one-fourth of the service where commerce passes over a joint rail and water line?

As a matter of fact, cutthroat rates have long been practiced by the railroads in their efforts to prevent water transportation in this country, and they are not only destructive to river navigation but they are destructive to the railroads themselves. Experience shows that the railroads never have been and that they never will be able to successfully compete with water transportation, and every attempt that they make in that direction is a source of useless expense.

As a Member of Congress I voted for the Esch-Cummins bill and for every other bill which in my judgment would strengthen and sustain the railroads, and I have not changed my views upon that subject. The country needs railroads and must have them where a cheaper form of transportation does not exist. For their services they ought to be allowed to collect sufficient revenue to defray all their necessary expenses and to pay a reasonable dividend to the stockholders, but they should not be allowed

to charge a confiscatory rate in one section of the country to destroy water transportation upon our rivers and then to charge exorbitant rates upon lines where there can be no water competition in order to recoup their losses. The public is entitled to the cheapest form of transportation available. If our railroads will quit wasting money along our rivers and between our water points, they will be able to give our people who are away from our rivers a reasonable rate and still earn a profit.

The thing in which we are interested in this country is a means of carrying our commerce. If our resources are to develop so that our national obligations can be met, then we must develop a great system of transportation, consisting of railways, waterways, and highways, each serving the public as economically as it can afford, not competing but coordinated with each other in one harmonious transportation system.

Mr. LAYTON. As a matter of fact, this great question of transportation in the United States is one that has never yet apparently invited the real solemn attention of the American people.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I think you are absolutely right.

Mr. LAYTON. We are spending large sums of money on rivers and harbors, and every dollar that we spend on rivers and harbors, as a rule, is in competition with the railroads, and then we have an Interstate Commerce Commission, with labor boards and everything of that kind, and we are taking the railroads over and handling them by law, and every instrumentality of transportation is running against every other. There is no coordination in any direction. In addition to that we are spending millions of dollars for public highways, which always enter into competition with both waterways and railroads.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. We are not interested in railroads, we are not interested in waterways, we are not interested in highways. But the thing in which the American people are interested is adequate and economical facilities for transportation. [Applause.]

The War Department, through the direction of Col. T. Q. Asburn, of its department of transportation, and Theodore Brent, the barge-line director, is making a demonstration upon the Mississippi River between St. Louis and New Orleans which is proving, in the face of tremendous obstacles, that river navigation is not only practicable but that it can be made a powerful instrument in the commercial development of the country. The barge line is carrying freight at 80 per cent of the rail rates which parallels the river, and the rail lines which parallel the river are permitted to make rates which amount to little more than 50 per cent of the average rail rates of the country; and in addition to this severe competition the barge line is handicapped by the unfair and unreasonable division of joint rail and water rates which I have just described. And yet the Mississippi Barge Line, in the face of all these difficulties, is operating at a profit.

The barge line began its operation on the 1st of January last year, and with 1 new towboat and 39 barges, most of which were inactive for a time for want of power to move them. In June 2 new towboats were added to the fleet and 1 old stern-wheel towboat, the *Barrett*, was rebuilt and put into service. Then 2 additional towboats were completed and put into service in November, making a total of 6 towboats, aided by three or four old inferior tugs, and this fleet is still in operation between New Orleans and St. Louis, and in order that you may understand the extent and success of that operation I will give you the tonnage, the gross expenses, the gross revenue, and the revenue, and the results.

Mississippi River section, 1921-22.

1921.

JANUARY.

Tonnage, 5,921.	
Gross expenses	\$81,915.80
Gross revenue	31,986.00
Deficit	49,929.80

FEBRUARY.

Tonnage, 23,203.	
Gross revenue	86,480.78
Gross expenses	77,610.21
Profit	8,870.57

MARCH.

Tonnage, 24,012.	
Gross expenses	95,783.00
Gross revenue	92,792.43
Deficit	2,991.18

APRIL.

Tonnage, 36,917.	
Gross revenue	166,266.10
Gross expenses	122,541.24
Profit	43,824.86

	MAY.
Tonnage, 44,412.	
Gross revenue	\$158,263.23
Gross expenses	129,555.98
Profit	28,707.25
	JUNE.
Tonnage, 38,476.	
Gross revenue	186,241.93
Gross expenses	148,017.07
Profit	38,224.86
	JULY.
Tonnage, 44,829.	
Gross revenue	192,584.52
Gross expenses	138,997.11
Profit	53,597.39
	AUGUST.
Tonnage, 58,345.	
Gross revenue	252,800.77
Gross expenses	180,938.43
Profit	71,862.34
	SEPTEMBER.
Tonnage, 44,372.	
Gross expenses	175,976.71
Gross revenue	159,917.35
Deficit	16,059.36
	OCTOBER.
Tonnage, 40,026.	
Gross expenses	173,609.65
Gross revenue	148,667.83
Deficit	25,031.31
	NOVEMBER.
Tonnage, 38,850.	
Gross expenses	154,598.31
Gross revenue	115,004.69
Deficit	39,583.62
	DECEMBER.
Tonnage, 59,062.	
Gross revenue	199,140.48
Gross expenses	159,289.42
Profit	39,851.06
	1922.
Tonnage, 60,529.	
Gross revenue	190,650.00
Gross expenses	188,000.00
Profit	2,650.00
	FEBRUARY.
Tonnage, 59,257.	
Gross revenue	183,378.00
Gross expenses	180,500.00
Profit	52,878.00

SUMMARY.

Total tonnage, 563,211.	
Gross revenue	\$2,164,270.09
Gross expenses	1,559,423.72
Profit	204,463.37

It is interesting to note that within a period of 14 months, with this limited equipment in its experimental state, operating under conditions which I have described, the barge line collected a total revenue of \$2,164,270.09. Operating, as it did, at 80 per cent of the rail rate which paralleled the river, this 20 per cent differential has resulted in a saving to the shippers who patronize the barge line amounting to \$541,134. It is also interesting to note that in spite of the obstacles encountered by the barge line during the first 14 months of its operation, its receipts exceed its total expenditure in the sum of \$204,463.37.

The barge-line equipment was built under war conditions at a war-time cost in excess of \$9,000,000. That equipment has been recently appraised, and it is found that the same equipment could be constructed to-day at a cost of approximately \$4,000,000.

Experienced rivermen tell me that there are barges and other equipment inferior to this which have been in use upon the Mississippi River for more than 40 years. There is no reason to believe that this equipment, under proper care, would not last equally long. This would mean a depreciation of 2½ per cent, amounting to \$100,000 per year. It will be observed from the figures which I have given that the barge-line profit during the last 12 months amounted to \$243,905.60. After setting aside \$100,000 of the total profit earned as depreciation, there is enough left to yield 3.6 per cent income upon \$4,000,000, the present reconstruction cost of the equipment. Even though the rail lines on an average collect 50 per cent more for the services rendered than the barge line, yet how many railroads are there

in this country who can boast of a better showing during the past 12 months?

It has been reported that while the barge line earned a profit last year it did not earn enough to pay its depreciation, but this is due to the fact that the barge line was required by a rule of the Interstate Commerce Commission to set aside for depreciation a sum equal to 5 per cent of the book value of the equipment, amounting to more than \$9,000,000, and the 5 per cent was fixed on the theory that the equipment will be worn out in 20 years. A fair depreciation would be 2½ per cent upon the cost of constructing the same equipment to-day.

The barge line made a profit of \$245,905.60 during the year in spite of the fact that during the months of September, October, and November, 1921, there was a loss of \$72,674.29. This is due to the fact that great quantities of wheat were moving from Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and western Missouri and adjoining States over the barge line during these months, and the Interstate Commerce Commission had reduced the freight rate upon wheat from 19 to 14 cents per 100 pounds, and, inasmuch as the 20 per cent differential made the barge line attractive to the shipper, great quantities of this wheat went over the barge line with much profit to the shipper but with considerable loss to the barge line. The railroads, however, fared only 20 per cent better than the barge line upon wheat which they carried. As a matter of fact, when unjust discriminations are eliminated and a fair division of freight is compelled on a joint rail and water haul, States like Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and South Dakota will profit as much from cheap water transportation on the Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers as the farmer and the merchant who resides upon or near the bank of the river.

In order to ascertain the character of freight which is being carried upon the Mississippi barge line and in order to learn its origin and destination I procured from that line a list of the freight which went down the Mississippi in one cargo last November. It would take too much time to give the entire list of freight carried in that cargo, but I will give you a few of the items, together with the point of origin and point of destination of each item:

From—	To—	Commodity.
St. Louis.	New Orleans.	Bulk corn.
Do.	do.	Bulk wheat.
Do.	Porto Rico.	Liquid paint.
Do.	Habana, Cuba.	Corn.
Do.	Hamburg, Germany.	Flour.
Do.	Tampa, Fla.	Wheat.
Do.	Portland, Oreg.	Iron castings.
Do.	Vera Cruz, Mexico.	Nails.
Memphis.	Tampa, Fla.	Feed.
Do.	Liverpool, England.	Cotton.
Do.	Shanghai, China.	Do.
Do.	Stockport, England.	Do.
Do.	Ghent, Belgium.	Do.
Do.	San Francisco.	Washboards.
Sandusky, Ohio.	New Orleans.	Crayons.
Indianapolis, Ind.	do.	Iron link belting.
Collierville, Tenn.	Bremen, Germany.	Cotton.
Jonesboro, Ark.	Liverpool, England.	Do.
Racine, Wis.	New Orleans.	Liquid wax.
St. Joseph, Mo.	Tampa.	Animal feed.
Kansas City, Mo.	New Orleans.	Burlap bags.
Bayard, Nebr.	Tampa.	Stock feed.
Elkton, Mich.	do.	Dried beans.
Indiana Harbor, Ind.	Kobe, Japan.	Sheet steel.
Chicago, Ill.	San Francisco.	Agricultural implements.
Do.	Portland, Oreg.	Do.
Paris, Ill.	Hamburg, Germany.	Starch.
Blytheville, Ark.	Liverpool, England.	Cotton.
Covington, Tenn.	do.	Do.
Caruthersville, Mo.	Bremen, Germany.	Do.
Do.	Liverpool, England.	Do.

Criticism is sometimes made of the fact that the Government is engaged in the operation of a transportation system, and no one believes in private operation more than I, but as a result of the war we have millions invested in waterway equipment, and if we do not want Government operation of our waterways we must find a status, a legal status, by which private capital in river operations can be made safe, and in the face of the discriminations and unfair division of rates, which I have described, it is evident that that status does not exist to-day. Who would be willing to purchase the barge-line equipment on the Mississippi and subject himself to the cutthroat competition and unfair division of rates which the Interstate Commerce Commission permits the railroads to practice?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman is on that subject, let me ask him a question. That barge line is a feature of the war, primarily?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. There is practically no transportation on the Mississippi River to-day except that barge line?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. There has been quite a good deal developing recently.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. How can you with success develop transportation on the Mississippi River by private enterprise so long as this system of discriminatory rates exists?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I will say frankly to the gentleman that if the discriminatory rail rates, which I am pointing out, and the unfair division of freight collected upon joint rail and water rates are continued and some legislation is not passed by Congress to correct these abuses, there is little hope of any considerable water transportation being developed by private capital.

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

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. As a matter of fact, could the Interstate Commerce Commission correct these abuses now, taking into consideration the operation of the railroads, with your labor boards and your wage boards and all that?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes; they could.

Mr. LAYTON. I do not think they can.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. If this Congress will enact legislation which will make it mandatory for the Interstate Commerce Commission to prevent these abuses and to treat waterway transportation with the same consideration which it gives to transportation by rail, our equipment can be sold to private capital at a tremendous advantage and cheap water transportation will develop upon our inland rivers which will stimulate the industries of the country and will benefit the railroads as well.

There may have been some excuse in years past for neglecting our rivers and depending upon our railways, because our railways were able then to meet the demands of commerce and their rates were not unduly high. But conditions are changed now. There has not been a railroad of any consequence constructed in this country in 15 years, and I have not seen capital looking for railroad investment. As soon as business opens up in earnest again the railroads will be totally inadequate to meet the demands of commerce. Furthermore, their rates are high, and when we consider the cost of railroad operation I am convinced that these rates may have to go higher still. I know of no better authority for the inability of the railroads to reduce rates or to meet the demands of commerce than statements made by officials of the railroads.

I am advised that Vice President McCrea, of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., before the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce on February 24, 1922, while discussing this subject, made a statement which contained the following:

In the United States during the 12 months ended December, 1921, but 400 miles of new line were built, while 700 miles have been abandoned. Practically no railroads have built double track, increased their yard facilities, or taken steps to relieve congested points where they have had much of their trouble in the past few years and know they will have more trouble in the future. We have had no money for this; every dollar available and all of our energies have of necessity been expended in restoring our existing facilities to a safe and efficient operating condition.

I am also advised that Vice President Elisha Lee, of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., in a speech recently before the Manufacturers Association of Philadelphia made a statement which, among other things, contained the following:

Traffic on our American railroads measured in ton-miles doubles about once in a decade or possibly a little longer. The next time our country has a real revival in business we shall in all probability be confronted with the most severe congestion of railroad traffic and the greatest inadequacy of railroad facilities ever experienced in our history.

When that happens rates will be lost sight of. Everyone will be clamoring for service, and our public highways will again be torn to pieces by huge truck loads of freight carried over roadways never designed for such purposes, and at rates and costs of operation so high as to constitute gross economic waste.

Then business men will not be bothering themselves much about rates. All they will be thinking about will be how to get transportation at any price.

In the face of these gloomy forebodings proclaimed by high railroad officials; in the face of their admissions that when business conditions improve they will not be able to meet the demands of commerce; in the face of their promise of still higher rates and with our knowledge that their predictions are well founded, how can any Member justify himself in failing to support adequate appropriations for the improvement of our waterways so that we may have facilities sufficient for our slow freight at least?

Mr. McDUFFIE. And do not they carry the commerce in shorter time than the railroads?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes. I have received a number of letters from shippers in St. Louis stating that consignments

of freight from points in England and Europe brought by ocean steamers to New Orleans and by barge to St. Louis have arrived in a shorter time than shipments by rail from various points in the United States.

The commerce of the country must have a cheaper and more adequate form of transportation for its bulky commodities. And where can you find such transportation except by the use of our waterways? At the close of the World War Kansas had an abundance of wheat. The market was strong and the price high, but cars to move the wheat were not available. Before the railroads could supply the cars to move this wheat the market had gone down until, I am advised, there was a loss to the farmers of Kansas amounting to more than \$2,000,000. Unless transportation facilities are increased this thing will occur again. If the Missouri River had been improved a few cars could have hauled this Kansas wheat to Kansas City, where it could have been loaded upon barges and carried to the market while the price was high, and that at a low freight rate. Surely the farmers of Kansas are interested in having this thing made possible.

In order to demonstrate to you the extent to which freight rates in this country have been increased during the past two years, I want to give you a few specific examples. Two years ago the rate on 100 pounds of sugar from New Orleans to St. Louis was 44 cents; to-day it is 59½ cents. Two years ago the rate on 100 pounds of sugar from New Orleans to Camden, Ark., was 50 cents; to-day it is 67½ cents. One year ago the rate on 100 pounds of wire rope from Clinton, Iowa, to Seattle was \$1.32; to-day it is \$1.50. One year ago the rate on 100 pounds of wire rope from Mount Wolf, Pa., to Seattle was 69 cents; to-day it is \$1.83½. And this general increase prevails throughout the country. I am not contending that the railroads can afford to make cheaper rates, for I know that it costs about three times as much to construct the necessary equipment and to carry a given amount of freight over a rail line than it does over a water line. What I am contending is that we need a form of transportation which it costs less to produce.

As an illustration of what barge-line transportation means to the farmer, I was told by a St. Louis hay merchant recently that he had been seeking a market for his hay in Cuba, but that he had found that hay produced upon the farms of Canada was being transported from Canadian ports to Havana for \$3 less freight per ton than hay could be shipped from St. Louis to the same port. He told me that the corn men of St. Louis were competing in the Cuban market because the barge line, though its space was limited, would take corn at the river rate. Hay from Missouri and Iowa and Kansas could likewise compete in the Cuban market if the barge-line equipment was adequate to give this bulky commodity space and likewise the benefit of its low rate.

I have stated that the barge line was carrying freight at 80 per cent of the rail rate which paralleled the river, and that the rail rate which paralleled the river was little better than 50 per cent of the average rail rate of the country. In proof of this assertion I desire to state that the barge line last year collected 3.86 mills per ton-mile for all the freight which it hauled. In other words, for every ton of merchandise which it carried 1 mile it received for compensation therefor the sum of 3.86 mills. In response to a request which I made upon the Interstate Commerce Commission as to the average revenue per ton-mile which the railroads of the United States received for carrying commerce during the years 1920 and 1921, I received a communication from that commission, dated the 2d instant, in which they informed me that the record for 1921 is not yet compiled, but that their records show that for the year 1920 the railroads of the United States received on an average for all freight carried the sum of 10.52 mills per ton-mile; and the rates were higher in 1921 than they were in 1920. In other words, the service of the barge line costs the shippers only 36 per cent as much as the service of the railroads, and the records further show that of the 10.52 mills which the railroads collected for each ton-mile for freight hauled it required 93.05 per cent of such amount to pay the expenses of operation, but that of the 3.86 mills which the barge line collected for each ton-mile of freight hauled it required only 90 per cent for operating expenses. There can be no question about the economy of water transportation. In the face of these facts, if the primary purpose of Congress is to serve the best interest of the whole people, how can we justify our failure to make appropriations adequate to insure the development of a form of transportation which will cost the people of this country only one-third as much as the form of transportation which they are compelled to use to-day? Whom are we here to serve, the railroads or the public? If it is the railroads, then for their own sake we should bar them from

from this foolish and wasteful competition. If it is the public, then we should no longer deprive them of the economy of water transportation. In what are we interested? Is it railroads or is it transportation for American commerce, regardless of form and at the cheapest prices obtainable? In our answer to these questions the public is concerned. [Applause.]

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

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAYTON. According to the gentleman's own statement there will be—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAYTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional 15 minutes, not to be taken out of the time already allotted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that can not be done.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to address myself particularly to the rivers and harbors item of this bill.

Too much stress can hardly be laid upon the absolute necessity of a thorough and comprehensive program for the development of our inland waterways, those great natural channels of transportation which have for so many years been practically neglected in our economic development. While it is true that millions have been appropriated from time to time for the development of individual projects, the great fault has been that plans completed in all sincerity have not been carried out. Appropriations have been made for the maintenance of a 6-foot channel from St. Paul, the headwaters of the Mississippi, to St. Louis—upon what is known as the upper Mississippi. Expenditures have been made with this purpose in view, but the work has lapsed from time to time, with the result that the 6-foot channel has not been maintained during the period of low water, and consequently navigation has been suspended.

Considering river navigation from a national viewpoint, in conjunction with our plans for developing our merchant marine and increasing our foreign trade, it is absolutely essential that shippers be given as low a through rate as possibly can be fixed upon the bulky commodities that enter into our foreign trade in order to permit American business to compete with our overseas rivals. If we can cut our transportation costs materially in delivering our commodities from the interior to our ports, it means that much more of an advantage to our people in foreign markets. This cost must be kept down to a minimum in order to compete with the constantly increasing productive capacities of foreign countries. Unless our transportation costs upon wheat and other agricultural commodities entering our export trade are decreased, it means the American farmer must bear the burden of decreased prices for his products. By the expenditure of a few millions of dollars in perfecting these lanes of transportation benefits of untold millions will accrue to the producers of our country. Surely this is economy of the most practical nature. We can well afford to accept the expert advice of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army in appropriating \$42,815,661, the amount he sets as the absolute minimum required for the improvement and the maintenance of our river and harbor facilities and for the very urgent new projects under contemplation.

In an address made by Vice President McCrea, of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., before the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce on February 24, 1922, he stated:

What is the real problem we have before us? Should we not anxiously consider the time when industries will be producing 100 per cent and will be demanding double the amount of transportation from the railways? Do you appreciate that the railways of this country are standing still, as far as expansion to meet these inevitable conditions of the future?

This statement, coming from one of the responsible heads of one of our great railway systems, clearly indicates the condition of our transportation facilities at the present time. Further on in his address Mr. McCrea pointed out that our railroads are doing nothing to meet the anticipated requirements of the near future when American business again returns to its normal capacity, nor to meet the increased output of our factories and farms as a result of the increasing demand due to the development of our foreign trade. There is a solution to this most perplexing problem. The railroads can and must be relieved of the responsibility of this added service. It

can very conveniently and very practicably be handled upon our inland waterways at an economic saving of millions of dollars to our producers. Our foreign competitors have the full use and benefit of both rail and water transportation, while we are practically confined to the use of but one form of transportation which has become entirely inadequate to meet the needs of our growing commerce. The only possible means of relief is water transportation. What are you going to do about it? Are you going to make sufficient appropriations for the proper development of our waterways, or are you going to allow our railroad facilities to suffer another total collapse such as we experienced during the recent war, as they surely will under the stress and strain of the constantly growing mountain of freight that must reach our ports once our output reaches its peak. To stagnate this business once it assumes these proportions will result in irreparable damage to our economic structure. It will create a spirit of depression even more sinister in its forebodings than that following the signing of the armistice. We must take advantage of this opportunity to ward off this danger by approving the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers for the development of our inland waterways. Of course, we all realize that railroad transportation is an absolute necessity. We could not exist without this system of transportation. But the point I desire to bring out forcibly is that our inland waterways are just as essential to the economic development of our country as are the railroads. In order to utilize our railroads to the utmost and increase their practicability and efficiency we must develop our waterways. Our railroads have reached the limit of their capacity for rendering satisfactory service. This thought is expressed generally by men primarily engaged in railroad activities. No one knows better than they the seriousness of the situation confronting us; they admit the railways will be in no position to handle the constantly growing commerce of the country, and yet some of their leaders openly and stubbornly antagonize all efforts tending to effect a utilization of the only other means of transportation which can effectively preclude the disaster which imminently hovers over them.

The practicability of transportation upon the Mississippi River is no longer doubted. The success of the service maintained between St. Louis and New Orleans has set at rest any fears of the failure of this method of transportation. To extend this service successfully upon the upper Mississippi is a very simple procedure. The barges and the motive power for the maintenance of such service has already been provided. The Government has recently completed the construction of a fleet of up-to-date barges and power boats, which are ready to operate on the river. The only drawback at this time is the lack of appropriations to put the channel in such shape as to insure a 6-foot waterway for the entire season. Once the municipalities along the river are assured of regular service very little time will be lost in building adequate dockage facilities to handle their local freight. The Government should assist municipalities along the river in the construction of docks and providing facilities for handling all foreign freight—that is, through freight from inland points to down-river points, and vice versa—for this burden should not fall entirely upon the local people; it is a national requirement and should be financed by the people as a whole. Under an amendment to the transportation act the Secretary of War was authorized to construct terminal facilities for interchange of traffic between the transportation facilities operated by him and other carriers. The War Department is now operating facilities on the lower Mississippi and on the Warrior River from Mobile to Birmingham, Ala. The authority for the construction of such terminal facilities and their maintenance should be extended to include those required along all our navigable inland waterways wherever they are utilized for the transshipment of commodities. Congress is responsible in a large measure for the success or failure of our transportation systems in an emergency. It has the power now to avert a repetition of the serious breakdown that occurred during the war. It has the opportunity to assist in the development to the fullest extent of our merchant marine and our foreign commerce, which directly concerns our people as a whole. This is a national problem and must be considered as such and not as a community or local matter. The amendment to increase the item of \$27,635,260 for rivers and harbors to the amount suggested by the Chief of Engineers of the War Department—\$42,815,661—should be adopted.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to yield time?

Mr. SISSON. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, this is designated as the Army appropriation bill, before the House for consideration, but the

speeches have taken a broad range and have gone far afield from this immediate subject under discussion. One gentleman discussed railroad rates and fertilizers. Another discussed rivers and harbors, another discussed the bonus, and it occurs to me that they have failed to reach the fundamentals of what is the matter. My friend discussing the fertilizer business and railroad rates surely ought to see that they can not have any cheaper fertilizer under present conditions and that you can not have cheaper railroad rates under existing conditions as are safeguarded around the famous Esch-Cummins railroad bill. When the Congress of the United States guaranteed to the railroads in the United States, after allowing them to pad their expense accounts and pyramid all types of expenses, and make 6 per cent clean profit, how do you expect the railroad rates to come down? Every man who is cognizant of conditions throughout this country, from the Canadian line to the Gulf of Mexico and from the Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic, must see that railroad rates are taking too much toll from all lines of industry. And let me say that any man who is a friend of the wealth producers of the United States is bound to admit that in the last analysis they are paying these exorbitant freight rates. In the last analysis these same people are paying these exorbitant fertilizer prices. What brought that about? The Republican majority of this House rammed through that Esch-Cummins bill that fastened these railroad rates on this country that will hang like a millstone around the neck of every honest wealth producer and wage earner in it. The farmers of the United States are paying seven-tenths of all the charges on freight of these railroads to-day. The statistics from your Government show that he paid that outrageous toll for freight on all the produce from the ground that he ships; that all of his truck, wheat, corn, potatoes, cotton, and wool, all of his live stock, must finally go to the manufacturer or to the consumer, and the charge for the freight is fixed in the sales price, and the farmer must bear that high freight rate that goes to make up their transportation charge on what he produces.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I will yield.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It costs just exactly half you get for beef steers shipped from Texas to Kansas City. What is responsible for that, the freight rate?

Mr. QUIN. It is the infamous Esch-Cummins railroad bill. When a Republican Congress guaranteed to them a profit of 6 per cent on all of their watered stocks and bonds, on all of their padded pay rolls, and unwarranted expense accounts, how do you expect, my friends, for the farmer and wage earner of this country to get a square deal? How do you expect the man out on the farm to prosper who must buy farm implements, who must buy clothing for his family, who must buy wagons, must buy tractors and fertilizers and other implements to carry on the occupation of a farmer?

He must pay that same exorbitant freight rate on those things that he consumes from the factory or distributing point down to the railroad station where he goes in to take them out to his farm. Do you not see that they rob him coming and going? There is a reason why all the outrageous toll comes out of the pockets of these men back on the farms, and some newspapers and some people in high station have the gall to criticize men in the Senate and in the House of Representatives because we have the manhood and the courage to endeavor to have some relief given to these farmers of the United States who constitute the backbone of the population of this Republic. And if this Republic is to be saved from all the dangers that stare it in the face it must be saved by the people back in the rural districts, these people who produce from the earth the food and the clothing that the folks of the country must consume.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. In 1920 the railroads of the country collected from the people of the United States—

Mr. QUIN. Talk fast. I have only 20 minutes. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. QUIN. Just a short question. I have not much time. I want to make a speech here. [Laughter.] In 1920 the railroads were robbing the people, and by the help of the Republican Party and a few Democrats they have been allowed to continue that thievery and robbery into the year 1922. One gentleman said that the United States was not able to pay the soldiers a bonus.

That same Republican Congress that put across this iniquitous railroad bill, to allow the transportation companies to press down upon the wealth producers, wage earners, in fact all laboring people, and every legitimate industry of the United States,

and take away from them half of their earnings in railroad rates, did some other things. They placed an additional burden on the people. They allowed all of these contractors to come in and filch this Government out of \$2,000,000,000, and the gentleman from California, my good friend Mr. LINEBERGER, said that they could not pay a bonus unless they do it by the sales tax, which would make the soldier himself pay his own bonus. They are going to enact a sales tax and let the poor people of the United States pay the bonus. Has it come to pass that this administration and a set of Congressmen and Senators would vote to give the railroads \$2,000,000,000, and paid all these war-profiteering contractors that rode during the war in their fine limousines and with silk hats on their heads \$2,000,000,000, and refuse to give after the war is over a bonus to these soldiers who went back home after the war was over, but before going to their families they had to get rid of the camp lice by having all their Army clothing run through a delousing machine? And yet some rich people in the United States cry out to-day, "Do not allow the boys a nickel; they were taken better care of than at any other time in their lives; they got plenty to eat, and a good suit of clothes, and can work." These same wealthy people were back home profiteering while those boys were standing deep in the mud of the trenches, ready to be shot at from German machine guns, cannon, rifles, and poisonous gas, receiving \$1 a day. One dollar and twenty-five cents per day is all that the American Legion asks Congress to pay as a bonus. Just \$1.25 a day for the actual time the soldier was in the service. Is that too much compensation? And yet they will allow a railroad president \$100,000 a year salary. By conscription you forced the soldier into the service to fight for his country, whether he wanted to or not, and now this country can not allow him to have the paltry sum of \$1.25 a day as bonus compensation, a just compensation at that, from this great Government of ours, except as the President said, and as the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] said, it is proposed he shall pay it himself through the route of the sales tax. Who in the world would consider that anything except an insult to every soldier of the United States, that he can only have a bonus provided he and his kinsfolk pay it? [Applause.] These people who profiteered during the war and are profiteering now, and are putting their hands down into the pockets of the people, are to go free and not help to pay these soldiers any bonus.

Another thing, the President of the United States, whom my friend Mr. LINEBERGER praises so highly, came before this Congress and asked it to aid and give further assistance to the rich. It seems that his policy is to give unto them that hath and take away from them that hath not, even that which they seemeth to have. [Laughter.] He proposed a ship subsidy bill to this House. The profiteers robbed the people in the construction of those ships of many hundreds of millions of dollars, and now the President proposes to let that same gang take them back at 30 cents on the dollar, and give them out of the Treasury of the United States \$30,000,000 to \$50,000,000 a year, compelling these same farmers, these same wealth producers, wage earners and laborers, and small business people of the Nation, not only to take care of these railroad freebooters, but to come up and take out of their pockets sufficient money to enrich the gentlemen who will take over the Government's fine merchant marine for nothing. Will Congress bow down to any such thing as that? And yet the gentleman from California says the Government can not give the soldiers a bonus unless they make the soldier himself pay it by sales taxes.

Now, what else have they done? They have proposed to allow the biggest Army here four years after the war is over that was ever heard of in the United States in peace times. War is over; the country is at peace. President Harding did a fine thing to call the nations of the earth together in a peace conference here, and they did a lot of good. They propose to take off a great part of this burden of the Navy, and I had hoped that this Congress, acting upon the request of the President of the United States, would reduce the size of the Army down to 50,000.

Yet that same President is alleged to have given out an interview on the day after I told Gen. Pershing before our committee that we ought to pass a bill limiting the Army to not over 75,000, and in that interview the President said the Army must not be reduced; if so, but very little; that he would rather have it stay as it is. Do you believe that those farmers that are paying seven-tenths of all these freight rates, and who are going to have to pay exorbitant rates on all the freight that goes on the ocean vessels after the Government practically gives its ships to a smooth set of business men, and in addition \$50,000,000 yearly as a subsidy, and with all other laboring people

will have to pay 70 per cent of all the \$50,000,000 a year that the President proposes to pay out as a subsidy to the ship-owners, are not going to have to pay the greater part of this immense Army bill?

The committee did its best, I think, to bring in a report recommending an appropriation for 115,000 men; but they want 11,000 officers. I am ashamed to say it, but when the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I am a member, reported out the bill, against my vote, to have officers up to the number of 13,000, Gen. Pershing, Chief of Staff, said he would need as many officers for an Army of 75,000 as for one of 150,000. [Laughter.] If a man had a few hands working for him—say 25 hands—according to Gen. Pershing's reasoning he would need as many foremen as he would if he had 50 hands or 100 hands. Gen. Pershing said he did not want a single general knocked off. You know there are 67 generals, and each of them gets as much as the combined income of 15 or 25 farmers. He did not want a single general displaced, no matter how much the Army was reduced.

Here is an Army recommended in this bill of 115,000 men. In my judgment, in peace times it is 65,000 more men than we ought to have. Fifty thousand enlisted men in the Regular Army and a strong National Guard is all we need. It ought to be reduced anyhow to 75,000 men. With all the foreign countries bankrupt, the United States is the only Nation that is able to pay its debts, and those other countries, which owe us so much money, are using our money to pay a bonus to their former soldiers. That bonus is coming out of the pockets of the people of the United States, and yet some folks are sitting here now bellowing for a big Army when every nation in the world is broke except the United States. [Applause.]

What do we want this big Army for? Do you believe that the wealth producers, wage earners, small business people, and professional men of the United States want such an Army as that? Do they want to have a soldier strapped on the back of each one of them when they are already humpbacked with bearing taxes of every kind—road taxes, and school taxes, and municipal taxes, and State taxes, and Federal taxes—and then have the Federal Government come in, slapping them in the face and pushing them down and putting soldiers on their backs? Do you believe there is a small business man or laboring man or woman or a farmer in this great Republic who wants such a big Army as this? [Applause.] Certainly none of them want 11,000 or 13,000 officers. If we are going to have an Army to go out and fight, they have already shown how we can get there. But we are not fixing to fight anybody. Before our committee those officers sat up with a straight face and talked as if we were going to war next week. [Laughter.] Ah, gentlemen, these gentlemen always told us before we got into war that it would take two years to train a soldier. Their faces would be as long as affidavits [laughter] when they told the committee it would take two years to teach young men how to march and drill and fight the enemy. But that fiction has been done away with. This war has demonstrated that we can train a man to fight, and fight effectively, in three months' time.

But that is the kind of rot that they used to hand out. Now that that is done away with it seems they want to destroy the National Guard. It seems that the National Guard must be supplied with a flying squadron and with a tank squadron and a balloon squadron and a chemical-warfare squadron, and every other kind of expense. Of course, the States can not maintain that kind of a National Guard. There is only one kind of army that is any way cheap, and that is the National Guard. Every State in this Union ought to have a strong National Guard of infantrymen, and the Federal Government ought to pay its part of it. [Applause.]

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

Mr. QUIN. Can the gentleman from Mississippi give me five minutes more?

Mr. SISSON. I would be glad to give the gentleman all the time remaining, but I can not. It is all promised.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] wish to use any more of his time to-night?

Mr. SISSON. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. I move that the committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. WALSH having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the War Department appropriation bill (H. R. 10871), had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution authorizing the extension, for a period of not to exceed 25 years, of the time for the payment of the principal and interest of the debt incurred by Austria September 4, 1920, for the purchase of wheat from the United States Grain Corporation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10559) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2897) to appropriate \$5,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain and of feed to be supplied to farmers in the crop-failure areas of the United States, said amount to be expended under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 160) authorizing the extension for a period of not to exceed 25 years of the time for the payment of the principal and interest of the debt incurred by Austria for the purchase of wheat from the United States Grain Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, March 17, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SINNOTT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 10443. A bill to repeal section 2453 and to amend sections 2450, 2451, and 2456, Revised Statutes of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FORDNEY: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 10874. A bill to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4933) granting a pension to W. W. Cooper, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 10924) to increase the limit of cost of the post-office building to be erected at Cohoes, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 10925) to authorize the Secretary of War to sell real property known as the Pittsburgh

storage supply depot at Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 10926) to provide surgical or medical treatment for the men of the Army, National Guard, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodetic Survey who have been honorably discharged from the service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 10927) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Hanes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENHAM: A bill (H. R. 10928) granting a pension to Minnie M. Wayt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10929) granting a pension to Sarah R. Spraggin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10930) granting a pension to Minnie Hosier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10931) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10932) granting a pension to Robert Ashby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GENSMAN: A bill (H. R. 10933) for the relief of Allen Ellsworth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 10934) granting a pension to Kate Garrity; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 10935) granting a pension to Emma J. Philhower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10936) granting a pension to Charles Farris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 10937) for the relief of John C. Fite; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON: A bill (H. R. 10938) granting a pension to Eva E. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.*

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4635. By Mr. BEGG: Petition of citizens of Huron County, Ohio, protesting against so-called Sunday blue laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4636. By Mr. CRAMTON: Resolution of the Michigan State Horticultural Society, of East Lansing, Mich., favoring the purchase of Muscle Shoals by Henry Ford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4637. Also, petition of Mrs. W. H. Hall and other residents of Vassar, Jacob Law and other residents of Millington, and Andrew J. Pierce and other residents of Lapeer, all in the State of Michigan, protesting against the passage of House bill 9753, Senate bill 1948, and similar bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4638. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York, urging the reestablishment of the pneumatic-tube system in the New York post office; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4639. By Mr. DREWRY: Petition of sundry citizens of Petersburg, Va., opposing the passage of House bill 9753 or any other Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4640. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of certain citizens of Bellingham, Wash., opposing the passage of House bill 9753 or any other Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4641: By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of residents of Cassopolis, Mich., requesting that immediate action be taken in the form of special and immediate legislation providing that the payment of Austria's debt to the United States be suspended for at least 20 years; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4642. Also, petition of residents of Bangor, Mich., protesting against the enactment of House bill 9753; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4643. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Jabez Burns & Sons, of New York City, N. Y., opposing the soldiers' bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4644. Also, petition of Edward B. Smith & Co. and their employees, all ex-service men, of New York City, N. Y., opposing

the passage of any soldiers' bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4645. By Mr. LEE of New York: Resolution of the Board of Aldermen of the city of New York, for restoration of pneumatic-tube service in New York and Brooklyn; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4646. By Mr. MALONEY: Resolution adopted by the City Council of the city of Lynn, Mass., favoring the passage of the soldiers' bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4647. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the Fathers' Association of the Washington School, of Oakland, Calif., indorsing House bill 7 and Senate bill 1017; to the Committee on Education.

4648. Also, petition of the California Bean Growers' Association, of San Francisco, Calif., urging appropriation for research work looking to the eradication of the "ladybird" or "Mexican bean beetle"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4649. Also, petition of the National Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, of San Francisco, Calif., indorsing and urging the passage of House bill 10198; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4650. Also, petition of B. F. Mackall, of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the enactment of the bonus bill; also, petition of C. C. Dickinson, M. D., member of Cheula Post, No. 92, American Legion, of McCloud, Calif., indorsing the bonus bill and urging its support; also, petition of David G. Kling, a lawyer of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against a tax on letter mail in raising revenue for the soldiers' bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4651. By Mr. RIORDAN: Resolution adopted by the board of aldermen of the city of New York, urging the restoration of the pneumatic-tube system in the New York post office; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4652. By Mr. ROSSDALE: Resolution adopted by the board of aldermen of the city of New York, to have the pneumatic-tube system restored in the city of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4653. Also, resolution adopted by the New York State executive committee of the American Legion, to provide proper hospitalization for the disabled soldiers and that the Langley bill be immediately reported to Congress; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

4654. Also, resolution adopted by the New York State executive committee of the American Legion to approve the fivefold optional plan of adjusted compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4655. By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of Twin Falls Chamber of Commerce, of Twin Falls, Idaho, urging that the unemployed be given work on the reclamation projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4656. Also, petition of the Commercial Club of Burley, Idaho, urging that the unemployed be given work on the reclamation projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4657. Also, petition of the North Side Community Club of Gooding, Idaho, urging the enactment of legislation providing for a more rapid development of the waste lands; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

4658. Also, petition of the Wallace Study Club, of Wallace, Idaho, urging the enactment of legislation providing for a more rapid development of the waste lands; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

4659. Also, petition of the members of the Eldorado Heights Civic Club, of Jerome, Idaho, urging the enactment of legislation providing for a more rapid development of the waste lands; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

4660. By Mr. TAYLOR of New Jersey: Petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, protesting against House bill 9753; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4661. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of Northwest Grange, No. 413, of Edon, Williams County, Ohio, urging immediate consideration of the truth in fabrics bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4662. Also, petition of certain citizens of Liberty Center, Ohio, urging that House bill 9753, a bill to secure Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, be not passed; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4663. Also, petition of Pulaski Grange, No. 2046, of Bryan, Ohio, asking for the early consideration and passage of the truth in fabrics bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4664. Also, petition of citizens of Liberty Center, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 9753, a bill to secure Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 17, 1922.

(*Legislative day of Thursday, March 16, 1922.*)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Treasury Department which are not needed in the transaction of business and having no permanent value or historic interest, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a joint select committee on the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments. The Vice President appointed Mr. STERLING and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate and ordered that the Secretary notify the House of Representatives thereof.

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, several days ago I called the attention of the Senate to a statement issued by the head of the American Legion showing that there are several million men out of work in the United States, 700,000 of whom are ex-service men, and protesting against the number of immigrants continually coming into the country to increase the number of idle people. He urged the President to help provide work for these unemployed ex-service men. I am not saying this in criticism. I am simply calling the attention of the Senate to the alarming condition brought about by the millions of unemployed in our country, which is being increased by the large number of immigrants constantly brought to our shores. If Congress had not passed the 3 per cent law last year we would have had one or two million more unemployed here now. I favored at the time this legislation was enacted and think now we ought to stop all immigration for five years, except in certain extreme cases of the same family, some of whom are already here and a number of whom served in our Army during the late war.

I have a letter now from the head of the American Federation of Labor, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD. I hope that the Senate Committee on Immigration will change the recent bill which passed the House and take steps to stop practically all immigration. The House bill simply extends for one year the 3 per cent law Congress enacted last year. If the Senate concurs in the House bill the 3 per cent law will expire June 30, 1923. Unless Congress is called in extra session at that time there will be no law restricting immigration, and the steamship companies, interested only in the profits they make in bringing the immigrants here, will use extra ships and bring in two or three millions more before Congress can pass a law preventing it. The regular session of Congress will convene in December, 1923. If one House of Congress should pass a bill restricting immigration the opposition in the other House might be able to delay action, which would give the steamship companies another year, in which they would bring in three or four million more immigrants to add to our already several million unemployed. If the Senate will not stop immigration entirely, as I believe should be done, it seems to me absolutely necessary that we should extend the present 3 per cent law until June 30, 1924, instead of 1923, as provided in the House bill. The letter from the head of the American Federation of Labor protesting against the House bill is exactly in line with that of the head of the American Legion. I have again offered an amendment that will prevent immigration for five years; also an amendment requiring that all immigrants be brought to this country in our own ships, and our agents could then prevent the undesirable ones from coming over and being sent back to their own country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1922.

Hon. WILLIAM J. HARRIS,

Senate Committee on Immigration, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In the name of the workers and the would-be workers now unemployed we protest against the adoption of H. J. Res. No. 268, as passed by the House of Representatives.

At the hearings before the House committee the representatives of the American Federation of Labor urged that immigration be restricted, except for the dependent immediate relatives of aliens now here who have established themselves and are able to support such dependent relatives, on the ground that every effective immigrant admitted under present industrial conditions must result in throwing out of employment a worker now in our country. We repeat that assertion; we point